

The 12th ODA Evaluation Workshop

Kuala Lumpur, 2-3 December, 2014













Table of Contents

Co-chairs' Summary	1
Record of Discussion	4
1. Opening Session	4
1.1. Welcome and Opening Remarks by Co-hosts:.....	4
1.2. Welcome Address and Introduction by Co-chairs.....	5
1.3. Presentation of JICA's Project Evaluation	5
1.4. Discussion.....	6
2. Session 1:	
Impact of Evaluation on Effectiveness of Bilateral Development Assistance	6
2.1. Presentation:	
Impact of Evaluation on Effectiveness of Bilateral Development Assistance in India.....	6
2.2. Presentation:	
Impact of Evaluation on Effectiveness of Bilateral Development Assistance in the Republic of Fiji	8
2.3. Discussion.....	10
3. Session 2:	
Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Assistance in Regional Cooperation	12
3.1. Presentation:	
Nepal's Perspectives.....	12
3.2. Presentation:	
Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Assistance in Regional Cooperation in the Philippines.....	14
3.3 Discussion.....	14
4. Session 3:	
The Role of the APEA and its Future Possibilities	17
4.1. Presentation:	
From JES to APEA (Asia Pacific Evaluation Association): Missions, Goals, Programmes and Institutional Development.....	17
4.2. Presentation:	
The MES- A VoPE with a Mission	18
4.3. Discussion.....	19
5. Session 4:	
New Trends in Evaluation	23
5.1. Presentation:	
New Trends in Evaluation.....	23
5.2. Presentation:	
New Trends in Evaluation at USAID	24
5.3. Discussion.....	26
6. Closing Session	29
Appendix 1: Workshop Program	30
Appendix 2: List of Participants	32
Appendix 3: List of Abbreviations.....	34

Co-chairs' Summary
The 12th ODA Evaluation Workshop in Kuala Lumpur on Dec. 2-3, 2014
Co-hosted by
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan
and
Economic Planning Unit, Prime Minister's Department, Malaysia

The 12th ODA Evaluation Workshop was held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, on December 2 and 3, 2014, and was jointly hosted by the Government of Japan and the Government of Malaysia.

1. Opening Session

Opening and welcoming remarks were delivered respectively by representatives of the two co-hosts: Mr. Kingo Toyoda, Deputy Director-General of the International Cooperation Bureau at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), Japan, and YBhg. Dato' Nik Azman Nik Abdul Majid, Deputy Director-General of the Economic Planning Unit (EPU), Malaysia. This workshop was co-chaired by Mr. Hiroyuki Kubota, Senior Deputy Director of the ODA Evaluation Division at MOFA and Mr. Mohamad Razif Abd Mubin, Deputy Director of the Environment and Natural Resources Section at EPU. Mr. Kubota explained the background to this workshop, and Mr. Mohamad Razif outlined the program for the two days of sessions.

To open the workshop, Mr. Keiichi Muraoka, Director General of the Evaluation Department at the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), made a presentation describing its project evaluation.

2. Session 1: Impact of Evaluation on Effectiveness of Bilateral Development Assistance

In this session, the impact of the evaluation on the effectiveness of bilateral development assistance was discussed. Two presentations were made: the first by Mr. Subrat Kumar Pradhan, Deputy Director of the Department of Economic Affairs at the Ministry of Finance, India, and the second by Mr. Mosese Ravasakula, Senior Economic Planning Officer, Overseas Development Assistance Unit at the Ministry of Finance, Fiji. Mr. Romeo B. Santos, Professor at the University of the Philippines, and Chair of Pilipinas Development Evaluators Association and Interim Vice President of the Asia Pacific Evaluation Association (APEA), moderated the discussion that followed the presentations.

The discussion by participants focused on the following major themes and points highlighted by the two presenters:

- 1) Mutual accountability of donors and recipient countries
- 2) The impact of evaluation on making development programs more effective
- 3) Emerging needs for evaluation in recipient countries and the purpose of evaluation for recipient countries
- 4) Application of emerging evaluation methodologies in determining the effectiveness of official development assistance (ODA) projects

3. Session 2: Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Assistance in Regional Cooperation

In Session 2, two presentations were made on efforts and challenges for enhancing monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of development assistance in regional cooperation: the first was by Mr. Narayan Dhakal, Under Secretary of the International Economic Cooperation Coordination Division at the Ministry of Finance, Nepal, and the second was by Ms. Violeta Corpus, Assistant Director of Monitoring and Evaluation Staff, National Economic and

Development Authority, the Philippines.

Mr. Champak Pokharel, the Board Member and Former Chairperson of the Nepal Evaluation Society, moderated the discussion after the presentations.

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

- 1) Expansion in the scope of development assistance beyond ODA
- 2) Diversifying donors and need for synchronizing the objectives of development assistance with the goals of recipient countries
- 3) Each country being the ultimate implementer of evaluation on regional development cooperation
- 4) Lack of funding arrangement for evaluation and weak desire for independent evaluation in general
- 5) Needed capacity building in both M&E

4. Session 3: The Role of APEA and its Future Possibilities

In Session 3, the participants discussed the role and future possibilities of the APEA as the first evaluation network in the Asia Pacific region. The presenters were two of the leading members of the APEA: Prof. Ryokichi Hirono, Interim President of APEA and Senior Advisor of the Japan Evaluation Society and Mr. Arunaselam Rasappan, Interim Secretary of APEA, and Board Member of the Malaysian Evaluation Society. Prof. Hirono outlined the history of the APEA, its recent activities, and challenges facing the APEA as well as collaboration with various partners. Following the presentation, Mr. Rasappan shared his perspective on the history of the Malaysia Evaluation Society as well as its activities and challenges. Mr. Benedictus Dwiagus Stepantoro, President of the Indonesian Development Evaluation Community and Board Member of APEA, moderated the discussion that followed the presentations.

Participants made various comments on points that included:

- 1) Important pressure from experts of evaluation societies on governments for the effectiveness of policies and institutional practices
- 2) Support from APEA for countries where national evaluation societies do not exist
- 3) Needed push for evaluation exercises even in places where the demand for evaluation seems to be at a relatively low level
- 4) Organizational processes regarding membership of APEA
- 5) Cross-cutting issues in evaluation

5. Session 4: New Trends in Evaluation

In this session, the emerging agenda and challenges for evaluation were discussed. Mr. James George, Assistant Resident Representative of the United Nations Development Programme, opened the session by introducing the recent changes in approaches to M&E with the emergence of information and communication technologies. Ms. Suzanne Polak, Regional Learning, Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor of the Regional Development Mission for Asia in Thailand, at the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), presented new trends in M&E at USAID. Mr. Pokharel moderated the questions that followed the three presentations.

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

- 1) Participation from local communities in designing programs and evaluation
- 2) Inter-ministry collaboration, coordination, ownership, and standardization in evaluation
- 3) Involvement of governments in independent evaluation
- 4) Adding new language in contracts that allows changes in bureaucracy

- 5) Knowledge management system for sharing and learning
- 6) Evidence-based results and values in evaluation

7. Closing Session

The two co-chairs concluded the Workshop by sharing a draft of the co-chairs' summary and confirming that the participating governments, international organizations, and evaluation societies will continue their dialogue with the aim of enhancing the quality of evaluation in each country and in the region as a whole. They also thanked all participants for their lively and stimulating presentations and discussions.

<END>

The 12th ODA Evaluation Workshop

Record of Discussion

1. Opening Session

1.1. Welcome and Opening Remarks by Co-hosts:

The 12th ODA Evaluation Workshop was opened by co-host Mr. Kingo Toyoda, Deputy Director-General of the International Cooperation Bureau at MOFA, Japan. He stated that this workshop had participants from 17 Asian and Pacific countries as well as development partners to discuss the evaluation of ODA for the effective use of further assistance and efficient implementation of ODA. Highlighting that Japan is proud of great advances made by the Asia Pacific region in various Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) towards the deadline year of MDGs, 2015, he emphasized the importance of assessing the achievements and reflecting the lessons learned in the Post-2015 Development Agenda. As 2015 is the International Year of Evaluation, it will be crucial to further advocate and promote evaluation and evidence-based policy-making at international, regional, national and local levels. Japan, which celebrated the 60th anniversary of its ODA this year, will continue to advocate the enhancement of the development evaluation capacities of partner countries. Mr. Toyoda expressed his gratitude to the Government of Malaysia for co-hosting the workshop and his expectations for hearing a wide range of ideas from participants and discussions on the evaluation of development assistance.

This was followed by a speech from the other co-host, YBhg. Dato' Nik Azman Nik Abdul Majid, Deputy Director General (Policy) of the Economic Planning Unit (EPU), Malaysia. He extended his gratitude for being able to make a welcome speech in this workshop, which is hosted by MOFA and EPU. He stated that this is the second time Malaysia has hosted the workshop since 2007 and that he is glad Kuala Lumpur was chosen as the venue for the workshop. He shared his appreciation of the ODA program, which has been contributing to the development of Malaysia since the 1970s. Like many other countries, Malaysia underwent a lot of development and made noticeable achievements with ODA, namely, in the sectors of transportation, bridges, roads and agricultural sectors. Over the years, the ODA for Malaysia was widened to rural and regional development projects where a number of high-impact projects were successfully completed. Among the notable projects under the scheme was the construction of Kuala Lumpur International Airport (KLIA). Mr. Majid also highlighted that in 2011, Malaysia and the Japan International Institute of Technology (MIIT) was established under the Yen Loan scheme.

The Government of Japan has been organizing the ODA evaluation workshop since 2001. The objective of this workshop is to promote the understanding of development evaluation concepts and enhance the evaluation system of ODA programs. He stated that this workshop would contribute to the enhancement of aid effectiveness and assistance and promote evaluation capacity development in each country. The Government of Malaysia's M&E mechanism is developed on an outcome-based approach similar to the result-oriented and evidence-based evaluation, which was adopted in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. Mr. Majid stressed that the joint evaluation is the best mechanism to address the issues arising from the M&E process, which, collectively and holistically, is the best solution to achieve the expected results and improve the performance of the projects. The joint mechanism basically provides room for harmonization of the evaluation system between donor and recipient countries in terms of methodology, procedure and formats. By emphasizing ownership of partner countries, alongside responsibilities of donors, joint evaluation by both parties will provide the project impact from two perspectives. He concluded his speech by saying that he expects to hear new ideas and experiences from each participant and to learn a lot from the discussions that will contribute to further development of the evaluation

system.

1.2. Welcome Address and Introduction by Co-chairs

Co-chair, Mr. Hiroyuki Kubota, Senior Deputy Director of the ODA Evaluation Division at MOFA, welcomed all the participants to the 12th ODA Workshop and introduced the background of the ODA Evaluation Workshop. He stated that the workshop is a space for mutual learning for development evaluation through sharing knowledge and experiences in our region. Mr. Kubota explained the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycle of the evaluation process, stating that aid effectiveness and evaluation are closely connected. For improving effectiveness and sustainability, it is important to be accountable to tax payers and improve the quality of public services related to development and administration. He concluded his presentation by introducing the themes to be discussed in the 12th Workshop.

The other co-chair, Mr. Mohamad Razif Abd Mubin, Deputy Director of the Environment and Natural Resources Section at EPU introduced himself and explained that discussions after presentations in each session would be facilitated by moderators following the agenda. Then he stated that it was his pleasure to co-chair the workshop for both days and hoped the participants engage in fruitful discussions.

1.3. Presentation of JICA's Project Evaluation

Mr. Keiichi Muraoka, Director General of the Evaluation Department at JICA

Mr. Muraoka gave a presentation on JICA's focus on evaluation for management improvement and capacity development. He noted that JICA's evaluation purpose is to improve its operations and management through the PDCA cycle and to ensure accountability to stakeholders of JICA's operations.

He explained the outlines of operation evaluations and the main targets of JICA's evaluation as a project-level evaluation and thematic evaluation. Project-level evaluation is done for projects over JPY 200 million, such as technical cooperation, grant assistance, and loans. For thematic evaluation, a specific theme is the main factor to do this evaluation. He described the five Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria as key evaluation criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. The evaluation is made by JICA as an internal evaluation or third party as an external evaluation depending on the total budget of the projects.

Mr. Muraoka also explained key points of the evaluation as well as the PDCA stages for better management. The planning stage is a pre-implementation stage that is an evaluation of relevance, details and expected outcomes prior to project implementation. In the implementation stage, the relevance of the plan and progress of the project as well as internal or external factors will be examined. Ex-post evaluation is made after the completion of the project to evaluate effectiveness, impact and efficiency. The feedback stage will produce evaluation reports that would be reflected in the present project for its improvement. Based on evaluation results, the feedback for JICA's basic strategies, projects and partner government's policies will be elaborated.

He stressed the joint evaluation activities in the Philippines and Nepal. In 2006, the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) and JICA entered into a three-year agreement on Joint Ex-post Evaluations to strengthen NEDA's evaluation capacity, and in 2008, NEDA formulated an action plan for the enhancement of national evaluation capacities. JICA also implements the Project for Strengthening the Monitoring and Evaluation System in Nepal Phase II (SMES2) in order to strengthen the M&E system of the Government of Nepal. SMES2 has been conducted to make optimum use of M&E feedback in its policy making, program/project formulation, and

planning.

Mr. Muraoka concluded his presentation by explaining that JICA's Evaluation Department provides lectures for various training courses in Japan and internal capacity development for JICA staff and to the participants from developing countries to strengthen evaluation capacity.

1.4. Discussion

Question: How do you deal with a situation where the third-party evaluation and the local evaluation conflict with each other?

Answer: JICA is conducting almost 100 third-party evaluations annually. In most cases we discuss the evaluation procedure and progress with third-party evaluators before making an evaluation. In some cases when third-party evaluation and JICA's opinions are different, we respect the evaluator's opinion and state JICA's view at the same time. However, such cases are rare in JICA's practice.

-----Coffee break-----

2. Session 1: Impact of Evaluation on Effectiveness of Bilateral Development Assistance

Moderator: Dr. Romeo B. Santos, Professor at University of the Philippines, Chair of Pilipinas Development Evaluators Association (PHILDEV), and Vice President of APEA

2.1. Presentation: Impact of Evaluation on Effectiveness of Bilateral Development Assistance in India

Mr. Subrat Kumar Pradhan, Deputy Director of Department of Economic Affairs at the Ministry of Finance, the Republic of India

Mr. Pradhan started his presentation by introducing India. India is one of the world's oldest civilizations. It is aiming to be the 5th largest economy in the world by 2020. India is one of the world's 'youngest' countries, with more than half its population under the age of 25. India is a democratic and economically developing country.

India has had a good relationship with Japan for many years, and the Government of Japan believes that providing assistance for sustainable development in India will not only strengthen bilateral relations between India and Japan, but also strongly promote peace, stability, and economic prosperity in Asia. India is one of the biggest recipients of Japan's ODA, and has been the top recipient of Japan's yen loans since 2003. Since 1958, the cumulative ODA commitment by Japan to India is JPY 4.1 trillion (approximately USD34.7 billion) for implementation of around 250 projects; presently, 70 projects thereof, with a budget of USD16 billion, are being implemented. Priority sectors for ODA are infrastructure sectors such as power, roads, bridges, water supplies, and urban transportation such as the Delhi Metro Project Phase 3, Dedicated Freight Corridor Project and Delhi Mumbai Industrial Corridor Project. Mr. Pradhan also explained that his department at the Ministry of Finance is the main department dealing with external assistance including all bilateral and multilateral assistance.

He moved on to the topic of impact on evaluation of the effectiveness of bilateral development assistance. He explained each evaluation parameter: relevance, effectiveness, impact, efficiency, and sustainability.

He explained the stages of evaluation: ex-ante evaluation, midterm review, terminal evaluation, ex-post evaluation, ex-post monitoring and feedback.

- Ex-ante evaluation is to assess the priority of projects and demands.
- Midterm review is utilized for long-term projects to assess if everything is correctly proceeding and if there is a need to change.
- Terminal evaluation is conducted every 6 or 7 months, and based on this evaluation, the decision will be made whether to continue projects or close the projects.
- Ex-post evaluation and ex-post monitoring are important stages of evaluation, and here the achievements and outcomes will be assessed and examined.
- Feedback is significant as it is a link to past, present, and future activities.

The principles of aid effectiveness were explained as below.

- Ownership – Partner countries exercise effective leadership over their development policies and strategies, and coordinate development actions
- Alignment – Donors base their overall support on partner countries' national development strategies, priorities, institutions, and procedures
- Harmonization – Donors' actions are more harmonized, transparent and collectively effective (very limited)
- Managing for Results – Managing resources and improving decision-making for results
- Mutual Accountability – Donors and partners are accountable for development results

Mr. Pradhan then explained Managing for Development Results (MfDR). Its objective is to do the right thing correctly and in the right way. He made clear the following five points, which encompass MfDR.

- Focus the dialogue on results and outcomes
- Align programming, M&E with results
- Keep measurement and reporting simple
- Manage for, not by, results
- Use results information for learning and decision-making

He presented the necessary elements to practice MfDR:

- Strong support from senior leadership in the country
- Focus on achievement measures
- Sufficient staff in evaluation team
- Sufficient operation capacity

The evaluation structure in the Government of India is as follows:

- The Planning Commission in the Government of India has a separate department for evaluating government-implemented programs and projects.
- The externally aided projects are jointly evaluated by the Planning Commission in India and the donor agency.
- Lessons learnt from the evaluation process are widely shared for future reference and informed decision-making.

He took the case study of JICA assisting Bakreshwar Thermal Power Station Units Extension Project as an example of evaluation practice in India. The relevancy of the project is very high. The impact of the project is that it was able to contribute to the realization of all the goals outlined at the time of ex-ante evaluation and was therefore rated high. The sustainability of the project effect is high as no major problems have been observed in the operation and maintenance. He then concluded his presentations by noting down the following messages:

- M&E of the project plays a crucial role in making the aid more effective
- There is a need for results-oriented capacity building for the Project Implementing Authorities so they can carry out the evaluation independently.
- While carrying out the evaluation impartially, independence is a key factor as it lends credence to the process. There is also a need for greater harmonization and mutual accountability of both the donor and recipient country in line with the goals set out in the Paris Declaration.

2.2 Presentation: Impact of Evaluation on Effectiveness of Bilateral Development Assistance in the Republic of Fiji

Mr. Mosese Ravasakula, Senior Economic Planning Officer of the Overseas Development Assistance Unit at the Ministry of Finance, the Republic of Fiji

Mr. Ravasakula started his presentation by introducing the Republic of Fiji and outlined the key areas of development in a policy called Roadmap for Democracy and Sustainable Social Economic Development: strengthening good governance, macroeconomic stability and social development and national unity. He also explained the fiscal policy of Fiji, which is focused on raising investment and economic growth while at the same time ensuring fiscal sustainability. He moved on to an explanation of government projects, which are to encourage the private sector and to create additional opportunities for the private sector. The following are the aims of the fiscal policy:

- Growth levels of 5% over the medium term
- Diversifying the economy for new sources of growth
- Promoting export-led growth and exploring opportunities for import substitution
- Ensuring access to essential services such as proper infrastructure, education, health, water, etc.
- Creating additional opportunities for employment and poverty reduction to improve overall living standards

He highlighted that Japan is a major donor. Its share in the percentage of total ODA Fiji receives is 7%, which is USD21.4 million in the ODA framework. He then explained the use of ODA by sector: social, economic, and infrastructure.

From the pie chart illustration, he concluded that the majority of ODA goes towards the social sector of the Fijian economy; in other words, most of the funding is channeled towards waste minimization and recycling and education/training. The second highest sector is the general administration sector – the Public Service Commission for training and capacity building of the civil service and volunteer schemes. The economic sector accounts for a total of 6%, while the infrastructure sector has the least ODA funding, and that is mainly for road projects and public utilities.

Regarding the aid modality, Fiji received assistance in the form of a grant in cash, aid in kind and concessional loan. He made clear Japan's aid program. The first is grassroots projects worth USD15.9 million. Mostly, grassroots projects focus on technical cooperation: technical training, dispatch of expertise and volunteers, equipment, and materials and basic survey-development programs

He showed some examples of ODA projects

- Waste Minimization and Recycling projects
- Construction of University of the South Pacific/Information Communication Technology (USP/ICT) Centre
- Strengthening Immunization Program in the Pacific
- Filariasis Elimination Campaign

- Training of Civil Servants
- Disaster Management Reinforcement Programme
- Human Development & Human Security ICT project
- Promotion of Regional Initiative on Solid Waste Management
- Fiji Rural Coastal Villages projects
- Water Desalination Plants for Fijian Islands

He explained the evaluation agencies in the Government of Fiji:

- Strategic Framework for Change Coordinating Office (SFCCO): For SFCCO, their main objectives are to ensure that all Government Agencies are contributing to the development aspirations of the current Government (through the Roadmap);
- Division of Strategic Planning: For strategic planning, their responsibility is to ensure that capital projects are implemented in line with their intended purpose, i.e., accountability principle;
- Budget Division – Expenditure Management Unit (EMU) – Evaluate the Operation of Government Agencies: In the Budget Division, the EMU Section's role is to ensure that the operational budget is implemented according to timeline and purpose;

The ODA Unit's role is to ensure 100% ODA utilization per donor and also to update and inform the Cabinet of the ODA utilization-transparency principle.

For all the agencies that undertake some form of M&E, they do gather some results but these are all directed towards the purpose of undertaking the evaluation.

The challenges facing Fiji's evaluation system:

- Consolidation of results as these agencies gather their own results, no sharing of results in an automated system; some of our challenges in evaluation are due to the nature in which we monitor and evaluate project results, i.e., separate agencies gather their own results and there is no sharing of results; so we need to ask them if we want to see their results.
- Government output is monitored; somehow we still need accurate consolidation towards government outcomes. SFCCO only monitors output but we still need planning to review the Roadmap on our outcomes, i.e., how these outputs are contributing to our outcomes.
- For ODA, Fiji has assistance that is channeled to non-governmental organizations (NGOs); it is not monitored by the ODA Unit. We need to monitor ODA that goes towards NGOs working on debt programs for Fiji for its contribution and effectiveness and to ensure no duplication of programs, etc.
- For ODA, different financial years of donors also affects the accuracy of results from monitoring; and
- For ODA, our donors and development partners liaise with headquarters to confirm ODA figures as the Offices in Fiji – at times these delay our obtaining the results.

Some of the lessons learnt from Fiji's evaluation activities have helped recognize an integrated approach to M&E by all relevant agencies and that data is shared through an integrated system. Fiji needs to work with the NGOs that receive ODA funds for development projects to be also evaluated on how they are contributing to Fiji's development goals as this helps to determine the similar programs best run by the NGOs, e.g., without government funding such as child protection. Fiji still needs to ensure that the budgets allocated are fully used within the allocated timeframe and that for ODA, the more Fiji monitors and evaluates and reports on results, donors and debt partners have improved confidence in the public financial management system, and hence put more funds into the government system.

2.3. Discussion

Moderator, Dr. Romeo B. Santos, invited comments on the presentations of India and Fiji.

Comment: Our country is trying to follow the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. The Indian situation is similar to our country. Japan's ODA has contributed a lot through its development programs for developing countries. For recipient countries, demand for effective implementation is increasing. ODA maintains and supports the effective management of the implementation of ODA and, most importantly, accountability. Accountability is a main concern of evaluation. According to the Paris Declaration of Aid Effectiveness, donors expect countries to assist them to improve the evaluation capacities and policies of developing countries. One of the main principles of the Paris Declaration is ownership. In the presentation by India, we learn how the government owns the projects and implements and develops projects and has an independent and separate policy on evaluation. We have a separate division to the ministry: the Implementation Monitoring Evaluation Division (IMED), which is the same as India. In Fiji's presentation, some ODAs directly go to the NGOs. How can Fiji monitor the projects implemented by NGOs if the ODA goes directly to them? This is one issue about ownership. If there is no monitoring, ownership cannot be achieved.

Comment: On Fiji's presentation, some important challenges were raised by the presenter. In fact, our country, the Cook Islands, faces similar challenges. We do monitoring well, but evaluations are not always connected to national decision-making processes, especially regional projects. How can we conduct better evaluation jointly with the recipient countries and partners? Making use nationally of learning from an evaluation lead by external agencies is often complicated, especially where local partners are not included from the start of the process. An important question to ask at the start of an evaluation plan is who is best placed to use learning for development effectiveness? How can we ensure there is co-ownership by these people in the evaluation process? We are already involved to varying degrees in evaluations for externally funded development programs, but not for all sectors and national programs. We want to better prioritise evaluation on what needs to be evaluated the most, not just what is funded by donors, and to connect learning to our national decision-making systems.

Comment: India's experience is similar to our country. In the case of Fiji, there are two challenges in which we may have experience: financing and budgeting and information sharing. We have a separate division: the Project Management and Monitoring Department at the Ministry of Finance and Planning. This department is arranging the monitoring meetings of stakeholders, preparing the basic evaluation databases and reports of lessons learnt as well as recommendations. It has central evaluation and monitoring databases at the Ministry of Finance and Planning that monitor the implementation of government projects and programs. We monitor and assess monthly all projects to see if they are implemented successfully or unsuccessfully. For Fiji's challenges, our experiences could be one idea in terms of an integration process.

Question: What is the percentage and results of successful projects that have been undertaken by India? I would like to clarify the grassroots projects from JICA.

Question: I would like to ask the participants from Malaysia, India, and Indonesia. We have a new inventive activity: South-South Cooperation, which enables mutual assistance among countries. Many developing countries are now revealing assistance and aid to other developing countries. I would like to ask the representatives of the guest countries that implement evaluation for South-South Cooperation aid. I would also like to have an answer from Thailand.

Comment: Nepal has the practice of evaluation of bilateral assistance from Japan, the Asian Development Bank (ADB), the World Bank and nine development banks. Furthermore, we need to start doing joint reviews on multilateral products.

Answer: The donor evaluation system is different in each country. There is no systemized specific system. Capacity building is important to achieve better outcomes in the development projects and programs. Maintaining creditability and measuring effectiveness are also significant for evaluation. India is implementing MfDRs as stated in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. We are aiming to get the maximum gains from the aid. As for the success rate of projects in India, we cannot say that they are all successful. We also have challenges. We do evaluations jointly with JICA in order to enhance the effectiveness of projects. Regarding South-South Cooperation, India is giving aid and credits to African countries. In evaluating what we are giving to another country, we hold regular meetings with stakeholders. In the future, we will implement an evaluation system, and we are focusing on giving assistance to fulfill the needs of the country we are helping.

Answer: A lot of assistance to NGOs does not only come from Japan. We monitor the ODA and other assistance from different countries and international organizations. All projects are evaluated by the Overseas Development Assistance Unit of the Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Fiji. Regarding the assistance prioritizing system, for example, in the case of Japan, we have an evidence-based assessment before considering the project funding.

We have two rounds of annual conferences with donors before adopting budgets. In this conference, we highlight our priority sectors and needs.

NGOs initially receive assistance without the participation of the Government of Fiji. However, they need to be evaluated by the government.

Answer: Malaysia gives its assistance to other countries. We give assistance, but we do not call it “aid”. As for an evaluation of what we are giving, 75% is provided to project financing and 25% is spent on training. We regularly monitor the assistance to improve any further programs. We focus on assistance based on the demands to fulfill the needs of the recipient countries.

Answer: In terms of the assistance, it is more like bilateral cooperation. Therefore, we currently have no evaluation system in terms of South-South Cooperation.

Answer: We provide assistance and cooperation mainly to neighboring countries and other developing countries. As for evaluation, at present, we have not done much. However, at the end of this month, we will organize a workshop in Bangkok on lessons learned in Thailand's development cooperation.

Question: In JICA and the Government of Japan, are there any tools to support and enhance South-South Cooperation?

Answer: Concerning the support programs directed to some grassroots establishments, such as local communities and NGOs, in the case of Japan, we started those programs based on mutual understanding with host governments, although we are not in the position to represent all other partners. Each small grant and piece of technical assistance for local communities or NGOs contributes to building or refurbishing local schools and clinics and to operate them more efficiently through building up local capacities. We believe these exercises fit well into the national development policies and plans. Maybe we should pay more attention to improving the level of communication with local and central governments to avoid any misunderstandings among all of us.

Question: Is there any tool to strengthen South-South Cooperation in JICA?

Answer: JICA provides technical assistance for training programs in Japan for capacity building collaboration. Every year, JICA gathers the requirements of each country. If you complete your ideas on technical assistance and support, please contact a JICA overseas office. As for the priority issues, they are specified by the governments. Evaluation is also in the agenda of the recipient country.

Regarding the evaluation of South-South Cooperation, my information might be old. Ten years ago, I conducted a joint evaluation of JICA's South-South Cooperation. We drew up questionnaires and held interviews among the South-South Cooperation stakeholders.

JICA provides certain support for the South-South Cooperation evaluation. However, it has a small budget. According to the Evaluation Department, the evaluation program's budget is approximately JPY 200 million. Evaluation thereof is made locally through questionnaires and interviews. You can check the information on the website.

Question: Pakistan imports cars from Japan. Is it possible to produce cars or products in the country under the ODA program?

Answer: We send Japanese volunteers who have technical skills. You may ask the private sector to utilize the ODA partnership program.

Moderator: Mr. Pradhan emphasized the importance of ODA received from Japan and also how it applies the evaluation process, adopting the OECD-DAC criteria for evaluation as supported by Japan. The presentation gave us information on how the evaluation system is developed in India. As the practice of evaluation is emerging, there is a need to focus on assessment of how evaluation really helps India in making the programs achieve effectiveness.

In regard to Mr. Ravasakula's presentation, we learnt the challenges the Government of Fiji faces. Actually, these challenges also became clear based on evaluation. Similar to India, the representative gave an insight into how Fiji is applying the emerging evaluation in assessing the ODA and other assistance programs in the country.

Both countries demonstrate the need to show results through evaluation of the various ODA programs.

-----Lunch break-----

3. Session 2: Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Assistance in Regional Cooperation

Moderator: Mr. Champak Pokharel, the Board Member/Formal Chairperson of Nepal Evaluation Society

3.1. Presentation: Nepal's Perspectives

Mr. Narayan Dhakal, Under Secretary, International Economic Cooperation Coordination Division, Ministry of Finance, the Government of Nepal

Mr. Dhakal started his presentation by pointing out that development assistance today is no longer limited to ODA. There is a paradigm shift from "aid effectiveness" to "development effectiveness" and "aid" or "loan" to "cooperation" and "donors" to "partners". It is pointed out that the new dynamics and actors in development assistance management and accountability are playing the main roles in monitoring and evaluating development

assistance.

Regional cooperation is necessary to solve regional problems. Regional cooperation aims at tackling regional and global challenges through collective actions. Many collective action problems arise by virtue of global public goods, for example, excessive exploitation of common pool property, pandemics, environmental threats, terrorism, etc., that demand collective efforts. These are also correlated with the problem of global poverty, illiteracy and so on. Therefore, there is a kind of in-built incentive for all regional stakeholder countries, be they donors or recipients, to contribute to regional harmony and tranquility. This contribution is not only limited to 'giving and receiving' but working for a win-win situation.

Therefore, the ODA is being mobilized in regional associations such as South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) in areas of democracy and peace building, promotion of regional connectivity and promotion of person-to-person exchanges. Some bilateral development partners, including Japan, Canada, Germany and some UN/Multilateral partners are collaborating, for example, with SAARC through ODA.

He elaborated on South Asia Sub Regional Economic Cooperation (SASEC) implemented by ADB supporting the strengthening of a multi-modal cross-border transport network for intraregional trade with East and Southeast Asia. Similarly, the World Bank's regional cooperation is supporting the strengthening of Regional Cooperation for Wildlife Protection in the South Asia region, particularly in Bangladesh, Nepal and Bhutan, and helping decrease transaction costs incurred in trades between Nepal and India and transit trades along the Kathmandu-Kolkata corridor through the World Bank-supported Nepal-India Regional Trade and Transport Facilitation Project. Another WB regional project is the Nepal-India electricity transmission and trade project.

Mr. Dhakal then went on to talk about some regional M&E frameworks of both donor and recipient country organizations that are being used for regional projects such as the ESCAP M&E system, ADB's Regional Cooperation Assistance Program Evaluation (RCAPE) and the World Bank's Independent Evaluation Group (IEG).

At the country level, Nepal has a strong institutional framework for M&E. The National Planning Commission is dedicated to this. The Office of the Prime Minister, National Development Action Committee (NDAC), Ministerial Development Action Committee (MDAC), Ministry of Finance and sectoral ministries are examples of higher level frameworks, and there is also the participatory M&E system at the local level in Nepal.

There are some issues for Nepal to tackle. Most of the evaluations are desk reviews, and the lack of quality data is often an issue. Moreover, there are challenges regarding inadequate linkages between country and regional levels, inadequate incentives to engage in evaluation, few incentives for management to conduct evaluations other than monitoring, putting evaluation in the shadow, inadequate sharing of regional best practices, absence of sustainability monitoring at the operational phase, and the use of a conventional method (before-after) for evaluation. Budget constraints also matter regarding less evaluation in Nepal.

Nepal issues annual surveys of national figures. Parliamentary oversight has already been initiated. 2015 will be celebrated as "Evaluation Year" in Nepal. Support from JICA and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in strengthening the Monitoring and Evaluation capacity in Nepal is important for the country.

Quality sectorial M&E are being developed. Nepal is exploring possibilities for using new systems, and NES is active enhancing the evaluation culture in Nepal.

He concluded his presentation by explaining further work to be done such as harmonization of evaluation

guidelines, uses of various sector-level data, publication of evaluation findings and sharing best practices across the region.

3.2. Presentation: Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Assistance in Regional Cooperation in the Philippines

Ms. Violeta Corpus, Assistant Director of National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA), the Republic of the Philippines

Ms. Corpus began her presentation by introducing the background of the country's M&E system. In the Philippines, NEDA is the main socio-economic planning agency responsible for development planning, monitoring and evaluation.

NEDA has monitoring and evaluation staff in charge of M&E of major government-funded projects and programs. NEDA has 15 regional offices with divisional units in charge of M&E. She mentioned the general roles of the institutional agencies that submitted M&E reports to NEDA on the programs and projects they implement. She described the legal framework of the institutional M&E mandate, namely, NEDA Board resolution No. 30 of 1992 and the ODA Act of 1996 as well as other acts. She moved on to explain the history of the M&E system of the Philippines. Prior to 1996, M&E focused on selected ODA projects for major infrastructure. Then the focus was results-orientated at the project level. From 2000 to 2004, there was a shift to sectorial goals and approaches. Starting from 2004, MDG and other high-level acts were adopted and the M&E focus became results-based management tools and systems, and impact evaluation. The Philippines entered several international agreements on aid and development effectiveness such as the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. From 2009 to the present, the M&E environment has been characterized by increased coordination. She explained the public sector management cycle of M&E. 2015 will be the International Year of Evaluation in the Philippines. The results matrices provide an indicator framework for the goal statements of the Philippine Development Plan. NEDA engaged in M&E activities with MES.

Ms. Corpus continued by talking about country evaluations and studies. She mentioned the collaborative partner donor evaluation framework study conducted in 2014 to improve its evaluation capacity to enhance the quality of its evaluation outputs. She also highlighted two case studies: the joint ex-post evaluation of selected projects by the Government of Japan-JICA and the Philippines, and Joint Supervision Implementation Support Mission by the Government of the Philippines and International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). She concluded her presentation stating that the Philippines National Evaluation Policy is in the finalization stage. The Government of the Philippines has held four annual M&E forums since 2001 and adopts guidelines and manuals of ex-post evaluation results-based M&E.

3.3 Discussion

The moderator opened the floor to discussion.

Comment: From the previous presentations, their experience shows that a lot of effort is being made in their countries to improve the national systems. Also, the presenters explained that there is increasing involvement in evaluation from the national evaluation system, regional system and people on the street.

There is one thing we need to focus on: how we can reduce duplication in terms of resources, expenditure, and

administration.

I think there is the potential for donors to develop international levels to look at independent regional organizations that are receiving the ODA from second sources. There is a competition going on between providing funds at the national level and funds going to regional organizations. Governments have to be specific, realistic, democratic and efficient in order to do a national evaluation.

Comment: With few suggestions, we all agree that project evaluation is important. We have to do our independent evaluation on the projects and programs.

The moderator proceeded to the Q&A session.

Question: It is interesting to know the evaluation system differences of different countries. It seems that the Government of the Philippines has a very strict budget limitation policy. In the case of Timor Leste, we require the projects to issue quarterly data to understand projects' progress. As you can imagine, this creates the risk of poor quality. However, we also have a solid system of checking and balancing to minimize any poor project quality. Also, we use our own procurement system. Although we receive commitments from our donors who use our system, we have several problems. What are the processes to approve the project? How many projects do you evaluate? How do you generate the yearly review of the project report? Regarding the case of Nepal, we can see how important the regional cooperation project is.

Question: Regarding Nepal's practice of the monitoring system, the presenter said Nepal is lacking a sustainable monitoring system. How do you stimulate monitoring sustainability?

I would like to ask about utilization of various management information systems in evaluation.

Answer: It is not that there is no monitoring system in Nepal. The issue is we have a long way to go to make a robust system for M&E for regional cooperation. We will have to make it effective and outcome-oriented. We will have to strike the right balance between M&E to end an "evaluation light and monitoring heavy" situation. Sustainability monitoring in the operational phase has been found to be neglected. This is crucial for institutionalizing development outcomes.

Answer: I totally agree with the need of the use of a management information system in evaluation. Nepal has introduced an Aid Management Platform (AMP) for effective and efficient management of aid. The information generated from the AMP has helped to conduct M&E for the implementation of the Paris Declaration in the past. The system has also generated crucial evidence for the new Development Cooperation Policy. The evidence revealed that development aid to Nepal was highly fragmented. The policy of setting threshold and priority areas for grants and credits is an outcome of this evidence. We believe that this system and other sector-specific systems will greatly contribute to conducting evidence-based M&E in Nepal. We are also improving our evaluation system with Japanese assistance. The AMP can generate a geographical map of the development project and help maintain a regional balance. There is a very weak co-relation between the quality of the system and use of the system. We encourage development partners to use a country monitoring framework and help develop the capacity of the country system.

Comment: Regional cooperation is the same as applied science. Regional cooperation does not have a long history. Evaluation always comes later; practice comes first. Therefore, learning from regional cooperation is not yet enough. All of us see how regional cooperation can be a direction to make evaluation effective. Ideas and experiences are invited. This year, we conducted regional cooperation evaluation for the first time. I hope by the

end of March we will share the findings of regional cooperation evaluation.

Question: I would like to ask the presenter from the Philippines to please show us in detail what assistance does NEDA have for regional cooperation?

Comment: From regional experience in the Pacific, I would like to highlight the usefulness of regional peer reviews for coordinated mutual learning for developing small-island states. These peer reviews are made on a national basis by a team made up from active regional donors (excluding the largest national donor) and Pacific island officials from neighboring countries and are managed by a regional organization (Pacific Island Forum Secretariat). The Cook Islands completed its first peer review in 2014 that included an observer from the People's Republic of China. The team interviewed non-governmental organizations, the private sector, local communities, ministries and local and central government officials. There are now detailed reports and a summary report of all 14 Pacific countries that have completed the peer review. This has been useful to independently gauge our practices against fellow Pacific countries and also to compare donor behavior across the region and hold up practices against international norms. This existing evaluation process could be improved to include more donors (like South-South providers and regional organizations) and to review national evaluation systems. In 2014, peer reviews by Pacific countries of donors have begun using this model (New Zealand, November).

<http://www.mfem.gov.ck/development-resources/peer-review>

Answer: Regional cooperation is very important. We focus on inter-coordination with international organizations. Concerning loans, we differentiate the policy making and decision making regarding what we use and how we spend. We have consultations on budgets. It is a six-month process. We then consult with the stakeholders on the progress of the projects.

As for regional assistance, we showcase capacity building assistance by organizing seminars and training as well as sharing our experiences through workshops.

Each agency should evaluate its project performance when it proposes a budget. To decide the budget line, an assessment is also required. In managing sustainability, we often hold meetings. The agencies have to provide an annual budget report. There is always a feedback session to assess the outcomes.

Answer: For regional cooperation, the development goals of the partners need to be matched. It is difficult to monitor national development goal indicators in one place and regional development goal indicators in another place. Synchronization of these development goal indicators needs to have successful regional cooperation.

Moderator: Nepal was recently a country suffering from a long-term conflict; one which lasted for more than a decade. Political stability in Nepal is now getting better. Also, the M&E system is gradually getting more sustainable and capable; though it was derailed for some time in the past and any considerable effort has yet to be made. In Nepal, we categorize the projects from high priority-level projects (P1) to low priority-level projects (P3). High-level priority projects will have guaranteed funds. Quarterly reporting is mandatory. Projects should reach at least 80% of the targeted goals to receive funds released for the next quarter of the fiscal year. If a project cannot reach the target, the budget will be stopped unless a satisfactory explanation is provided. Reporting is also important. If you don't provide a report, you will not receive a budget. This is the reality; hence, project implementers have to be more serious. So, we demand reports, and if the reports are not provided, the budget will stop.

Comments: Pakistan is eager to broaden its regional cooperation. At present, Pakistan has established regional cooperation with Afghanistan, etc.

Moderator: Mr. Dhakal presented SAARC-focused bilateral/multilateral regional cooperation. He has pointed out that ODA is not confined to DAC members only, and the scope of such assistance has increased. He also pointed out that monitoring has expanded with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, which also initiated an MfDR culture in ODA. He also mentioned challenges regarding the weak desire for independent evaluation and lack of a monitoring system.

Ms. Violata presented the case of the Philippines and introduced the country's experiences in both M&E. According to her, evaluation resources are still highly donor-dependent. However, evaluation of ODA is emerging and gradually becoming important by going beyond a conventional project completion review, and Japan is also a strong supporter for such initiatives in the Asia Pacific Region. She also highlighted that the quality of data and reports need to be improved. The presentations emphasized the importance of the evaluation of regional development cooperation.

-----Coffee break-----

4. Session 3: The Role of the APEA and its Future Possibilities

Moderator: Mr. Benedictus Dwiagus Stepanoro, President of Indonesian Development Evaluation Community and Board Member of APEA

4.1. Presentation: From JES to APEA (Asia Pacific Evaluation Association): Missions, Goals, Programmes and Institutional Development

Prof. Ryokichi Hirono, Interim President of APEA and Senior Advisor, Japan Evaluation Society (JES)

Prof. Hirono started his presentation by introducing the beginning of the JES. JES was established in 2001 to strengthen the evaluation capacity and improve the effectiveness, efficiency and outcomes of the development programs. With the successful achievements of JES, the idea to establish the Asian and Pacific Regional Organization of Evaluation was initiated. The official start of APEA began from 2012. Up to now, APEA has made three achievements:

- Building up the culture of evaluation. The culture of evaluation is very important. To do evaluation, culture is important.
- Having a national evaluation system. Most of us now have a national evaluation association. Although the quality is different by country, we have built a national evaluation system.
- Demanding that governments as well as donors emphasize the evaluation.

The government does not spend money on evaluation. However, the government needs evaluation to define its priorities. Hence, we need to demand the government integrate evaluation into its policy.

APEA is just the beginning of evaluation cooperation at the regional level. Achievements and challenges also exist in APEA, the same as others. There are more challenges facing us now:

- We need to engage in active discussions and realize better performances. Evaluation is an instrument to achieve better results.
- In this globalized world, some international organizations and some countries already invest their money in other countries such as China and India. Last year, out of the total investment by the government, only 15% was in Japan; 85% went overseas as cooperation. Multinational corporations take care of their best interests

and leave the problems to governments. Because of this, unemployment problems have arisen in the EU and the UK, for example. How does the government provide jobs for the unemployed? The government can provide jobs through fiscal policy; that is a Public-Private Partnership (PPP). The government and the private sector should cooperate in order to solve those problems.

- There are a lot of issues at the global level such as sustainable development goals, infectious diseases, etc. It is important to have a framework to cover global issues. We cannot do it alone; therefore, we need to collaborate to deal with global issues. Several initiatives have been made such as ASEAN and the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TTP).

He concluded his presentation stating that good evaluation is an instrument to determine government priorities and achieve national and global development goals. He stressed that evaluation is the instrument to realize international development.

4.2. Presentation: The MES- A VoPE with a Mission

Mr. Arunaselam Rasappan, Secretary of APEA, and Board Member of Malaysian Evaluation Society (MES)

MES was initially conceptualized in 1995. MES mostly focused on the public sector to improve its performance. The difference between Malaysia and other countries is that the government already incorporated evaluation into development issues. Evaluation has already become a part of the development agenda. In the Malaysian public sector, evaluation evolved in 1996.

Evaluation was the key component in all types of budgeting systems. In some countries, an evaluation policy is included in legislation. However, in Malaysia, the evaluation process is regulated at the administrative level. Every ministry and every program should be evaluated and show evidence for budgeting. The evaluation system is a circular process. MES believes that if there is legislation, it is difficult to amend the legislation and be flexible to adopt new trends and tools. Second, evaluation is a tool. It is impossible to legislate every tool. It is better to have administrative procedures in order to be flexible. One achievement of Malaysia is that it incorporated evaluation into the budgeting process.

In 1999, Malaysia initiated outcome-based budgeting. The Steering Committee decided that the Malaysian Government needed to revisit the evaluation agenda. MES realized that the projects and programs were not achieving what they desired. In 2007, the government announced that the Millennium Development Plan did not achieve the successes it wanted.

Malaysia also realized there are lots of areas to improve. For example, the staff were only educated in project evaluation. They did not do M&E in a variety of sectors except the projects. The programs were difficult to evaluate and the education of the staff was not sufficient. Therefore, the government decided to adopt integrated results-based management in 2009. Now, MES has moved to outcome-based management as it looks at specific priority sectors and defines the needs and problems and their risks, and carefully lays out the desired outcomes.

To measure the outcomes, MES looks at the resources for the budgeting process. There are two resources: financial sources and human resources. As for financial resources, the Ministry of Finance decided to limit the budgeting from an outcome-based focus. For every dollar it gives, the government asks what the result of the funding was. For human resources, it is necessary to consider how we utilize human resources to achieve the successes.

Outcome-based evaluation is the appropriate system for evaluation of the projects and programs. The processes and progress of the projects or programs can be excellent, but they may not deliver the desired outcomes. Therefore, instead of focusing on the progresses, it now takes into account the outcomes as the main indicator.

Lastly, MES revisited the decision-making system, particularly regarding resource allocation. Hence, it uses results-based decisions to make evaluations to help it make better decisions. The Malaysian state has the initiative and courage to take the evaluation as an instrument of development. In many countries, the governments see the evaluation as a checking system and as the final form. One of the agendas of MES is how it improves the perception of evaluation and shows and proves that evaluation can produce better results. It is not just a checking system, it is the way for improvement and assessment to reach better outcomes.

In the last few years, MES adopted transformation programs and shifted to outcome-based performance and budgeting. MES has strong tripartite collaboration between partners. MES pushes the evaluation system to be used in development agendas and promotes the education of evaluation. The Ministry of Finance is the main government agency and provides and allocates budgets. The third party provides technical assistance and expertise. Because the public sector does not have any expertise, MES cooperates with the private sector in providing such expertise.

According to our surveys made in 2011, only 1% of public sector officials knew about public sector evaluation. Public officials know about monitoring, but only 1% knows about evaluation. In such situation, how could we implement evaluation if there are only a few people who knew about evaluation and if there is no capacity for evaluation? Hence, it is necessary to have an agenda to build support for public sectors to educate public officials and for technical assistance and to build up the system to support the government for M&E.

MES is not a huge organization. It has about 30 people. It is a small organization, but it has a big potential and well-educated experts.

The proposed MES Action in 2015 is as below:

- Evaluation standards to have a united standard.
- Evaluation professionalism to improve further use of evaluation.
- Evaluation and Integrated Result-Based Management (IRBM) Advocacy in public and private sectors.
- Foundational Evaluation Capacity Building (ECB) in long-term education at universities. MES is closely working with universities to set up programs to prepare evaluation-educated professionals.
- Evaluation research and development support for government.

MES needs to bring expertise to the government and to be a model.

At the international level, MES is focusing on the following points:

- Peer-to-Peer Supporter and Implementer
- Support for APEA Strengthening
- Professionalization of Evaluation and Related ECB
- Strengthening evaluation capacity development (ECD) within an IRBM framework
- ECD and ECB initiatives for partner Voluntary Organizations of Professional Evaluators (VoPEs)

The success of MES is that the evaluation is incorporated in government policy and agenda.

4.3. Discussion

The moderator opened the floor to discussion.

Comment: Most developing countries are in the initial stage of evaluation capacity. It is very difficult to get the evaluation information on time such as in most developed countries. Most of such developing countries don't have the required knowledge and experience in evaluation, and at the same time we are lacking the financial resources. The presentations that highlighted the involvement of the private sector were very informative and useful for further improvement of the evaluation system.

Comment: The Maldives is pleased to have this opportunity to once again be part of this workshop. Let me first welcome my colleagues around the table and express my appreciation to Dr. Arunaselam and Professor Riyokichi Hirono for the briefing. The presentation has indeed enlightened us all about the role of the Asia Pacific Evaluation Association and its future possibilities.

Linking the national evaluation societies such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), UNDP, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), etc., and creating networks in Asian Pacific countries has definitely resulted in a much more professional evaluation practice, giving the region a bigger means of representation in the global arena. Since its formation, the APEA has worked to improve, promote and maintain transparent and accountable governance in the region. As both of you explained, it has indeed worked on advocating and promoting the use of evaluation in member countries, by organizing various expert-led workshops to develop capacity among the evaluating bodies.

The "Public Enterprise Monitoring and Evaluation Board" established by the Government of the Maldives in March 1995 also ensures that all public enterprises operate in an efficient manner, complying with the corporate governance requirements. Also, as Professor Riyokichi Hirono mentioned earlier, before APEA was founded, many international organizations and consultants provided assistance at a national level in the areas of evaluation and capacity development. For instance, the Maldives itself received great assistance from such international organizations, including the International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS), UNICEF and UNDP. And I strongly believe that it is very important that developing countries create and strengthen their relationship with APEA in terms of developing and building their capacity.

Comment: Myanmar so far doesn't have an evaluation society at the national level. However, for government expenditure, especially for the capital budget, Myanmar has the Project Appraisal and Progress Reporting Department under the Ministry of National Planning and Economic Development for evaluation and monitoring of the projects and programs implemented with the state budget of a capital nature. The Environmental and Social Impact Assessment has to be made to approve the projects/programs to be implemented. The recommendation to have a separate and independent evaluation division has been noted. Another point to mention is that evaluation promotes transparency and accountability of the government. In this respect, Myanmar is now in the process of becoming a full member of the Extractive Transparency Initiative (EITI) for better resource governance; and also a member of the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) for development effectiveness and international aid transparency. I agree with the point made by Professor Hirono that it is important to promote the culture of evaluation.

Answer: In the parliament and in the ministries of Myanmar, the government of Myanmar is eager to build up an evaluation system.

It is important to know what JES has done.

- JES pushed the government to adopt the policy evaluation act. JES pushed the government, its agencies and all independent agencies to have compulsive internal and external evaluation. JES provided an expert committee

for the government to teach how evaluation should be done.

- Inter-ministerial collaboration. Japan has the Prime Minister's Office, which annually contacts every ministry about the evaluation report. Inter-ministerial collaboration is to strengthen collaboration among the ministries and agencies. Before an evaluation at the ministries, they have to propose an evaluation plan. Once it is proved, an evaluation will be implemented. After that, the specific evaluation will be held to make sure that their policy goals are achieved. Ministries do not continue the ODA projects and programs if there are no results.
- Professionalism of evaluators. JES has its certified professional evaluators: senior and junior evaluators. JES has 20 senior evaluators and around 125 junior evaluators. JES provides professional certificates to the evaluators. JES also contacts and talks with UNDP and the World Bank to assure them that such certificate is important to meet international and national standards and needs.

Lastly, Prof. Hirono concluded that before making an evaluation, it is important to have the full participation of citizens.

Answer: Based on eight countries' evaluation studies made by MES, it can be seen that as long as there are no joint demands for evaluation, there is no use in talking about evaluation. It can be said that there are eight different dimensions, which support the evaluation in their countries. If you need an institutional body, please contact APEA. APEA will send its experts to the country. APEA will do complete mapping as every country is different. If we do not know the country and its specific needs, it is impossible to build up an evaluation system. Therefore, making the complete mapping and understanding the situation fully are the first steps to develop the evaluation system.

Question: To be members of APEA, does the country need to have an evaluation society?

Question: What is the APEA process to visit the country for implementation of the studies?

Answer: APEA is a regional cooperative. Most members are national organizations and associations. We need to complete the mapping of support policies, practices, institutional policies and functional set ups. We do complete mapping. We go from bottom to top. We do not initially go for training. This is the last thing to do. Before that, we do complete studies to complete the assessment. In many countries, there are no evaluation societies or networks. In this situation, APEA can help these countries as it has professional members from different countries.

Answer: Depending on the country, demand for evaluation is very high. Therefore, you really have to meet the demands. As we all see, the situation changes quickly. Traditional evaluation methodology is important, but we need to do evaluations quickly. We have to do fast evaluations. We cannot wait for a year to get the results of the evaluation. Quick evaluation is very important to save money, time and energy, and to make the projects efficient. I think that evaluation today is moving towards quick responses to demands.

Answer: We have been talking extensively about evaluation, which gives feedback in a short period. On-demand evaluation can immediately connect with management and, it can also quickly change policy aspects. Based on the experience of implementation of on-demand evaluation, it is necessary to have a quick change of policy in terms of human resources, management aspect, and monitoring tracking. Hence, on-demand evaluation is quite important to be in the same line with the fast changing demands and situations.

Question: How do you hold the APEA meeting?

Answer: There is a meeting today. Each member will nominate a candidate for the APEA secretariat. We select from the nominees as a board member.

Comment: Let me introduce JICA's change of system. We stopped calling it "midterm evaluation" and now call it "regular monitoring". JICA's Operations Department is now conducting regular monitoring as it is considered as a project management tool. We are considering introducing impact evaluation to choose the appropriate approach for project expansion. During the implementation process, we are considering inserting a budget line in the project for impact evaluation.

Answer: Regarding the question of becoming a member of APEA, the members of APEA are national, thematic and sectoral evaluation associations in Asia. We see the context of every country as we are a regional cooperation and association consisting of evaluation practitioners and professionals. APEA is as such not a membership organization of individual members, but we assist individuals in their development of national organizations and help them to improve their evaluation capacity. We consider that, as a way of culture, an evaluation culture should be developed in every society.

Question: We just had a conference last week where one of the researchers concluded that we need more monitoring and there is too much evaluation. That is quite different from what we have heard here, except JICA pointed out its system change for M&E. Another issue is the gender-related question. If we look at the people in the room, almost 100% are male. Everybody knows that the decision will be biased by a difference of values. How are we going to ensure the gender status is correctly represented? How to direct and orient this aspect in evaluation in the region? If we are going to set up an organization, is there some way to structure a clearer orientation on the use of evaluation issues of what is important to locate and measure and how to measure?

Answer: A culture of evaluation means that we want to build a culture of accountability and transparency. As for M&E, these two aspects are two parts of one curtain that cannot be parted. Evaluation means restoring values or chances of particular items such as standards. Monitoring is the process of "if we are going in the right direction". For accountability, learning is important. In many countries, especially in developing countries, there is the issue of corruption. When we finance projects and programs, we use resources and public resources. That is why corruption came to be seen. If people are not adapted to a culture of evaluation or value transparency, then evaluation will not work. As for gender issues, it is a crosscutting issue even in the UN.

Moderator: Different countries have different problems and aspects in M&E.

Answer: As I mentioned in my presentation, in 2009, we realized that we talked about issues a lot. However, if we do not talk and build up the foundation first, all issues will be just fancy talk. We need to talk about where evaluation will stand. If you do not have a results-based management system as a base, how can we talk about financing, especially evaluation? We need to be rationale and have incentives in developing issues. If we do not build the framework in the right way, everything in it will fail.

Moderator: When you do establish a monitoring system, you will need to identify the demands. In Nepal, we have a deposit system for donor-based projects. Before allocating the budget, donors have to place a deposit. Then, based upon the monitoring results, the projects will be monitored and assessed. Based on this monitoring, deposits will be given periodically. It is an example of practicing establishing a monitoring system in Nepal. We have to have a proper monitoring framework to start. Then we start evaluation.

Answer: Japan has the Policy Evaluation Act. 85% of local governments have evaluation systems themselves. Citizens demand them. Citizens demand evaluation. Mayors have to respond to citizens' demands. Before making

an evaluation, full participation of the citizens is necessary for drafting. There are constant demands of citizens. We can see how well people are educated in evaluation. If people are sensitive, they will make demands. People have to be well-informed, well-educated and have an understanding of full participation.

Moderator: We agree that the role of APEA is critical. Different countries have different situations. Some people are focusing on monitoring and some are focusing on evaluation. However, these two are integral parts. I believe APEA's regional cooperation would give it benefits in capacity building and evaluation system improvement at the national level.

-----END OF DAY 1-----

5. Session 4: New Trends in Evaluation

Moderator: Mr. Champak Pokharel, Board Member/Former Chairperson of Nepal Evaluation Society

The moderator opened the session by introducing the topic of Session 4, agenda and the presenters of Session 4.

5.1. Presentation: New Trends in Evaluation

Mr. James George, Assistant Resident Representative (Programme) of United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Mr. George introduced his topic: new trends in evaluation. He indicated that in recent years, there was a plethora of and a significant increase in the amount of literature and documents on evaluation trends that are readily available in the public domain. He suggested that this poses a question to evaluators that requires deeper reflection if these trends are leading towards newer evaluation systems or are merely an evolution and re-design of existing evaluation processes. Does the introduction of new technologies pose new opportunities for the design of evaluation approaches and processes? Do the new trends capitalize on a whole range of tools that were not available before that enhance and strengthen the evaluation process? He posed the question: do these new developments represent a pre-requisite to moving forward or do they merely supplement the current existing approaches?

Technology is changing fast. Because of this, the evaluation processes are also changing significantly and at a speed that is uncommon to the public sector, and the sources of information are also changing. In this new era of instantaneous communication and flow of information, a new range of demands are coming from the public that increases the demands for greater accountability and transparency of the public sector. Mr. George noted that the traditional approaches of independent evaluation will not go away. The point to note is that there are different sources to utilize and there are many sophisticated documents and tools to assist in the evaluation of the development process. Mr. George also raised the question about the purpose of evaluation of development activities and that it must be focused on the impact and transformational change and not merely a verification of completion of activities or outputs or delivery of services. For example, he raised the question that an evaluation should focus on improving the quality of life of its citizens and not such things as the physical completion of a hospital.

Another issue raised by Mr. George was the importance of ensuring there are feedback loops for the traditional monitoring processes. In terms of making adjustments in financing, we realized that a five-year route is too late. He also mentioned that conventional M&E processes leave unheard voices of the people who are most affected so that

there is a difficulty in identifying the real problems and issues, and this needs to be addressed with immediate effect.

New evaluation trends are as below:

- Combine the traditional approaches with the need for better approaches to M&E with the emergence of ICT and the rise of “big data” and new approaches are being extensively tested and utilized.
- These news advances offer the possibility for more inclusive and responsive ways of adopting an appropriate strategy, and collaborating for results. Collaborating with the community is important and critical.
- Fast feedback loops and broad citizen engagement are key features of most of the innovations.

He explained 11 new innovations profiled in the UNDP publication, *UNDP Discussion Paper on Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results*. Each of them focused on a different dimension of M&E processes and tools. All of these approaches demonstrate that main broad citizen engagements are key features of most of the innovations. Many of them present cost-conscious, less formal and more flexible approaches to managing and assuring the quality of policies, programs and service delivery.

- Crowdsourcing: It is a whole range of communication on feedback. Combining crowdsourcing with new technology could be a key.
- Real time and simple reporting: It means that real time monitoring and frequent stories, narratives and updates show what is happening in real life.
- Participatory statistics: It means community involvement in generating data and statistics.
- Mobile data collection: It is targeted gathering of information using mobile phones. It allows tracking locations and different visuals of the community on the ground.

As you can see from the list, there are three important things to combine. The first is the opportunities offered by the advances and accessibility of information communication technology; the second is the increasing need for community participation; and the third is the process of M&E and sources of information we gather.

For example, for data visualization, software is available to collect a significantly large amount of data and to create graphically interactive tools and documents for ease of review and evidence-based decision making in real time. It allows us to take different variables and change the variables and look at the tracks. As for remote sensing, and the use of geographic information system (GIS), for example, Mr. George shared the examples of how the Government of Malaysia broadly uses GIS for observing and analyzing spatial information for evidence-based planning. Data exhaust: This is tracking the information. The question is how to see the different data approaches in making policies and evaluation.

He pointed out the consideration and challenges in M&E. The first is building M&E into the planning phase. The second is designing theories of change to monitor intermediary outcomes. The third is keeping institutional planning and programming processes flexible and strengthening internal capacities with third parties. The fourth was the challenge of cost in technology. For technology, one has to pay a lot of money, and pay upfront. The fifth is the necessity to close the loop with citizens. The sixth is the need to ensure privacy to keep private information secure.

5.2. Presentation: New Trends in Evaluation at USAID

Ms. Suzanne Polak, Regional Learning, Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor, Regional Development Mission for Asia (Thailand), USAID

Ms. Polak started her presentation by explaining that over the past five years, USAID has had significant changes in terms of why and how the agency does evaluations. She said that it is clear from the discussions that USAID is moving in the same direction as the other donors and organizations who have presented at the workshop.

The brief background of the evaluation of USAID: USAID had a strong evaluation culture in the 1980s and 1990s. In the 2000s, however, evaluations fell out of use. The agency knew the evaluations were important to measure development and impact. However, evaluations required a lot of resources and time and, most importantly, they were not required as part of project design or assistance.

However, there was a shift to a renewed emphasis on evidence-based development assistance as a result of, among other frameworks, the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the U.S. Government's Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review in 2010, which laid out how USAID and the Department of State could become more efficient, accountable, and effective.

A new set of agency reforms were put into place to improve learning and accountability. Project evaluation was key among these. USAID needed not only reforms but also a culture transformation that would improve development assistance outcomes. Also, USAID's new administrator at that time, Dr. Rajiv Shah, emphasized evaluations and evidence-based decision making; therefore, evaluation became part of the reform process.

Reform agendas of evaluation: 1) USAID Forward was a set of reforms to improve agency efficiency and effectiveness, and strengthening M&E was one focus area; 2) the Bureau of Policy, Planning and Learning was established to oversee strategy, learning, evaluation and research; 3) the Evaluation Policy laid out guidelines on when evaluations were required, why, and guidelines on what should be included in reports, as well as how they should be used by the agency; 4) all missions were now required to have a five-year strategy approved by Washington (called Country Cooperation Development Strategy). Within the strategy, there is a mandatory section addressing M&E, along with illustrative evaluation questions and identifying possible opportunities for impact evaluations; 5) each mission was required to develop their own mission orders on evaluation, performance monitoring, strategy, and project design. There was a template, but the missions could customize according to local and regional context; 6) project design guidance was revised and included a section on M&E along with potential planning for impact evaluations, possible questions, and an evaluation plan.

Ms. Polak then explained the program cycle, which includes using evaluations throughout the process. USAID projects are divided into two categories: evaluation-required and evaluation-recommended. Large projects are required to have an evaluation, and innovative or pilot activities that intend to be scaled up are required to have an impact evaluation if feasible. All required evaluations are external, third party. It is also suggested that 3% of project funds be allocated for evaluations.

New ideas and approaches on evaluation at USAID: The first is formalizing learning through collaborating, learning, and adapting, or CLA, similar to evaluative learning as you may have heard the term. USAID has added language to our guidance that promotes collaboration, knowledge-sharing and peer-to-peer exchange through meetings and other events, both internally and with stakeholders and other donors. It also allows for course corrections for projects and adaptive management. Language and guidance gives a little more freedom to be more innovative and take risks. Second is that USAID has an external evaluation and internal assessment and mission evaluation dissemination and tracking plans on evaluation. Third, USAID is integrating gender analysis into M&E. USAID wants to include gender questions into evaluations. However, if the project was set up without gender

considerations, it cannot evaluate gender adequately. Therefore, the agency is integrating gender issues and analysis in the beginning, at the project design stage, and during monitoring. USAID also focuses on local solutions and local capacity development and supports local experts in terms of evaluation capacity development. USAID also shares its evaluation reports and information on its public website; it strives to share evaluations with stakeholders, governments, and the public.

She then introduced new approaches:

- Complexity-aware monitoring and outcome harvesting. It is a new way of tracking outcomes and identifying, describing and verifying contributions to unexpected or expected results.
- Use of mobile technology such as crowdsourcing for monitoring. USAID also has a new office in Washington, the Global Development Lab. It designs new ideas based on scientific studies.

In Bangkok, USAID has its regional training center where it trains staff and hosts outside events with stakeholders and donors. The mission has a Monitoring and Evaluation Community of Practice for development professionals throughout Bangkok and organizes events such as talks and seminars. Finally, the mission also works on CLA to further improve the M&E system in USAID.

5.3. Discussion

The moderator opened the floor to discussion.

Comment: First, I would like to comment on UNDP's presentation. For the country program and development program, there is an interim review on policy. We must see a change in their program progress in order to know whether they achieve the goal. New trends in evaluation are very important for us. We can see 11 innovations, especially data use of ICT, which will make evaluations more useful and accurate.

Comment: In the Lao PDR, the Ministry of Planning and Investment, Department of International Cooperation, monitors and evaluates ODA programs/projects in conjunction with line ministries and utilizes M&E of development partners/donors. Our struggle at the moment is to consolidate and integrate the line ministries and DP's into a national system. In 2014, we conducted an assessment on ODA and PIP to document our challenges and develop a high-level solution design roadmap. In 2015, we aim to begin this integration journey using information technology best practices. This will allow us to go from monitoring individual projects to a country-wide and sector-wide approach. Firstly, we will enhance and leverage our current monitoring process through consultation with stakeholders, to receive consensus and commitment from all stakeholders on the M&E standards. This will enable us to standardise and improve the effectiveness of the project implementation. There are two initial target areas: first is the ODA-AMP, which is to enhance the database by collecting all ODA projects. Currently, AMP contains 60% of ODA projects in the Lao PDR. And the second is integration of ODA project data with geo mapping to enhance our monitoring system.

The Lao PDR would like to hear from the audience and presenters about experiences while taking on this journey from monitoring and evaluating individual projects to country-wide and sector-wide agendas and examples of successful implementations of technology solutions to monitor and evaluate ODA as lessons learnt and best practice approaches.

Comment: I would like to introduce the concept of TAPES, which is a concise statement for what we are doing in terms of evaluation. TAPES. T stands for Transparency. A stands for Accountability. P stands for policy, planning,

participation (all people; not only experts but also regular people), partnership (public and private sectors, farmers, women, everyone). UNDP and USAID mentioned the importance of community engagement. We have five main engagement goals. The first is employment. We must consider the full employment of the community (paid or voluntary). For this, and as the second goal, we focus on education. Third, health is important. Sick people cannot effectively be involved in community development. Fourth is the social goal of the community. The final point is the environment.

These five goals are set for TAPES.

The last point is designation. Go to the people, be open. We have 70 community centers.

We do hold meetings every month. Good evaluation is not enough. Sharing is an integral part. For example, in Japan, the mayor of the city has to respond to citizens' demands for certain days, such as within 3 days, etc. If he/she cannot fulfill this obligation, he/she will resign. This is the power of the community. The last thing to say is that we need to have efficient evaluation, transparent evaluation, accountable evaluation and responsible evaluation.

Question: There are different perceptions in the community of M&E. How do we meaningfully deal with the issue of community involvement?

Question: I would like to ask a question to donor agencies. There are situations when government policies as well as community policies change a lot. In such unpredictable situation, what kind of approaches do you take?

Question: What approaches do USAID and UNDP have on joint evaluations with national evaluation organizations?

Question: Who will see the evaluation reports? Will they work as knowledge management?

Comment: A lot of outcomes are through results of evaluation. Evaluation is emerging. UNDP mentioned 11 exciting innovations. These innovations are in the beginning stages. We face challenges connecting programs to outcomes, in other words, logical connections.

Question: How do the governments adjust, consolidate or conduct their policies in terms of evaluations of international organizations and third party evaluation?

Answer: We have two USAID websites: one is for internal use and one is for public use. On the websites, we upload all related evaluation information that anybody can see and read. We are also building a website community outside of USAID to invite outsiders.

Answer: We focus on developing and bringing technological innovations into the development programs at national levels. In regard to inter-ministerial coordination and collaboration, many ministries set up their agencies with huge structures and technological costs; however, in some instances, agencies do not consolidate each other's information. We have seen reluctance to consult and collaborate between a number of ministries.

Another issue is crowdsourcing. It is a source of information, but it is not the only source. You have to look at all aspects. Then you can look at the community and ask them what the challenges are and view the challenges from different aspects regarding how to utilize the programs. The third question is about the changes in the policies of the governments. Whenever we do projects we have to work with governments, ministries and agencies. As for the question of how we deal with the changes in policies, approaches and currency exchange rates, there is no solution for such changes. The question is can you anticipate the risk? UNDP has the following policies:

- Compulsory to have in each UNDP office a minimal percentage of the budget

- Monitoring of all indicators is done before any risk taking. It has to be done systematically.

The collaboration of ministers and national statistical offices is significant. The use of ICT and big data should also be considered.

Answer: What we are doing is beginning to incorporate CLA language in programs and projects as well as contracts. Putting it in the contract allows us to make changes more easily, without too much added bureaucracy.

Randomized evaluation is a type of impact evaluation, but it involves a lot of time, work and money. It is a good tool, but it is not the only one. Why do we evaluate? We do evaluation for accountability to the Government of the U.S. and taxpayers. We are also trying to learn how to improve development outcomes.

Concerning government involvement, we have guidance for project design. We agree on the guidance with stakeholders, who consist of beneficiaries, governments and communities. Who will be looking at the evaluation? As I mentioned, it is all the stakeholders who have been involved in the project or evaluation. However, we put the evaluation reports on our website to make sure everyone can access them; they are not just for us, but for everyone.

Question: Evaluation contains the word “value”. There are certain systems of value. It is fine to go into the community. We may have value systems for different communities. How do you reconcile the differences of values and opinions? Which value takes priority?

Answer: There are two things we look at. The first is a designing project. We request the community, individuals, and organization to give us information. We are trying to cooperate with the communities. Second, we need to understand any complex situations arising, especially in the border area. There are many different nationalities. We use local experts who can communicate in the local languages. It is a challenge, I admit.

Question: I would like to ask what you are doing about knowledge management?

Answer: In regard to the evaluation, we collect the data and ask questions. First you need to have questions, surveys, questionnaires, discussions, interviews, etc. Then you can compare the answers with the data and understand the challenges.

Question: Who is designing theory of change?

Answer: The theory of change is developed in the Malaysian context. We have discussions about it with different stakeholders. A single person cannot design the theory of change. It is a collaborative work with stakeholders.

Comment: The theory of change is just one theory; there is not a right or wrong theory.

With this theory, we want to build ownership. There are a lot of theories such as the theory of implementation, the theory of process, etc. It is up to you what to use. We use critical thinking to assess what is appropriate and not appropriate. As for value, there are different types of values such as ethical or moral value. We can make a value be high or low, for example.

Question: We do not have a knowledge management plan. Is it important?

Answer: We have knowledge management at USAID. CLA is active learning. For knowledge management, it is an

issue of how to use data. For example, when we talk about actual sharing, we talk about learning and discussing.

Answer: JICA has a sector-by-sector knowledge management system. The evaluation department offers lessons learned from evaluation as a tool of knowledge management.

The moderator gave his comments on the discussions and presentations of Session 4.

Moderator: Mr. George highlighted the need of the flexible and participatory approach of M&E, supported also with a complementary direct feedback framework from a grass-root level rather than a generalized traditional approach. This is important as the trickledown effect varies widely and signal feedback has been too slow to have a quick impact on decision-making. Innovation in policy and implementation are the key aspects to such feedback. He also, however, emphasized the need for internal capacity building and information extraction by various means, with due regard to privacy and the conceptual backing for correct policy feedback.

Ms. Polak emphasized the need for blending knowledge tools and field-level learning as a major reform agenda in evaluation. New trends introduced for evaluation in USAID include integrating learning, training, gender perspective, missions linking to community of practice and feedback from the grassroots level through a wider participatory approach for better aid effectiveness. I think it is quite helpful to explore their frameworks to enhance our evaluation knowledge and explore further ideas.

There was a comment that the use of technologies should be consistent. Also, there was a discussion on evaluation-related policy changes. Policy change is not easy. It sometimes several months, and will take at least six months. For policy changes, it has to be a signal of sectorial- or country-based need rather than a project-based emphasis. We also had a comment on the importance of involvement of the community. Community involvement is indeed necessary for evaluation as we all agree that the ownership and successes of development projects are generally in the hands of communities. Lastly, I will conclude this session by noting that evaluation has to be evidence-based, knowledge-based and environment-based.

-----Coffee break-----

6. Closing Session

The co-chair read out the draft of the co-chairs summary of the workshop. The summary will be finalized when all the corrections are integrated in a few weeks.

Ms. Violeta Corpus, on behalf of all participants, briefly thanked everyone for organizing and participating in the workshop.

Co-chair, Mr. Kubota, thanked EPU of the Government of Malaysia for hosting the workshop and the participants for their active discussions and officially closed the workshop.

Appendix 1: Workshop Program

The 12th ODA Evaluation Workshop –Agenda-

<i>Venue: Renaissance Kuala Lumpur Hotel</i>	
December 2, 2014	Day 1
09:00-09:30-10:05	Registration Opening Session (1) Welcome and Opening Remarks by Co-Hosts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mr. Kingo Toyoda, Deputy Director-General, International Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), Japan ● YBhg. Dato' Nik Azman Nik Abdul Majid, Deputy Director General (Policy), Economic Planning Unit (EPU), Malaysia (2) Introduction of Workshop and Explanation of Agenda by Co-Chairs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mr. Hiroyuki Kubota, Senior Deputy Director, ODA Evaluation Division, Minister's Secretariat, MOFA, Japan ● Mr. Mohamad Razif Abd Mubin, Deputy Director, Environment and Natural Resources Section, EPU, Malaysia (3) Presentation of Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)'s Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mr. Keiichi Muraoka, Director General, Evaluation Department, JICA
10:05-10:15	Coffee Break
10:15-11:45	Session 1 <u>Impact of Evaluation on Effectiveness of Bilateral Development Assistance</u> Moderator: Mr. Romeo B. Santos, Professor of the University of the Philippines and Chair, PHILDEV and V.P., the Asia Pacific Evaluation Association (APEA) (1) Presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mr. Subrat Kumar Pradhan, Deputy Director, Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance, the Republic of India ● Mr. Abhay Kumar Sharan, Under Secretary, Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance, the Republic of India ● Mr. Mosese Ravasakula, Senior Economic Planning Officer, Overseas Development Assistance Unit, Ministry of Finance, the Republic of Fiji (2) Discussion
12:00-13:30	Lunch
13:30-15:00	Session 2 <u>Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Assistance in Regional Cooperation</u> Moderator: Mr. Champak Pokharel, Board Member/Formal Chairperson of Nepal Evaluation Society (1) Presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mr. Narayan Dhakal, Under Secretary, International Economic Cooperation Coordination Division, Ministry of Finance, the Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal ● Ms. Violeta Corpus, Assistant Director, National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA), the Republic of the Philippines (2) Discussion
15:00-15:15	Coffee Break

15:15-16:45	Session 3 <u>The Role of APEA and its Future Possibilities</u> Moderator: Mr. Benedictus Dwiagus Stepantoro, President of InDEC (Indonesia) and Board Member of APEA (1) Presentations by the APEA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Prof. Ryokichi Hirono, Japan Evaluation Society ● Mr. Arunaselam Rasappan, Secretary of APEA, and Board Member of Malaysian Evaluation Society (2) Discussion
16:45-17:00	Miscellanies and Closing of Day 1
20:00-21:00	Dinner Reception hosted by EPU

December 3, 2014		Day 2
09:30-11:00	Session 4 <u>New Trends in Evaluation</u> Moderator: Mr. Champak Pokharel, the Board Member/Formal Chairperson of Nepal Evaluation Society (1) Presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mr. James George, Assistant Resident Representative (Programme), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) ● Ms. Suzanne Polak, Regional Learning, Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor, Regional Development Mission for Asia (Thailand), United States Agency for International Development (USAID) (2) Discussion	
11:00-11:15	Coffee Break	
11:15-11:45	Closing Session (1) Co-Chairs' Summary Mr. Hiroyuki Kubota, Senior Deputy Director, ODA Evaluation Division, Minister's Secretariat, MOFA, Japan (2) Closing Remarks Mr. Mohamad Razif Abd Mubin, Deputy Director, Environment and Natural Resources Section, EPU, Malaysia	
12:00-13:30	Lunch	

Appendix 2: List of Participants

(Presenter: Name / Moderater: Name*)

Representatives of Co-Hosts

Country	Organization	Title	Name
Japan	International Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Deputy Director-General	Mr.Kingo TOYODA
Malaysia	Economic Planning Unit	Deputy Director General	Ybhg.Dato' Nik Azman NIK ABDUL MAJID

Co-Chairs

Country	Organization	Title	Name
Japan	ODA Evaluation Division, Minister's Secretariat, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Senior Deputy Director	Mr.Hiroyuki KUBOTA
Malaysia	Environment and Natural Resources Section	Deputy Director	Mohamad Razif Abd Mubin

Participants

Country	Organization	Title	Name
Bangladesh	Economic Relations Division, Ministry of Finance	Deputy Secretary	Mr. Mohammad YAMIN CHOWDHURY
Bhutan	Gross National Happiness Commission	Planning Officer	Mr.PENJOR
Cambodia	UN Agencies Aid Coordination Department, The Council for the Development of Cambodia	Director	Mr. Samreth CHEDTHAPHIRUM
Cook Islands	Development Coordination Division, Ministry of Finance and Economic Management	Manager	Mr. Peter TIERNEY
Fiji	Overseas Development Assistance Unit, Ministry of Finance	Senior Economic Planning Officer	<u>Mr. Mosese RAVASAKULA</u>
	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Director of International Cooperation Division	Mr. Apolosi LEWAQAI
India	Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance	Deputy Director	<u>Mr. Subrat Kumar PRADHAN</u>
	Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance	Under Secretary	<u>Mr. Abhay Kumar SHARAN</u>
Indonesia	Indonesian Development Evaluation Community (InDEC)	President	Mr. Benedictus Dwiagus STEPANTORO*
	State Ministry of National Development Planning (BAPPENAS)	Director for Sectoral Development Performance Evaluation	Ms. YOHANDARWATI
	State Ministry of National Development Planning (BAPPENAS)	Young Planner	Ms. Meitha Ika PRATIWI
Lao PDR	Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Planning and Investment	Deputy Director of Aid Effectiveness Division	Mr. Alounxay KHATIALATH
Maldives	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Senior Desk Officer	Mr. Mohamed SHAFFAU IBRAHIM
Micronesia	Office of Statistics, Budget and Economic Management, Overseas Development Assistance, and Compact Management	Budget Analyst	Mr. Alan SEMENS
Myanmar	Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of National Planning and Economic Development	Director	Mr. Htun ZAW
Nepal	Nepal Evaluation Society	Board Member/Formal Chairperson	Mr. Champak POKHAREL*
	International Economic Cooperation Coordination Division, Ministry of Finance	Under Secretary	<u>Mr. Narayan DHAKAL</u>
	International Economic Cooperation Coordination Division, Ministry of Finance	Section Officer	Mr. Fadindra Prasad ACHARYA

Pakistan	Economic Affairs Division, Ministry of Finance, Revenue, Economic Affairs, Statistics and Privatization	Deputy Secretary (Japan)	Mr. Shahid Ahmed VAKIL
Philippines	Pilipinas Development Evaluators Association (PHILDEV)	Chair	Mr. Romeo B. SANTOS*
	National Economic Development Authority	Assistant Director	<u>Ms. Violeta CORPUS</u>
	Non-transport Infrastructure Sector Division, National Economic Development Authority (NEDA)	Division Chief	Ms. Rosalina ALMENDRAL
Sri Lanka	Department of External Resources	Assistant Director	Ms. Jayasena Dasilige Gayoma SENANAYAKE
Thailand	Thailand International Development Cooperation Agency (TICA), Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Development Cooperation Officer	Ms. Patchara KOSINANONT
Timor-Leste	Ministry of Finance	External Assistance Coordination Officer	Mr. Elson Martinho DA COSTA

Development Partners

Organization	Organization	Title	Name
France	Treasury Office, Embassy of France in Malaysia	Deputy Head	Mr. François-Xavier Flamand
UNDP	UNDP Malaysia	Assistant Resident Representative	<u>Mr. James GEORGE</u>
USA	Regional Development Mission for Asia (Thailand), USAID	Regional Learning, Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor	<u>Ms. Suzanne POLAK</u>

Co-host countries

Country	Organization	Title	Name
Japan	Seikei University	Professor Emeritus	<u>Prof. Ryokichi HIRONO</u>
	Evaluation Department, Japan International Cooperation Agency	Director General	<u>Mr. Keiichi MURAOKA</u>
	Japan International Cooperation Agency Malaysia Office	Senior Representative	Ms. Kyoko OKUBO
	Japan International Cooperation Agency Malaysia Office	Project Formulation Advisor	Ms. Mayumi SUEHIRO
	Embassy of Japan in Malaysia	Counsellor	Mr. Kazuhiro KAWASE
	Embassy of Japan in Malaysia	Second Secretary	Mr. Yusuke MORITA
	ODA Evaluation Division, Minister's Secretariat, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Officer	Ms. Sachiyo YASUNAGA
	LEOS International	Coordinator	Ms. Yuriko OSADA
	LEOS International	Coordinator	Ms. Rina NATARAJAN
	LEOS International	Coordinator	Ms. Maralgoo DASHDOOROV
Malaysia	International Cooperation Section, Economic Planning Unit	Director	Pn. Hiday MISRAN
		Principal Assistant Director	Mr. Sivaneswaran Ramachandran
		Assistant Director	Ms. Norhayati Salam
	Malaysian Evaluation Society and APEA	Board Member	<u>Mr. Arunaselam RASAPPAN</u>
	Ministry of Finance	Budget Division	Mr. Koshy THOMAS

Appendix 3: List of Abbreviations

ADB: Asian Development Bank
APEA: Asia Pacific Evaluation Association
AMP: Aid Management Platform
BAPPENAS: National Development Planning Agency (Indonesia)
DAC: Development Assistance Committee
EAs: Evaluation Associations
ECB: Evaluation Capacity Building
ECD: Evaluation Capacity Development
EMU: Expenditure Management Unit
EPU: Economic Planning Unit
GIS: Geographic Information System
ICT: Information Communication Technology
IDEAS: International Development Evaluation Associations
IFAD: International Fund for Agricultural Development
JES: Japan Evaluation Society
JICA: Japan International Cooperation Agency
M&E: Monitoring and Evaluation
MDGs: Millennium Development Goals
MES: Malaysia Evaluation Society
MfDR: Managing for Development Results
MOFA: Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan
NEDA: National Economic and Development Authority
NES: Nepal Evaluation Society
NGOs: Non-Governmental Organizations
ODA: Official Development Assistance
OECD: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
P2P: Peer to Peer
PDCA: Plan - Do - Check - Act
PHILDEV: Pilipinas Development Evaluators Association
SAARC: South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation
SFCCO: Strategic Framework for Change Coordinating Office
SMES2: Strengthening the Monitoring and Evaluation System in Nepal Phase II
UNDP: United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF: United Nations Children's Fund
USAID: The United States Agency for International Development
VoPEs: Voluntary Organizations of Professional Evaluators