Report of the 8th Workshop on ODA Evaluation in Singapore

Singapore, 3-4 March, 2009

Table of Contents

CO-CHAIR'S SUMMARY
Mr. Koh Tin Fook and Prof. Hiromitsu Muta

The 8th ODA Evaluation Workshop was organized jointly by the Governments of Singapore and Japan and was held in Singapore on March 3-4, 2009.

The two co-chairs, Prof. Hiromitsu Muta, Executive Vice-President, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Japan and Mr. Koh Tin Fook, Director, Technical Cooperation Directorate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Singapore each gave opening remarks at the plenary session of the Workshop.

Mr. Katsuki Oda, Deputy Director-General of International Cooperation Bureau of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan, gave a welcome speech, thanking the Government of Singapore for co-organizing the Workshop and for the warm hospitality extended to all the participants in the Workshop.

Prof. Muta made the first presentation based on a paper prepared by Prof. Ryokichi Hirono, emeritus professor at Seikei University. Prof. Muta comprehensively elaborated on policy evaluation, including international trends and Japan's approach to policy evaluation.

Prof. John Wong, Research Director, East Asian Institute, National University of Singapore made the second presentation. He focused on Singapore's flexible transitioning in regards to its economic development policies and the fundamentals of the East Asian Development Model.

The Workshop had two breakout sessions in the afternoon of the first day, the WG A on joint evaluation between donors and partners, and the WG B on project-level evaluation.

In the WG A, there were two presentations on joint evaluation one by Mr. Cao Manh Cuong, Deputy Director-General, Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of Planning and Investment, Vietnam, and one by Ms. Suthanone Fungtammasan, Director of Planning and Monitoring for Partnership Branch, TICA, Thailand. The discussion centred on the followings:

1. How can governments of host countries maintain a strong commitment to joint evaluations?

2. How can the beneficiaries in host countries maintain a strong motivation to participate in evaluation activities?

3. How can institutions necessary for improving evaluations such as laws, rules, and regulations be developed?

4. How can human resources, such as evaluators and evaluation users, in host countries be developed to improve evaluation?

5. How can host countries establish an institutional memory for more effective use of evaluation reports?

6. What kind of mechanisms should be established to use evaluation results effectively; how can evaluation results be fed back to beneficiaries and communities.

In the WG B, there were two presentations: a project-level presentation by Mr. Minato, Acting Director, International Development Research Institute, FASID, Japan titled – A case of environmental projects in Indonesia –, followed another presentation by Mr. Mohan D. Manandhar, Senior Adviser, Organisation Development Centre Inc., Nepal, on the effective use of project-level evaluation, and involving host countries' point of views. The participants discussed the following points:

1. Participation in the evaluation design stage process.

2. How to confirm a project direction fits the policy priorities of governments.

3. How to confirm projects' purposes/outcomes meet beneficiaries' needs and demand.

4. Indicators used for capacity development or institutional development.

5. Feedback on evaluation results acknowledged by stakeholders in the host county.

6. Involvement of local communities' interests.

7. Stakeholders' potential contributions to evaluation.

A number of points were raised at the second-day plenary session in the discussions that followed the presentation of each WG's summary, such as a) the difficulty of clarifying the targets of the evaluation and evaluation reports, b) the extent to which the local community and beneficiaries should be involved in evaluation processes, c) the significance of maintaining understandable contents, local languages and openness/accessibility of the evaluation reports for the public, d) the importance of the timing to conduct evaluation so that the results can be incorporated into national development plans, and e) the significance

of the efforts by donors and partners in maintaining the institutional memory of evaluation results.

The participants in the 8th ODA Evaluation Workshop expressed their deep appreciation to the two organizers of the Workshop for their excellent organization and to the presenters for their comprehensive and encouraging presentations, which focused on their efforts and experiences pertaining to the main Workshop agenda items. All participants expressed an urgent need for continuing this sort of candid exchange of views in order to improve evaluation quality through capacity building. The Workshop also touched upon some advantages to establishing a regional network of evaluation professionals in the region.

1. Plenary Session 1: Opening

1.1. Opening Remarks

1.1.1. Co-Chair's Opening Address

Prof. Hiromitsu Muta, Executive Vice-President, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Japan

The plenary session of the Workshop was opened with remarks from the two co-chairs, Prof. Hiromitsu Muta and Mr. Koh Tin Fook. First, Prof. Muta explained that Prof. Ryokichi Hirono, Professor Emeritus at Seikei University, who had been serving as a co-chair since the first Workshop, was not able to attend this time due to his health condition. However, Prof. Muta further elaborated that Prof. Hirono's vigorous ideas had shaped the themes of this Workshop, and encouraged participants to actively join the discussion through sharing their wide-ranging experiences regarding evaluation.

Mr. Koh Tin Fook, Director, Technical Cooperation Directorate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Singapore.

Mr. Koh Tin Fook made opening remarks on behalf of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Singapore. He expressed his thanks to Mr. Katsuki Oda, Deputy Director-General of the International Cooperation Bureau of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for deciding to hold the Workshop in Singapore. He said that Singapore was privileged to participate in the workshop and to both contribute and learn from the knowledge and expertise that all

participants would be sharing over the course of the one and half day seminar. He explained Singapore's development cooperation and in particular the successful collaboration with JICA. The main activities of Singapore's development assistance were conducting training courses for participants from developing countries. Human resource capacity building was Singapore's key principle in its development assistance. Evaluation would be a key to improving the quality of development assistance and in producing the required results. Effective joint evaluation would also be essential for effective development cooperation. The workshop would be an effective platform for exchanging views, knowledge, and experiences to improve our evaluation capacity. The workshop this year would focus on joint evaluation between donors and host countries and project-level evaluation. He expected that the workshop would contribute to aid effectiveness. He hoped that the conference would be successful and that participants would enjoy their stay in Singapore.

1.1.2. Welcome Speech by the Japanese Representative

Mr. Katsuki Oda, Deputy Director-General, International Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan

Mr. Oda expressed his gratitude to the Government of Singapore for co-organizing the Workshop and for the warm hospitality extended to all the participants in the Workshop. In his speech, Mr. Oda said that Japan considered evaluation an essential process in the cycle of planning, acting, and checking. Evaluation would be needed to judge whether ODA was a success or failure in the past, and to enhance accountability and transparency in the future. By strengthening ownership in partner countries, evaluation would contribute to more effective use of development resources. Mr. Oda emphasized that Japan had been organizing the ODA Evaluation Workshops annually for that reason. These workshops had contributed to better understanding of international evaluation standards and exchanging ideas and experiences in the Asia-Pacific region. Mr. Oda concluded by saying that he hoped participants would be able to learn from each other's various experiences and that would lead to extracting future lessons for promoting the quality of development in the region.

1.2. Presentation: Japan's Approach to Policy Evaluation

Prof. Hiromitsu Muta, Executive Vice-President, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Japan

As co-chair, Prof. Muta clarified that the purpose of the ODA Evaluation Workshop was to exchange experiences and ideas regarding evaluation and the evaluation capacity development of countries in the Asia-Pacific region. Prof. Muta also mentioned that these exchanges would also contribute to improving aid effectiveness from bilateral and multilateral institutional donors. At the 7th ODA Evaluation Workshop in Kuala Lumpur, the discussion focused on institutional evaluation capacity development and human resource development for enhanced evaluation. The discussion at the 8th ODA Evaluation Workshop in Singapore, which focused on effective joint evaluation and project-level evaluation, set its goal to facilitate donors and host countries to strengthen their ongoing works, and to take further concrete actions which would enhance their evaluation capacity development. Prof. Muta also explained the framework of the program including the focused discussion of Working Group A and B and the time schedule of the Workshop.

Prof. Muta made a presentation based on the paper and slides prepared by Prof. Ryokichi Hirono which were modified by Prof. Muta. The title of the presentation was 'Japanese Approach to Policy Evaluation'. Prof. Muta comprehensively elaborated on policy evaluation, including international trends and Japan's approach to policy evaluation. The presentation covered the following points.

(1) Definition and Background of Policy Evaluation
Policy evaluation is carried out, firstly, to improve future development policy interventions through feedbacking evaluation results and recommendations, and secondly to provide all relevant stakeholders with its results. The main reasons why development policy evaluation has become so important are the sizeable waste of public expenditures not directly related to development policies; an increasing concern both within and outside the Government with fiscal imbalances, parliamentary oversight of development strategy and policy relevance, coherence and impact; and a rising demand from the private sector for public information disclosure and from civil society for transparency and accountability of government activities. Other factors which have propelled Asian countries to install an evaluation system in national governments and their implementing agencies are; the presence of reform-minded political leadership in light of the Asian financial crisis and the sustained growth of two giants in Asia; more awareness among bureaucrats to improve their overall development performance; a series of legislative, executive and judiciary actions that attempt to ensure effective responses of the government to the public demand and call for administrative reforms; and a rising demand for evaluation in the private sector for corporate social

responsibility, transparency and accountability.

(2) Policy Evaluation: Multiple Objectives, Evaluation Criteria, and Methodologies

The basic objectives of pubic policy evaluation are i) to ensure policy relevance and enhance policy impact and to ensure policy coherence across all ministries and increase cost- and development-effectiveness of government activities, and ii) to increase transparency and accountability of the governments of both partner and donor countries to tax payers and the general public. Which one of the twin objectives prevails depends on specific circumstances such as who carries out evaluation, specific perspectives, and the audience of the evaluation.

The standard evaluation criteria (Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact, Sustainability) has been developed by OECD/DAC in consultation with UNDP, the World Bank and bilateral agencies. Other evaluation criteria may include necessity/essentiality, extent of goal achievements, and strategicness and innovativeness. The timings of policy evaluation periods include ex-ante, mid-term, terminal and ex-post. Evaluators include evaluation experts equipped with technical knowledge and experience, together with policy specialists with analytical and communications capacity in the relevant policy areas. There are various approaches such as internal and external evaluation, donor evaluation, partner evaluation, results-based evaluation, process evaluation and others. Joint evaluation is conducted both among donors and between donors and partners. Donor-partner joint evaluation's objectives are firstly to promote ownership of partner countries, secondly to include partner countries' perspective on foreign development intervention, and thirdly to assist partner countries in strengthening their evaluation capacity.

(3) International Comparisons of Policy Evaluation

Developed countries and The World Bank have various experiences to share. Some European and North American countries have a longer period of exposure to policy evaluation in response to varying degrees of internal and external pressures. Only a limited number of countries link performance targets to expenditures for all government programs. Many developing countries lack demand for evaluation in part because the power of civil society organizations demand for greater transparency and accountability is weak, and in part, because the public sector suffers from weak political will and low institutional capacity leading to an absence of performance orientation. Both central and local government bureaucracies tend to be fully occupied with the day-to-day implementation and monitoring of developing interventions and have little time and money to allocate for evaluation.

(4) Japanese Approach to Policy Evaluation

In 2001, the Government of Japan issued Standard Guideline on Policy Evaluation (SGPE), followed by the enactment of Law Concerning Policy Evaluation in Administrative Organisations in June 2002. The Basic Policy stipulates that: a) each ministry concerned must decide on concrete forms and requirements for policy evaluation, b) the bureaucracy needs to transform its mentality in favour of Results-based Management, and c) transparency must be ensured by making evaluation reports public.

(5) Types of Policy Evaluation in Japan

The types of policy evaluations conducted in both partner and donor countries usually cover theme, sector, programme and country. Emphasis has been changed from projects through thematic, sectoral and programme policy to strategic policy evaluation for the following reasons:

➢ A rising concern for the well-being of the final beneficiaries. Amidst a large number of often uncoordinated development policy interventions by different Ministries in a partner country, the emphasis has been on the outcome and impact of a given project rather than the input and output of the project.

➢ An increasing emphasis by both donor and partner countries on their combined contribution to national development in given themes, sectors or programme areas has de-emphasized an individual donor's contribution, resulting in a growing concern with the cost- and development-effectiveness of all development activities and interventions.

➢ An increasing emphasis on overall policy relevance and coherence at the national level which entails the impact of macro-economic policies, industrial policies, and international trade and investment policies on partner countries' national development and the alignment of donor assistance to partner countries' strategies, policies and systems for promoting economic, social and environmental sustainability.

(6) Quo Vadis

Partner countries could engage with both bilateral and multilateral donors for promoting donor-partner joint evaluation of policy interventions. National evaluation societies in partner countries could work with their governments to conduct peer reviews of policy interventions. The 8th ODA Workshop should proceed with a preparatory committee to establish an Asia-Pacific Evaluation Association Network (APEA NET) which would be composed of evaluation professionals working in both the private and public sectors. Furthermore, a regional panel of professional evaluators established by APEA NET could

meta-evaluate internal policy evaluation in developing countries.

(7) Recommendations to Improve Policy Evaluation in Japan

The following five points are recommended to improve policy evaluation in Japan, 1) the coverage, accuracy and timeliness of data delivered; 2) the quality of professional evaluators; 3) the high cost of policy evaluation exercises; 4) ways to ensure the independence of evaluation; 5) ways to ensure feedback contributes to the effective formulation and implementation of new development policies, sector/programs and thematic projects.

1.3. Presentation: The Fundamentals of a Sound Singapore Experience and Its Perspective

Prof. John Wong, Research Director, East Asian Institute, National University of Singapore

The second presentation, titled Singapore's Economic Development, was made by Prof. John Wong.

(1) Singapore the smallest Asian Dragon

Prof. Wong started by explaining Singapore's economic background as the smallest Asian dragon. Singapore achieved average high growth between the 1960s and the 1990s. East Asia's four "dragons" including Singapore managed to overcome constraints such as scarce land and poor natural resources by intensifying their human resource development and by operating export-oriented development strategies. The per-capita GNP of Singapore has increased from US$440 (in 1960) to US$32,470 (in 2007). Until the recent global economic crisis, Singapore was an economy with low inflation and full employment, cushioned by huge international reserves and zero foreign debt. Singapore has also made impressive progress in social areas such as public housing and education.

(2) The Industrialization Drive

Prof. Wong focussed on the story of Singapore's modern economic development from 1959 under the administration of Mr Lee Kuan Yew. The entrepot economy that Singapore followed was not capable of generating sufficient jobs, and therefore Singapore had to be industrialized. Economic growth was quite slow in the first part of the 1960s, partly because Singapore essentially adopted an import substitution type of industrialization strategy and Singapore also experienced domestic political instability. In 1965, Singapore was separated from Malaysia to become a fully independent state. Singapore's development strategies

transited from import substitution to export-oriented. Singapore became free to devise its own appropriate tariffs and to expand its global economic linkages.

(3) The Second Industrial Revolution

Having faced a rise in labour-intensive manufactured exports and labour shortages, the government took bold measures. One such measure was a high-wage policy which forced industrial restructuring, i.e., from labour-intensive activities to more capital-intensive and higher productivity pursuits. This is called the "Second Industrial Revolution." Similar industrial upgrading was also successfully taking place around the same time in South Korea and Taiwan, albeit with less government intervention.

(4) The Challenges of the New Economy

By the 2000s, Singapore was pushing hard to develop itself into an "intelligent island" for the emerging information-based society and knowledge-based economy. As a small compact island with a world-class physical infrastructure and ample financial resources, the major challenge for Singapore was coming from the "software component" associated with the accumulation of human and intellectual capital. Singapore has found developing the required IT (information technology) infrastructure relatively easy. The government has also invested heavily in R&D, particularly for the life sciences. Nevertheless, Singapore has been facing considerable disadvantages as a small country with a very limited high-level manpower base, and liberal immigration policies for foreign talent cannot easily remedy the situation.

(5) Q&A:

Question: Singapore's government rather focuses on economic development policy and seems not to place a priority on social aspects. However, Singapore is a very successful country both economically and socially. Is there any comment on this?

Answer: The Singapore's government has been concerned about social aspects as well. There are issues like less equal income distribution. However, social safety net, such as governmental housing provision and health care, supports lower income earners. Incomes of skilled professionals like professors and engineers in Singapore are competitive, and have reached international levels (of the UK and the USA). Their salaries are much higher than that of local [blue colour] workers. Nonetheless, the government provides decent housing at reasonable prices with a provision policy according to incomes. Health care fees are set according to income levels as well. There are subsidies and free health care with good medical facilities. It is also possible that the people pursue quality of education for almost

free. In Singapore, the government balances economic development with social protection so that everyone is able to retain the living standards.

Question: How can the government of Singapore maintain its effectiveness?
Answer: In Singapore, there is no corruption among civil servants, because civil servants have high incomes and high education levels.

Question: How does Singapore overcome scarce natural resources?
Answer: Because Singapore is poor in natural resources, humans are resources for this country and human resource development has become one of the strategies for economic development. The people are encouraged to pursue higher educations in Singapore where there are linkage of educations and job opportunities that the government has helped create.

Question: One of the necessary approaches to government-led development is to remove corruption, but it is very difficult to manage because corruption is systematic. We placed a monetary monitoring system in our county to combat corruption and increase efficiency and accountability. What kind of approaches can we take to or how can we prevent corruption?
Answer: To build a clean government, Lee Kuan Yew, the former prime minister, made an anti-corruption agency that was independent and strict. A social value system, strong leadership, and a social welfare system led the Singapore government to reduce corruption. Public servants should receive sufficient payment so that it would prevent them from being attracted to extra risky money. If the payment is too low, corruption will occur for rent seeking, resulting in higher social costs.

2. Working Group A: Joint Evaluation by Host Countries and Donors

2.1. Presentation: Joint Evaluation in Vietnam

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

Mr. Cuong started his presentation by introducing Vietnam's work on reinforcing its ODA M&E system through various decrees, decisions, and circulars and institutionalized the strategic framework in its national development plan. Then Mr. Cuong explained arrangements for strengthening the partnership with donors for the purpose of sharing

experiences in M&E, and introduced a joint evaluation with JICA. In 2007, MPI and JICA agreed to a three-year MOU and conducted a joint evaluation in the transport sector, followed by the communication and power sector in the following year. The MOU's stated aims are effective and efficient ODA management, and harmonization of the evaluation mechanism. The joint evaluation by Vietnam and JICA is expected to contribute to institutional enhancement, and its strategies are 1) harmonization of the evaluation methodology, 2) hands-on training, 3) execution of Vietnam's newly established ODA evaluation system. Mr. Cuong explained that the evaluation team (consisting of JICA members as well as members from Vietnam's line ministries) discussed evaluation frameworks, work plans, etc. He also emphasized that the Vietnamese members fully participated in all stages of evaluation. Furthermore, he analyzed the reasons for their enhanced effort on the joint evaluation as follows; 1) strong commitment of the government to development ownership, 2) sense of responsibility among ODA-related agencies through regulations, decrees and decisions on ODA M&E, 3) official involvement of stakeholders in the joint evaluation activities, 4) strong leadership of MPI as a focal point of the evaluation, 5) high relevance of strategies applied, 6) capacity development through Vietnam-Australia Monitoring and Evaluation Strengthening Project (VAMESP) since 2003. Lastly, Mr. Cuong pointed out the following 4 challenges to be overcome; 1) the feedback mechanism is weak in the utilization of evaluation results especially at the policy level, 2) the accumulation of evaluation knowledge is insufficient and there are not enough professional evaluators, 3) an evaluation unit should be established in many of the government agencies which are in charge of ODA, 4) lack of budget for evaluation.

At the end of the presentation, Dr. Nguyen, Project Coordinator, Vietnam Australia Monitoring and Evaluation Strengthening Project – Phase II (VAMESP II), and an expected Board Member of Vietnam Evaluation Association, reported on the progress of the Vietnam Evaluation Association (VEA), which had received support from JICA. Dr. Nguyen introduced the VEA as a professional association whose status is voluntary, non-governmental, and non-profit. Its objectives are: dissemination of knowledge on M&E, policy advocacy for the government on M&E, provision of M&E services to ensure the accountability, transparency and effectiveness/efficiency of business and government sector management. Dr. Nguyen stated that they had submitted the profile of VEA to the Ministry of Home Affairs for the final approval subsequent to the approval by MPI in February 2009.

2.2. Presentation (of Thailand): Joint Evaluation with JICA

Ms. Suthanone Fungtammasan, Director of Planning and Monitoring for Partnership Branch, TICA, Thailand

Ms. Suthanone started her presentation by stating that the main reason for conducting a joint evaluation is a joint effort to achieve development goals. Japan is the biggest donor in Thailand, and TICA has participated in almost all JICA's evaluations. The presentation selected a joint evaluation for Thai-Japanese training project as part of technical cooperation with JICA, and she outlined the evaluation exercise. The joint evaluation team, comprised of JICA (Headquarter/Bangkok office), TICA, Thai implementing agency (organizer of the training course), and JICA consultants, conducted document review, questionnaires, interviews, etc. for the selected target groups. The collected data were analyzed and evaluated in accordance with OECD/DAC's 5 criteria, and the conclusion was compiled in a report. The reported findings from the evaluation were mostly excellent; however, several obstacles to carry out the ex-post evaluation exercise were confirmed such as the low return rate of questionnaires, difficulties locating ex-participants due to rotation, retirement, etc., the level of utilization of the training outcomes depended on the positions and the commitment of each ex-participant.

Ms. Suthanone explained the benefits of the joint evaluation as follows; 1) the integrated recommendations of the evaluation contributes to different programs, 2) providing involved partners with working together in all steps with the donor, 3) knowledge and experience were shared, 4) the cost-effectiveness, 5) networking opportunities among the evaluation team and other partner countries. On the other hand, she pointed out challenging issues in achieving effective joint evaluation; 1) varying cultures and habits, and the very limited timeframe for the evaluation, 2) the tendency of donor-driven evaluation in the whole process of the evaluation, 3) special consideration on the qualification and seniority needs to be given in forming the evaluation team, 4) the timing to conduct the joint evaluation to provide inputs for future planning.

2.3. Discussion

After each presentation, Prof. Muta opened the floor for questions and answers. Participants asked the presenters for more detailed information on efforts on the joint evaluation taken

by the two countries, and the presenters responded with added explanation.

Next, Prof. Muta moved to the discussion points set in the discussion paper.

The first discussion point was how the governments of host countries maintain strong motivations to commit themselves to join evaluations. A participant commented that the results of evaluation must be taken into account in the decision making process among donors and host countries. A participant expressed a view that the M&E system could be fit into the national agenda. Participants confirmed that the localization of M&E according to needs or standards of the host countries is essential. The importance of capacity development gained through the joint evaluation together with donors was also pointed out as an incentive for governments of host countries.

In regards to the second discussion point on how the beneficiaries in host countries maintain a strong motivation to participate in evaluation activities, it was stated that the participation of beneficiaries increased the transparency and the accountability of projects. In addition, it had impacts on the empowerment of the local authority. The participation of beneficiaries from a very early stage of evaluation process was emphasized as intended beneficiaries of development projects keeping their motivation to commit to the project is also very important.

The third discussion point was about institutional arrangements within host countries such as laws, rules, and regulations for improving evaluations. Prof. Muta asked the participants if their countries had a policy evaluation law, and some participants reported on their countries' arrangements. However, binding feedback system of evaluation results into the future policy planning was deemed necessary for the utilization of evaluation reports. In relation to institutional view, a question was posed in regards to the neutrality of evaluations together with the balance between recommendations from third party evaluations and the government's views. Prof. Muta explained the importance of the role of third parties in improving transparency and accountability. However, he added that different types of evaluations should be used to obtain more balanced and wider perspectives as each evaluator had a different way of thinking, and therefore, evaluating evaluation reports by peer reviews or through meta-evaluation would be important.

The fourth discussion point was how human resources such as evaluators and evaluation users could be trained to improve evaluation. The necessity of human resource development

not only on an individual level but also on an institutional level was raised. The idea of setting up an evaluation association as one way of human resource development was mentioned. Such evaluation association could provide active forums for networking and exchanging good practices among those who have interests in evaluations or evaluation stakeholders. An evaluation association could also serve as a conduit for the transmission of evaluation knowledge. The utilization of internet network was pointed out as a tool for the wide and active dissemination of evaluations. It was agreed that joint evaluation would be a good way to develop evaluator resources. The two presentations also mentioned that through the evaluation exercises from the donor side, joint evaluation was a kind of on-the-job training as evaluation team members from the host country side learn the process, methodologies, and way of analysis from the donor side. A participant suggested that there would be a need to clarify what kind of capacity should be developed for evaluations. The government sector should be equipped with evaluation methodologies as they develop evaluation TORs and get feedbacks. At the same time, professional evaluators should be aware of the methodologies and incorporate the government's efforts. It was considered as two sides of the same coin, which was the government makes the evaluation requirements, and the professional evaluators try to meet these requirements. The participants also emphasized that training at an early stage of a project would be essential in ensuring effective M&E, so that the human resource development should be arranged from the outset of the project cycle.

The fifth discussion point dealt with how host governments could establish institutional memories for more effective use of evaluation reports. The Thai presentation mentioned the rotation or the retirement of officials who had received the training as a severe problem. One idea presented to tackle this issue was strengthening collaboration with donors. A participant stated that a multilateral agency had a handful of evaluators so that collaboration with such an agency would enable host countries to access records of evaluation professionals. Another participant added that a project database could be used to share good practices and findings, and could be referenced when planning new projects. Prof. Muta supplemented that the issue of evaluation database related to the effective use of the evaluation results, and introduced JICA's efforts to build the database with a view to utilizing the past evaluation report for new project/program planning.

The last discussion point was about the effective use of evaluation results. A participant recommended building systems to determine which evaluation made sense, as useful evaluation reports would highlight the most useful lessons learned and appeal to the

audience, concerned agencies, and stakeholders. It would be a pre-requisite that reports were easy to understand and shared with a wide range of evaluation stakeholders. Prof. Muta explained the importance of introducing a mechanism of the feedback of evaluation results together with an evaluation system by illustrating Japan's feedback system of ODA evaluation in which MOFA would bear the responsibility to respond to evaluation recommendations. Another participant proposed a system to take evaluation recommendations into a new project/program, and added that the recommendations should be utilized by host countries. Prof. Muta agreed to this comment and introduced a JICA arrangement that set up a proposal form that requires writing down the recommendation from the previous project.

Prof. Muta expressed his gratitude to participants for their active discussion and exchange of views based on individual experiences, and he closed the discussion.

3. Working Group B: Project-level Evaluation

3.1. Presentation: Project-level Evaluation and Feedback – A case of Environmental Projects
        in Indonesia –

Mr. Naonobu Minato, Acting Director, International Development Research Institute, FASID

Mr. Minato made a presentation titled "Project-level Evaluation and Feedback – A Case of Environmental Projects in Indonesia". This presentation introduced environmental management projects in Indonesia and illustrated how the project replications were made with feedback through project evaluations. The evaluation method used in the evaluations was combined with Project Design Matrix (PDM), ODA/DAC's five evaluation criteria – relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability – and six cross-cutting issues: policy, technology, environment, society and culture, organizations and institutions, economy and finance. The presenter more practically showed how we could utilize evaluation results.

The case study consisted of two projects. The first project, the "Environmental Management Centre" (EMC) project, was supported and implemented in Java from 1993 to 1997. This project was to establish an environmental monitoring laboratory and an environmental management system in the country. The staff of the laboratory and the officials of the implemental organization, Environmental Impact Management Agency (BAPEDAL)

acquired monitoring and managerial skills through the project. The terminal evaluation was conducted in 2000 and some specific techniques and methods that the technical staff had not acquired yet were identified. The terminal evaluation also uncovered the financial and managerial skills that the officials and the administrative staff would need to gain to disseminate the techniques to the other areas. Thus, the EMC project was extended two years and three months to fully fulfill the objective. Three months before the extension project ended, the terminal evaluation for the extended project was carried out. It assessed the staff and the officials had achieved necessary techniques and skills to expand the project to another area, and the extension project was completed.

In regard with the EMC project, there were several evaluations undertaken on both projects from different perspectives and by different agents like a modality evaluation of the EMC project. With the lessons learnt from those studies together with a political movement toward decentralization in the country, the second project was planned. The project was called "Project for Strengthening Decentralized Environmental Management System in Indonesia (DEM)", and implemented from July 2002 to June 2006 with a regional governmental office for environmental management in North Sumatra (BAPEDALDA). The DEM project focused on the creation of a framework for environmental management in which PUSARPEDAL (the laboratory in North Sumatra), the EMC and BAPEDALDA would work together. In relation with the DEM project, the presentation introduced the terminal evaluation. The presenter confirmed the project objectives and furthermore showed how much the ultimate goal was fulfilled. In this case study, the presenter illustrated the evaluations, focusing on how the evaluations were utilized in the planning and implementation of the two projects.

3.2. Presentation (of Nepal): Effective Use of Project-level Evaluation and Involving Host
        Countries' Point of Views

Mr. Mohan D. Manandhar, Senior Adviser, Organisation Development Centre Inc., Nepal

The second presenter, Mr. Manandhar gave a presentation on result-based-management and issues/important aspects to consider when evaluating infrastructure projects. He explained specifically how infrastructure projects could be evaluated and how those evaluations would offer more accurate and reliable results. Mr. Manandhar explained that result-base-management was fundamentally a method of managing a project; however, it

was used as a tool to evaluate projects and is often employed by multilateral organisations. Evaluation using result-base-management would be able to ease taking feedback into the ongoing project by comparing planned results to actual results at the time of evaluation. It was not only useful in evaluating infrastructure projects but also considered the process of implementation, activities, management and partnerships being built in infrastructure projects (such as water facilities and health care centres) that tended to focus on what would be produced.

According to Mr. Manandhar, evaluations using result-base-management looked at money spent and values produced. With a peculiarity of infrastructure projects, that was the tangibility of physical inputs and outputs, evaluations of infrastructure projects often looked into cost-performance. Moreover, investment in feasibility studies and detail design of the project on its cost part would be high. Hence, when evaluating infrastructure projects, the evaluation design should try to balance between assessing efficiency and effectiveness (quality and quantity of inputs and outputs) and positive changes in the lives of beneficiaries – impacts and sustainability. Infrastructure projects such as building a hospital, school and water facility, directly offered benefits to users (the project beneficiaries). Therefore, it appeared relevant. Nevertheless, there were hidden issues of such projects. For example, there were cases in which the costs of maintenance or user fees had exceeded beneficiaries' expectation and acceptance, and they went back to the conventional way of doing things a few years after the termination of a project. There were also cases of exclusions made from power relations in a community. For example, locations and kinds of outputs – hospitals, water facilities, roads etc. were often chosen or expanded after projects in favour of elites, peers, and powerful people like village chiefs in a community. In order to understand such influence from power relations information should be collected from as many stakeholders as possible. Different perspectives from various local stakeholders ease discovering impacts and sustainability as well.

Data from implementing organisations and local staff in the field should be collected because they usually had useful accurate data. Communities and countries should be researched in relation to their socio, political and economic situations and the histories and complexities of politics in project sites, to assess sustainability more precisely.

The presenter lastly stressed key issues for improving project results through evaluations. Infrastructural operation would not be sustainable without the active involvement of communities and governmental agencies. In that sense, the participation of beneficiaries

from planning to reporting evaluations would be highly encouraged, because ownerships as well as a stronger sense of required maintenance would be gained through evaluation activities. Mr. Manandhar emphasised that, simultaneously, we would have to think of ways and offer opportunities so that more stakeholders could participate in evaluation activities. Inclusion of evaluations as a part of a project could be one such way. As for improving evaluations, the involvement of key policy makers and national agencies including implementation agencies and operational staff would be desirable as they could gain knowledge, experience, and opportunities for feedback.

3.3. Discussion

The two presentations were followed by a discussion proceeded by Mr. Minato, in which participants exchanged their experiences and opinions on the seven discussion points as given.

The first question was on participation and the discussion began with an proposition that beneficiaries should participate in evaluation process so that the evaluation result would be more reliable. This in part corresponded to the presenter's emphasis that only participation in all the phases of a project and an evaluation process could make ownership of beneficiaries strong. The presenter introduced a case from his experience of evaluating an educational project. When he and his staff were about to evaluate the project, different stakeholders – the operational office, the construction contractor, and the department of education requested data that had not been covered in the evaluation team's scope. Those requests and the revisions of evaluation planning (whether intentionally or not) guided the evaluation team to collect more useful data. A participant made a comment on different starting times of a fiscal year between donors and his country that had impeded active participation in planning. This implied that flexible timings of budgeting may allow host countries to plan to participate in evaluation and project planning activities.

In regards to the second question on ways of confirming whether a project direction would fit with national priorities, there were two responses. The first one was that evaluation commissions and departments existed to assess project plans and national priorities in the speaker's country. The other was the clarification of 6 priorities in cooperation with JICA by utilizing master plans that reflected project objectives.

The third question was on how project purposes met beneficiaries' needs and demands. A participant introduced his country's method to propose a project. In his country, proposals were planned at the community level and submitted to the district office, and then sent to the central government before going to a donor. Sometimes needs and demands were slightly different from the national priorities of development plans; in such cases, they discussed how they could integrate the different needs. Another participant commented that they employed the same and discussed project ideas every three months with donors. Having agreed that sometimes people's needs and national interests would be different, another participant added an issue of difficulty in setting appropriate goals. He had an experience with the government which planned a technical transfer project in manufacturing and was eager to realise the project immediately, but they needed to gain general managerial and institutional capacities before its implementation.

In regards to the fourth question, participants actively exchanged opinions on indicators. In general, the impression towards indicators to measure capacity development was that such indicators were indeed not easy to set. For example, a participant commented that it would be challenging to identify indicators to measure capacity or institutional development where indicators may not clearly reflect the national interests or match achievements of whatever had been done before. Various stakeholders, such as donors and governments try to measure capacity development from different perspectives. It was mentioned that JICA had been seeking suitable indicators to measure capacity development from good practices. A participant introduced a scholarship programme supported by AuSAID, and thanks to the program, graduates studying under the scholarship had been promoted to higher-ranking positions and institutional capacity had seemingly been improved. Hence, the number of people promoted to such important positions could be an indicator to measure the effectiveness of an educational program or levels of universities.

As for feedback of evaluations, some participants pointed out the necessity of making evaluation reports easier to understand and more interesting to read, because evaluation reports were often written in technical languages and often too difficult to read. They stressed reports should at least be translated into the local languages and could be posted on websites to attract more people's attention. This would increase chances that people take feedback from evaluations. India in fact posted evaluation reports translated into local languages on websites.

The sixth question was how to engage interests of community interests. A participant

emphasised that 80 percent of JICA projects had been successful with proper consultation with the communities. Proper consultation increased community participation and helped communities gain a sense of ownership. There were inter-related issues (Mr. Mohan) in cases of community infrastructure projects. Communities were the ones who had to maintain a project. Therefore, they were fundamentally interested in learning evaluation results and expected that they would be provided with the information. However, in order for them to become more enthusiastic about learning, they had to be more actively engaged in the planning and implementing process of projects and evaluations.

The last discussion, methods of securing the process of evaluation activities, began with a discussion of the importance of participation timing. Stakeholders should participate from the planning stage, because such planning would affect the whole evaluation and project. A participant commented on the relation of evaluation purposes with sampling of data collection. She said that determining who should be involved would depend on what we want to do after an evaluation. Therefore, careful sampling would be important and sometimes pre-tests for sampling would be necessary.

Important aspects, issues, and methods of evaluations were clarified through the discussion, and the participants had the opportunity to exchange their experiences and opinions. Under such an atmosphere, Mr. Mohan and Mr. Minato closed the session by summarizing the discussion.

4. Plenary Session 2: Closing

4.1. Reporting Back to the Plenary by the Chairpersons of Working Groups

Prof. Muta gave explanation on the summary of the discussion at Working Group A that the Group focused on identifying the challenges of facilitating joint evaluation and possible ways to overcome them. Next, Mr. Minato explained the summary of the discussion at Working Group B that focused on the project-level evaluation using the cases of environmental projects and infrastructure projects.

4.2. Discussion

Prof. Muta asked the floor for comments, corrections, or additions to the reported summary of the discussion, and for further discussion.

Firstly, Prof. Muta asked about the discussion in Group B on the users of the evaluation report. Mr. Minato replied that the reader of the evaluation report would depend on purposes of the evaluation so that stakeholders should be involved in the designing stage of the evaluation to identify its purposes. He added that if the evaluation report should be read by beneficiaries, it should be user-friendly and sometimes should be translated into their languages. Relating to the use of evaluation reports, it was pointed out that reports should be clearly written and open to the public. Evaluation reports tended to be written in technical languages and were often difficult to be understood by local people. Some participants introduced their countries' efforts on making evaluation reports more attractive, such as making summaries in local languages which were easy for beneficiaries and the general public to read and understand, posting them on a local website, and producing evaluation reports in their own languages.

In connection with the dissemination of evaluation reports, an additional comment was made that targeting the right audience would be necessary for the effective use of evaluation results.

The issue of the indicators used to evaluate the capacity or institutional development drew participants' attention in the discussion. It was reported that the discussion in Group B had revealed that it would be challenging to identify indicators to measure capacity or institutional development, where indicators may not clearly reflect the national interests or match achievements of what had been done before. Mr. Minato commented that it would be very difficult to set appropriate indicators for capacity or institutional development because evaluating capacity or institutional development would be different from evaluating projects in areas such as agriculture, health, and primary education. However, local knowledge was useful to identify appropriate indicators for capacity and institutional development. He mentioned that some indicators would focus on the number of beneficiaries who receive/access the service, or that technical transfer could be seen as capacity development. A participant commented that good practices showed good indicators. Mr. Sugimoto explained JICA's arrangement to draw good practices of indicators from the past evaluation reports. JICA commissioned the Japan Evaluation Association to analyze past evaluation reports and give comments to improve JICA's evaluation system. He expressed the view that JICA was trying to find good practices showing useful indicators and lessons learned.

How to confirm whether projects' purposes/outcomes meet beneficiaries' need and demand drew several comments from participants. To develop a project in line with demand and requirements of the community through both a bottom-up approach and a participatory approach was proposed. It was stressed that meeting the needs and interests of beneficiaries would be a pre-requisite for the effective implementation of the project. And, in relation to the discussion point on how to involve the interests of the local community, Mr. Minato reported that the discussion in Group B confirmed that the interest of local community was also important to sustain and maintain the benefits after the project.

The timing to conduct evaluation was indicated as crucial to utilize results in the future development plan. A participant explained her case that her country's development plan would come on board in 2011, and they had been in the process of evaluating all projects looking at how and what kind of projects were taken further and what had been the best practices over the years. In connection with institutional memories, one idea was mentioned that donors could help to set up a central deposit system within host countries so that the body of literature could be used and maintained.

4.3. Adoption of Co-Chair's Summary

Prof. Muta read a Co-Chair's Summary, which outlined the discussion of the Workshop, and it was approved by all participants. Prof. Muta showed his gratitude to participants and closed the session.

5. Informal Session

5.1. Proposal of Asia-Pacific Evaluation Association

Mr. Minato read the proposal for establishing the Asia-Pacific Evaluation Association Network (APEA NET) prepared by Prof. Ryokichi Hirono. The concept of the APEA NET was a networking association where Asian Pacific countries could share experiences, knowledge, and practices in evaluation. Evaluation practices were more and more common at the corporate, local and national levels in the region. They were now woven into the social governance system in an increasing number of countries. Studies on evaluation theories,

methodologies, approaches, and systems had been conducted by scholars and researchers in this region. Simultaneously, several countries, such as Bangladesh, India, Japan, Malaysia, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and Vietnam had already established country-based evaluation societies, and Nepal was in the process of establishing such a society.

Evaluation, however, was a comparatively new profession, and thus the exchange of information and experiences among evaluation professionals and the networking among national evaluation societies were essential for the further advancement of evaluation theories and practices. For this reason, the International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS) was organized in 2002 by development-oriented evaluation experts and the Organization for International Cooperation in Evaluation (OICE) in 2003 by those concerned with evaluation in general.

In view of this emerging situation, Japan Evaluation Society, together with the other national evaluation societies, would like to jointly propose the establishment of the APEA NET and to realize this initiative. The Japan Evaluation Society proposed establishing an Asia-Pacific preparatory committee composed of representatives of several national evaluation societies in the region.

APEA NET would be a non-profit, non-governmental, volunteer organisation with membership open to individuals and institutions involved in evaluation as well as in development from developing and developed countries. Its members would include evaluation experts and development practitioners from governments, civil society (e.g. NGOs, academia, and research institutions), private sector, and bilateral and multilateral institutions in the international development cooperation community. The main objectives of APEA NET were to promote the theory, practice, and utilization of evaluation in Asian and Pacific countries and to enhance academic and professional networking among evaluators and others concerned with evaluation in the region. It was expected that APEA NET would promote an evaluation culture and strengthen evaluation capacities among its member countries, thus contributing to realizing high-quality evaluation researches and practices in the region. APEA NET was also expected to cooperate with both IDEAS and OICE in pursuit of the above objectives.

5.2. Discussion

Following the proposal read by Mr. Minato, the participants exchanged opinions on such

associations.

First, Mr. Keishi Miyazaki, evaluation consultant and a member of International Exchange Committee of Japan Evaluation Society (JES) introduced Dr. Cuong Nguyen Manh and Dr. Ngyen Van Phuc, expected management board members of the Vietnam Evaluation Association (VEA) to share ideas on networking and evaluation associations. The VEA was a network composed of researchers, academicians, and people from civil society, NGOs and the private sector. JICA had lent its support to preparations for its establishment. Dr. Nguyen Manh said they intended to structure the VEA in the following four sections.

1. Training: Improve skills of members
2. Research: Promote research on governmental policies and the VEA's activities.
3. Public Relation: Research results will be opened to the public through bulletins and websites.
4. Administration: Day-to-day work to support the organisation.

Mr. Minato continued the session and shared reasons why we wished to establish such an international association. In 2000, Japan established an equivalent organization, the JES. The members were from international development agencies, universities, the public sector etc., and they worked together through the JES. This sort of association was useful to develop capacities in evaluation by sharing practices and ideas from different perspectives. As a response to this, there were active comments to acclaim the significance of establishing such an international evaluation association.

Mr. Minato commented that since there were already evaluation associations in New Zealand and Australia, there would be a possibility to cooperate with them in the future. The Asian and the Pacific association also might be able to link with the existing African and Latin American associations.

Mr. Minato and Prof. Muta closed the informal session by showing promising expectations for the proposed establishment of the APEA NET.

Appendix 1: Workshop Program

3 March 2009 (Tuesday)		
AM	Plenary Session 1: Opening ➢ Co-chairs' Opening Address ➢ Welcome Speech by the Singaporean Representative ➢ Welcome Speech by the Japanese Representative ➢ Presentation: Japan's approach to policy evaluation ➢ Presentation: Singapore's approach to development policy	
Noon	Lunch Break	
PM	Working Group A 'Joint Evaluation between Donor Countries and Host Countries - 1' Co-chair: Prof. Hiromitsu Muta (Presentations) ➢ Vietnam ➢ Thailand	Working Group B 'Project-level Evaluation-1' Co-chair: Mr. Naonobu Minato and Mr. Mohan D. Manandhar (Presentations) ➢ Japan (FASID) ➢ Nepal
	Coffee Break	
	Working Group A (continued) 'Joint Evaluation between Donor Countries and Host Countries - 2'	Working Group B (continued) 'Project-level Evaluation-2'
Evening	Reception	
4 March 2009 (Wednesday)		
AM	Plenary Session 2: Closing ➢ Reporting Back to the Plenary by the Chairpersons of Working Groups	
	Coffee Break	
	Co-Chair's Summary Closing	

Appendix 2：List of Participants

Co-Chairs

Country	Organisation	Title	Name	Working Group
Japan（Co-host）	Tokyo Institute of Technology	Member of the Board/Executive Vice President	Prof. Hiromitsu Muta	Co-Chair of Plenary Session Chair of Working Group A
Japan（Co-host）	FASID - Foundation for Advanced Studies on International Development	Acting Director	Mr. Naonobu Minato	Chair of Working Group B
Singapore（Co-host）	Technical Cooperation Directorate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Director	Mr. Koh Tin Fook	Co-Chair of Plenary Session

Presenters

Country	Organisation	Title	Name	Working Group
Singapore	East Asian Institute National University of Singapore	Research Director	Prof. John Wong	Plenary Session
Vietnam	Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of Planning and Investment	Deputy Director General	Mr. Cuong Manh Cao	A
Thailand	TICA - Thailand International Development Cooperation Agency	Director of Planning and Monitoring	Ms. Suthanone Fungtammasan	A
Nepal	Organisation Development Centre, Inc.	Senior Advisor	Mr. Mohan Das Manandhar	B

Partners

Country	Organisation	Title	Name	Working Group
Bangladesh	Evaluation Sector IMED（Implementation, Monitoring, and Evaluation Division） Ministry of Planning	Director General	Mr. Md. Jainal Abedin	A
Bangladesh	Evaluation Sector IMED（Implementation, Monitoring, and Evaluation Division） Ministry of Planning	Director	Ms. Rowshan Ara Begum	A
Bhutan	Gross National Happiness Commission	Chief Programme Coordinator	Mr.Thinley Namgyel	A
Bhutan	Asia Division Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Head	Mr. Rinchen Kuentsyl	B
Cambodia	Coucil for the Development of Cambodia (CDC) /Cambodian Rehabilitation and Development Board-CDC/CRDB	Director NGO Coordination Department	Mr. IM Sour	A
Cambodia	Coucil for the Development of Cambodia (CDC) /Cambodian Rehabilitation and Development Board-CDC/CRDB	Deputy Director Policy Department	Mr. Oul Nak	A
China	Ministry of Commerce	First Secretary	Mr. Guangjun Li	A
China	Ministry of Commerce	First Secretary	Mr. Yuandong Zheng	B
India	Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance	Director	Mr.Surendrakumar Bagde	A
India	Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance	Under Secretary	Ms.Sreyasi Chaudhuri	A
Indonesia	Ministry of National Development Planning Agency (BAPPENAS)	Deputy Director for Asian Bilateral Funding	Mr.Kurniawan Ariadi	A
Indonesia	Ministry of National Development Planning Agency (BAPPENAS)	Head of Sub Directorate/Deputy Director for Ministries/Agencies and Regions Directorate of Utilization of Development Funding	Ms.Tati Lies Aryati	B
Laos	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Acting Director General	Mr. Philathivong Souchay	
Laos	Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Planning and Investment	Deputy Director General	Ms. Mangnomek Saymonekham	B

Malaysia	Internaional Cooperation, Economic Planning Unit, Prime Minister's Department	Director	Ms.Norani Ibrahim	A
Malaysia	Internaional Cooperation, Economic Planning Unit, Prime Minister's Department	Principal Assistant Director	Ms. Hidah Misran	B
Maldives	Ministry of Finance and Treasury	Exective Director	Mr.Hamdhy Ageel	B
Maldives	Economic and Development Cooperation Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Director	Ms.Farzana Zahir	B
Mongolia	Department of Policy and Coordination for Loans and Aid, Ministry of Finance	Deputy Director	Mr. Dorjkhand Togmid	A
Mongolia	Department of Policy and Coordination for Loans and Aid, Ministry of Finance	Officer	Mr.Tuguldur Baajiikhuu	B
Myanmar	Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of National Planning and Economic Development	Director	Mr. Maung Maung Khin	A
Myanmar	Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of National Planning and Economic Development	Assistant Director	Ms.Daw Aye Than	B
Nepal	Foreign Aid Co-ordination Division,Ministry of Finance	Under Secretary	Mr.Lal Shankar Ghimire	A
Nepal	North East, South East Asia and the Pacific Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Under Secretary	Mr.Tara Prasad Pokharel	B
Pakistan	Planning Commission,Planning and Development Division	Deputy Chief	Mr.Gul Bad Shah	A
Pakistan	Economic Affair Division,Ministry of Economic Affairs & Statistics	Section Officer(ODA)	Mr. Mazhar Iqbal	A
Papua New Guinea	Department of National Planning & Monitoring	Assistant Secretary -Infrastructure&Utilities	Mr.Paul Ilia	A
Papua New Guinea	Development Monitoring & Evaluation Division, Department of National Planning & Monitoring	Monitoring & Evaluation Officer - Roads & Bridges	Ms. Grace Hilda Mick	B
Solomon	Ministry of Development Planning and Aid Coordination	Director (Social Services Sector)	Mr . Daniel Beto Rove	B
Solomon	Ministry of Development Planning and Aid Coordination	Chief Planning Officer (Economic and Productive Sector)	Mr . Andrew Prakash	B
Sri Lanka	Department of External Resources, Ministry of Finance and Planning	Director	Ms.Deepika Chrishanthi Wickramaratne Hapugoda	B
Thailand	TICA - Thailand International Development Cooperation Agency	Director of Countries Partnership Branch (Bilateral and Trilateral)	Ms. Chittimas Kongpolprom	B
the Philippines	National Economic And Development Authority	Deputy Director General	Mr.Roland G Tungpalan	A
the Philippines	National Economic And Development Authority	Director	Mr.Roderick Mari Planta	B
Timor Leste	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Director General for External Affairs	Mr.Constancio C Pinto	A
Timor Leste	National Directorate of Rural Development, Ministry of Economy and Development	National Director	Mr.Eusebio Dacosta Jeronimo	B
Vietnam	Foreign Economic Relations Department,Ministry of Planning and Investment	Expert	Mr.Vu Quang Bui	B

Observers

Country	Organisation	Title	Name	Working Group
Singapore	Technical Cooperation Directorate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs		Mr. Kasiviswanathan	
Thailand	TICA - Thailand International Development Cooperation Agency	Program Officer	Mr. Pichet Khemthong	A
Vietnam	Institute for Social Studies (ISS)	Acting Rector (Expected Board Member of Vietnam Evaluation Association)	Mr/Dr Cuong Nguyen Manh	A
Vietnam	Vietnam Australia Monitoring and Evaluation Strengthening Project – Phase II (VAMESP II)	Project Coordinator (Expected Board Member of Vietnam Evaluation Association)	Mr/Dr Nguyen Van Phuc	A
Vietnam	OPMAC Corporation	Deputy General Manager, Planning Department (Team Leader of MPI-JICA Joint Evaluation Program 2008)	Mr. Keishi Miyazaki	A

Organisers

MOFA Japan	International Cooperation Bureau	Deputy Director General	Mr. Katsuki Oda	B
MOFA Japan	International Cooperation Bureau ODA Evaluation Division	Director	Mr. Kaoru Hata	A
MOFA Japan	International Cooperation Bureau ODA Evaluation Division	Offcial	Ms. Wakana Kanikawa	A
MOFA Japan	International Cooperation Bureau ODA Evaluation Division	Offcial	Ms. Aya Moriya	B
JICA	Evaluation Department	Deputy Director General	Mr. Mitsukuni Sugimoto	B
JICA	JICA, Evaluation Department		Mr. Satoshi Kodakari	B
FASID		Program Officer	Ms. Yuki Nakamura	A
FASID		Program Officer	Ms. Yoshimi Hayashi	B

Appendix 3: List of Abbreviations

APEA NET	Asia-Pacific Evaluation Association Network
AuS AID	Australian Agency for International Development
BAPEDAL	Environmental Impact Management Agency
BAPEDALDA	Environmental Impact Management Agency in North Sumatra
DEM	Strengthening Decentralized Environmental Management System
EMC	Environmental Management Centre
GNP	Gross National Product
IDEAS	International Development Evaluation Association
IT	Information Technology
JES	Japan Evaluation Society
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
M&E	Monitaring and Evaluation
MOFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPI	Ministry of Planning and Investment
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD/DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Co-operation Directorate
OICE	Organization for International Cooperation in Evaluation
PDM	Project Design Matrix
PUSARPEDAL	Environmental Impact Management Laboratory in North Sumatra
R&D	Research and Development
SGPE	Standard Guideline on Policy Evaluation
TICA	Thailand International Development Cooperation Agency
TOR	Terms of Reference
UK	United Kingdom
USA	United States of America
VAMESP	Vietnam-Australia Monitoring and Evaluation Strengthening Project
VEA	Vietnam Evaluation Association
WG A	Working Group A
WG B	Working Group B