

The 9th ODA Evaluation Workshop:
Trends of ODA Evaluation in Asia

Tokyo, 18 February, 2010



Table of Contents

Chair's Summary	1
1. Opening Session	4
1.1 Chair's Opening Address.....	4
1.2 Welcome Address by the Representative of Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) of Japan.....	4
1.3 Welcome Address by the Representative of Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)	5
2. Item 1: A Study on Examples of Project-level and Program-Level (Joint) Evaluations	5
2.1 Presentation: Case Studies on Project-Level Evaluation of Japan's ODA Projects (Japan)	5
2.2 Presentation: Example of Joint Evaluation and Vietnam's Efforts for Monitoring and Evaluation (Vietnam).....	7
2.3 Discussion	9
3. Item 2: The Role of Evaluation in the PDCA Cycle and Feeding Back of Evaluation Results	11
3.1 Presentation: System for ODA Evaluation (Policy-Level) and Feedback at MOFA (Japan).....	11
3.2 Presentation: Introduction to Policy Evaluation of Participating Countries: Some Observations from Nepal (Nepal).....	11
3.3 Discussion	12
4. Item 3: The Present State of the System for ODA Evaluation, Improvements, and Their Results	14
4.1 Presentation: Efforts to Improve Development Evaluation: The Philippine Story (Philippines)	14
4.2 Presentation: Pakistan's Efforts to Improve ODA Evaluation System and Their Results (Pakistan).....	15
4.3 Discussion	16
5. Item 4: Key Note Address by Participating Donor Country and International Agency	17
5.1 Presentation: Singapore's Experience in Effective Evaluation (Singapore).....	17
5.2 Presentation: Evaluation of the Paris Declaration (EVALUNET).....	18
5.3 Presentation: CLEAR: Centers for Learning on Evaluation and Results (the World Bank).....	19
5.4 Discussions.....	20
6. Other	22
6.1 Progress in Establishing an Asia Pacific Evaluation Association (APEA).....	22
7. Closing Session	23
7.1 Adoption of Chair's Summary.....	23
 Appendix 1: Workshop Program	 24
Appendix 2: List of Participants.....	26
Appendix 3: List of Abbreviations	29

Chair's Summary

CHAIR'S SUMMARY

Prof. Hiromitsu Muta

The 9th ODA Evaluation Workshop organized jointly by Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) of Japan and Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) was held in Japan on February 18, 2010.

The chair, Prof. Hiromitsu Muta, Executive Vice-President, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Japan, gave opening remarks at the opening session of the Workshop.

Mr. Hiroki Owaki, Deputy Director General of International Cooperation Bureau of MOFA, Japan, and Mr. Kuroda, Vice-President, JICA, each gave a welcome speech for the warm hospitality extended to all the participants in the Workshop respectively.

From Item 1 to Item 3 of the workshop, Prof. Yoshio Wada, a professor of National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies (GRIPS) activated discussion as a moderator.

In Item 1, there were two presentations to focus on examples of project-level and program-level evaluations: one by Ms. Takako Haraguchi, Senior Consultant, International Development Associates, Ltd, titled "Case Studies on Project-Level Evaluation of Japan's ODA Projects", and another by Mr. Cao Manh Cuong, Deputy Director General, Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of Planning and Investment, Vietnam, titled "Example of Joint Evaluation and Vietnam's Efforts for Monitoring and Evaluation." After the presentations, participants discussed the following points:

1. What are the expected benefits from the evaluations on infrastructure and capacity development projects? How do you take advantage of them?
2. What are the appropriate costs of evaluation (expenditure and time) compared to the expected benefits?
3. What are the methods/tools/indicators and design for the ODA evaluations?
4. Who should be the evaluators? Are they internal or external specialists?
5. What are the advantages or disadvantages of joint evaluations?

The Workshop had a lunch break after two presentations.

In Item 2, there were two presentations on the Role of Evaluation in the PDCA cycle and Feedback of Evaluation Results: the first presentation was titled "System for ODA Evaluation (Policy level)

and Feedback at MOFA“ by Mr. Seizaburo Fujisawa, Senior Deputy Director, ODA Evaluation and Public Relations Division, International Cooperation Bureau, MOFA, Japan, and followed by the presentation by Dr. Mahesh Banskota, Dean, School of Arts, Kathmandu University, titled “Introduction to Policy Evaluations of Participating Countries: Some Observations from Nepal.” The discussion after the presentations centered on the following in order to identify issues and good practices:

1. How do the governments of donor/partner countries reflect the evaluation findings/recommendations to their PDCA cycles?
2. What are the necessary capacities for implementing PDCA cycles?
3. How far should the governments follow-up evaluation results? What are the particular benchmarks for terminating the follow-up?

A number of points regarding the difficulty in conducting evaluations such as quality of recommendations, mechanism, and policy making circumstances in each country were discussed.

Topics in Item 3 were focused on the present state of the system for ODA evaluation, improvements, and their results by identifying ways in which to improve effects of ODA and increase sense of ownership in partner countries. Two presentations were made, one by Mr. Roland G. Tungpalan, Deputy Director General, National Economic and Development Authority, the Philippines, titled “Efforts to Improve Development Evaluation: The Philippine Story”, followed another presentation by Mr. Zuhfran Qasim, Assistant Chief, Economic Affairs Division, Ministry of Economic Affairs & Statistics, Pakistan, titled “Pakistan’s Efforts to Improve ODA Evaluation System and Their Results.” After the presentations, participants discussed the following points:

1. How do you evaluate the evolution of the ODA monitoring and evaluation systems in your country?
2. What are the effective ways to enhance the sector development results in the existing monitoring and evaluation systems?
3. How do you foresee the future of the monitoring and evaluation system in your country?

Followed by the presentations, almost half of the participants made comments to the above three discussion points respectively by quoting their own country’s case and experience regarding project-level and program-level evaluations such as strengthening check and monitoring functions by establishing PDCA cycles, joint evaluations, and third-party evaluations. Some progresses in evaluation systems in the participants’ countries were observed. The participants were informed that evaluation and progress reports of some countries in the framework of Paris Declaration are

made available by EVALUNET.

In Item 4, there were three presentations by the participating donor country and international agencies.

1. “Singapore’s Experience in Effective Evaluation- Japan-Singapore Partnership Programme for the 21st Century” by Ms. Denise Cheng, Assistance Director for Technical Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Singapore
2. “Evaluation of the Paris Declaration – A Contribution to Evaluation Capacity Development” by Mr. Niels A. Dabelstein, Head of the Secretariat for the Evaluation of the Paris Declaration
3. “CLEAR: Centers for Learning on Evaluation and Results – A Multilateral Initiative” by Mr. Hans-Martin Boehmer, Manager, Communication, Strategy and Learning, Independent Evaluation Group, The World Bank Group

After three presentations, there was an announcement on the progress in establishing an Asia-Pacific Evaluation Association Network (APEA NET) by Prof. Ryokichi Hirono, Professor Emeritus, Seikei University.

As it is described, this year’s workshop examined the examples of project-level and program-level joint evaluations in the first session to share respective evaluation processes. In the second session, with the overview on the policy-level evaluation and feedback system of Japan, as well as policy evaluations of partner countries, the participants explored how to reflect evaluation results to our policies. Thirdly, the participants learned about the difficulties faced by and fruits of partner countries in their efforts to improve their evaluation mechanisms. Through the interactive discussion, the participants shared a wide range of experiences and insights in our region, not only to improve our evaluation capacity but also to attain to our common goal: effective and accountable development interventions.

The summary of the workshop will be published and uploaded on the website of the MOFA.

Prof. Muta, the chair, concluded the workshop by thanking all presenters and participants for their lively and stimulating discussion.

1. Opening Session

1.1 Chair's Opening Address

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

The 9th ODA Evaluation Workshop was opened with the opening remarks from the chair, Prof. Hiromitsu Muta. First, Prof. Muta introduced Prof. Wada, a professor of GRIPS, as a moderator to activate discussion throughout the workshop. Prof. Muta explained that the Government of Japan had been hosting the ODA Evaluation Workshop since 2001 with a view to develop evaluation capacity in the Asia-Pacific region. Then, he summarized the previous workshop in Singapore, and mentioned that a number of points were identified by the participants, such as the importance of the timing to conduct evaluation so that the results could be incorporated into the national development plans, and the significance of the efforts both by donors and partners in setting out the institutional memory of evaluation results. Prof. Muta also explained the schedule of the workshop. He closed his opening remarks by expressing his hope to share a wide range of experiences and insights in the region among all the participants in order to improve the evaluation capacity as well as to attain the common goal, and effective, accountable development interventions.

1.2 Welcome Address by the Representative of Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) of Japan

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

Mr. Owaki expressed his pleasure to hold the workshop in Japan, and welcomed all the participants from the Asian and Pacific partner countries. Mr. Owaki said that Japan made efforts to improve its ODA through the cycle of planning, implementing, checking and acting for the further development of ODA. Evaluation would be needed to judge whether ODA was a success or failure in the past, and to enhance its accountability and transparency in the future. By strengthening ownership in partner countries, evaluation would contribute to more effective use of development resources. Therefore, Japan had been organizing the annual ODA Evaluation Workshops since 2001. Mr. Owaki emphasized that these workshops had contributed to promoting further understanding of international evaluation standards and exchanging views on the ways to improve development policies and implementation. Mr. Owaki concluded by saying that he hoped participants would be able to learn from each other's various experiences and identify future lessons for promoting the quality of development.

1.3 Welcome Address by the Representative of Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

Mr. Atsuo Kuroda, Vice-President, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

Mr. Kuroda welcomed all the participants, and expressed his pleasure for JICA to co-host the workshop with MOFA of Japan. He said that JICA started to co-host the ODA Evaluation Workshop in 2007, and the workshop provided an occasion both for donors and recipient countries in the Asia Pacific region to exchange knowledge and experience in ODA evaluation. Mr. Kuroda explained that JICA had merged with the ODA loan section of the Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JIBC), and undertook integrated, comprehensive and seamless management of the three aid schemes of technical cooperation, ODA loans and grant aid. In the area of evaluation, Mr. Kuroda mentioned the monitoring and evaluation system of JICA on the project-level and program-level. JICA had striven to establish a consistent monitoring and evaluation system. However, step by step, JICA has been trying to establish new ways for various programs to extract common recommendations and lessons. Mr. Kuroda also pointed out that the new administration in Japan placed stringent demands on JICA in terms of efficiency-boosting and cost-cutting. Therefore, Japan's development assistance needed to be provided more efficiently, effectively and equitably. He expected to hear actual cases and good practices from various countries and fruitful discussion among all the participants.

2. Item 1: A Study on Examples of Project-level and Program-Level (Joint) Evaluations

2.1 Presentation: Case Studies on Project-Level Evaluation of Japan's ODA Projects (Japan)

Ms. Takako Haraguchi, Senior Consultant, International Development Associates, Ltd.

In her presentation, Ms. Haraguchi comprehensively elaborated on project-level evaluation using two cases of infrastructure projects. One was an ODA loan project in Kazakhstan and the other was a technical cooperation capacity development project in Malaysia. The practical process of project-level evaluation was concretely described, focusing on inputs, outputs, evaluation indicators/ alternative indicators (in case primary data was not available), evaluation methods and evaluation results.

Each case covered the following points: 1) Framework of evaluation (type of evaluation, primary purpose, evaluator, and evaluation schedule and work volume), 2) Evaluation methods and tools, 3) Logic model and evaluation criteria, 4) Results of evaluation (Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact, and Sustainability), 5) Overall rating (ODA loan) and conclusion (technical cooperation), 6) Lessons and recommendations, 7) Limitation of evaluation and implication.

Focal points of each case study are summarized as follows:

Case Study 1: ODA Loan

Irtys River Bridge Construction Project in Kazakhstan (Ex-Post Evaluation: 2 years after project completion, 2006)

- A typical ex-post evaluation of the ODA loan was conducted
- The ex-post evaluation team conducted a traffic quantity survey due to the lack of traffic quantity data as a basic indicator to evaluate effective operation.
- Recommendations held a major significance in the evaluation as the sustainability of the project was questioned despite high effectiveness and great impact by contributing to an increase in traffic in a wider area, and thus contribution to the development of the regional economy was confirmed.
- A beneficiary survey was also conducted by a sub-contracted local research company (160 samples).

Case Study 2: Technical Cooperation

Project on Networked Multimedia Education System (NMES) in Malaysia (Terminal Evaluation: 6 months before end of cooperation period, 2005)

- Capacity development was conducted in the central government and 5 local governments.
- Priority was weighed more on hardware than human capacity development compared to ordinary technical cooperation project.
- There was no visit to local sites due to the limitation of the evaluation study.
- Process management was evaluated more than quantitative indicator (the number of alumni).

After the two case studies, some comparison was shown such as type of evaluator (external or internal), analysis and reporting of evaluation, and methods/tools/design. The emphasis was on that results measured by quantitative indicators are most important in loan project, whereas assessment of process is also important in technical cooperation in terms of human capacity development.

2.2 Presentation: Example of Joint Evaluation and Vietnam's Efforts for Monitoring and Evaluation (Vietnam)

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

Mr. Cuong gave a presentation about efforts achieved through capacity development through joint evaluation in Vietnam. The Government of Vietnam has been paid a lot of attention to regarding development of the monitoring and evaluation system especially in the context of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness in 2005 where the five principles of: ownership, alignment, harmonization, management for results, and mutual accountability were set. By taking the lead to implement the Paris Declaration, the Government of Vietnam and the donor community have been committed to bringing the Aid Effectiveness Agenda forward by implementing the Hanoi Core Statement (HCS) and Accra Agenda for Action (AAA). He also introduced Vietnam's work on reinforcing its ODA M&E system through various decrees, decisions, 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, the Ministry of Planning and Investment (MPI) and JICA agreed to a three-year Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and conducted a joint evaluation in order to promote effective and efficient ODA management, and a harmonized evaluation mechanism between JICA and the Government of Vietnam. There were two components; the first was a joint ex-post evaluation of a Japanese ODA project. The second was capacity development specifically providing evaluation training for the government officers.

Mr. Cuong provided the progress and results of joint evaluation in 2007 and 2008, and an ongoing program in 2009. He mentioned that Vietnamese team members fully participated in all stages of evaluation including planning, data collection, analysis and reporting. The program also enhanced awareness of evaluation, confirmed validity of the MPI's evaluation manual, and promoted collaboration with other donors in evaluation capacity development. Furthermore, he analyzed the reasons for their effort on the joint evaluation; 1) strong commitment and leadership of MPI as a focal point of evaluation, 2) good institutional and legal framework. However, Mr. Cuong pointed out the following four challenges to be overcome; 1) lack of human resources for evaluation in the private sector, 2) lack of a cost norm for evaluation, 3) lack of human resources for evaluation in the government sector, and 4) weakness in utilization of evaluation results especially at the policy level.

Then, Mr. Coung provided a case study of joint ex-post evaluation conducted in 2008. He mentioned that there was a movement in the ownership from Japan to the Government of Vietnam throughout the capacity development. For the first year, the Japanese side took the leading role, but the second year, both sides had equal roles, and the final year will be led by the Vietnamese side. As a result of joint evaluation, the Project Management Unit (PMU) is able to prepare for evaluation and be aware of what information is needed. However, Mr. Coung pointed out some challenges they faced. First, the government offices did not have enough time for writing reports. Second, it was difficult for participating organizations to allocate budget for travelling for fieldwork and evaluation workshops because it had not been planned from the beginning. Therefore, he recommended the government should think of a division of labor, and have a cost norm for evaluation.

After the presentation, Prof. Muta opened the floor for questions and answers. The participants asked the presenters for more detailed information as described below:

Question: What sort of qualification do you require for evaluation advisor?

Answer: We use one who took part in our previous joint evaluation with Japan. They got enough experience and they can transfer their experience to the next generation.

Question: Evaluation advisors are expected to become the focal point of ODA evaluation at the line agency level. Are they at their ministry or agency? Do you have separate evaluation advisors or evaluators?

Answer: According to our regulations, we have the three levels in our ODA state management system. The first level is the ODA state management agency that includes the Ministry of Planning and Investment, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the State Bank of Vietnam, and so on. The second level is called the line agency which includes the provincial and the line ministries. The third one is the project owner which includes the project management unit as well. At each level, according to our regulations, they have to set up the monitoring and evaluation unit as the focal points. Therefore, these units are the ones who managed the ODA at their level. When we conduct the evaluation, they are the persons who take the responsibility and also they are the ones who benefit from the training. So we already got the organizational structure for monitoring and evaluation at each level in our system.

Question: What are the major incentives to encourage or to convince any development partners into the evaluation system?

Answer: We try to do it in many ways. For example, we ask the donor to provide us the programs of the evaluation within a year and to report back to us the results of the evaluation, and also we informed them that the government would like to conduct those projects, and that if they are thinking about the joint evaluation, then they can contact us. I think that the only way is sharing information rather than the kind of the mechanism.

Question: You informed us that your government is preparing the cost norm for evaluation. I would like to know about the progress of the process of establishing the cost norm.

Answer: Normally, we do not have a separate budget for the project evaluation, but now according to our regulations, all the projects should conduct the evaluation and they have to develop the monitoring and evaluation plan and budget. However, we do not have a budget because budget is not included in the project, therefore, the government should provide the budget from the current expenditure. If we do not have cost norms especially for impact evaluation when the projects are already finished, there is no project management unit, and then it's difficult for us to conduct our evaluation. Therefore, the demand for cost norm – evaluation cost norm is important and we are now preparing that. It is not only for ODA because we should have a common cost norm for ODA and public investment.

2.3 Discussion

In the discussion of Item 1, Prof. Wada led the discussion as a moderator. Firstly Prof. Wada posed the following five questions and invited the participants to make their own comments. Focal points of the discussion are summarized per question as follows.

1. What are the expected benefits from the evaluations on infrastructure and capacity development projects? How do you take advantage of them?

A participant answered that benefits from the evaluations would direct his country to the appropriate way by helping measure the results, the effectiveness, and the efficiency of the project against the national vision. Prof. Hirono pointed out that what is more important these days is not only to measure the impact of a new project in terms of developmental or financial sustainability, but also to measure environmental aspects of sustainability.

2. What are the appropriate costs of evaluation (expenditure and time) compared to the expected benefits?

A participant stated that assigning standard cost for evaluation should be carefully dealt with because the appropriate costs of evaluations are not proportional to the project size or the project investment. The actual cost of evaluation for a large project such as the construction of a large bridge and for a

small technical cooperation project is about the same. If in-depth analysis of the whys and why-nots would be taken, it would be more costly than merely measuring the outcomes.

3. What are the methods/tools/indicators and design for the ODA evaluations? (presented by Ms. Haraguchi)

Participants confirmed that the Logic Model, DAC's Five Evaluation Criteria (Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact and Sustainability), performance indicators, cost benefit analysis (loan project), and social analysis (loan project), description of process (capacity development) were used for the ODA evaluations.

4. Who should be evaluators? Are they internal or external specialists?

A participant gave an opinion that evaluation by external evaluator would be more beneficial because implementing agencies did not have specialists in the field of evaluations. Other participant commented that whether external or internal was not important, but the most important things were the independency and capacity. Prof. Hirono commented that both internal and external evaluators were needed; internal for improvement of project management, and external for accountability to the public because the public sector uses taxpayer money. The floor agreed with the comment by Prof. Hirono.

5. What are the advantages or disadvantages of joint evaluations?

A presenter stated that Vietnam learned a lot from Japan's experience and stressed the significance of ODA evaluations not only because of the public accountability and transparency, but also based on the fact that Vietnam could develop an international standard methodology approach and techniques in evaluation. As to capacity development, the Government of Vietnam was thinking about setting up a society on evaluation which would be a professional association to ensure an independent view. A participant pointed out a shortage in human resources in the monitoring and evaluation field of the participant's country, so they are not able to evaluate projects which were not donor-funded.

A participant stated that joint evaluations would be very effective by pooling donor funds to evaluate the sector like sector wide approaches. It was added that reviews such as a Portfolio Performance Review in each country could also highlight the major weaknesses and major strengths and that if a technical assistance pool fund could be created, it would facilitate joint evaluation.

A participant pointed out that the advantage of joint evaluations was mutual accountability; and joint evaluations would reduce the burden for both parties. An issue was shared with the floor that many donors and stakeholders were involved in the country; however it would be difficult to get donors to act together and plan jointly.

3. Item 2: The Role of Evaluation in the PDCA Cycle and Feeding Back of Evaluation Results

3.1 Presentation: System for ODA Evaluation (Policy-Level) and Feedback at MOFA (Japan)

Mr. Seizaburo Fujisawa, Senior Deputy Director, ODA Evaluation and Public Relations Division, International Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Mr. Fujisawa started his presentation by explaining third party evaluations. The External Advisory Meeting on ODA Evaluation was established in October, 2003, in order to ensure objectivity of evaluations by having a third party conduct evaluations. According to his explanation, the External Advisory Meeting on ODA Evaluation consisted of 9 members, and took the roles of making evaluation plans, implementing evaluations and making evaluation reports. Each member of the meeting took charge of one topic of evaluation, and about nine evaluations were conducted each year. In order to implement an evaluation, evaluation teams were formed, and they conducted evaluations consisting of domestic research and overseas field studies which took 8 to 10 months starting from June or July and ending in March of the following year. The evaluation team completed evaluation reports in March. These evaluation reports contained recommendations for the improvement of ODA.

He also explained the mechanism of feedback for ODA evaluation. After the completion and publication of the evaluation report in March, it is distributed to entities such as Japanese Embassies and JICA offices in order to determine and reflect follow-up measures for three main areas; 1) ODA policy-making for the future, 2) country assistance programs, and 3) implementation of the on-going ODA. Mr. Fujisawa provided four case studies as examples of follow-up activities. He mentioned that these evaluation and feedback systems at MOFA worked effectively. However, a decision was made to dissolve the External Advisory Meeting on ODA Evaluation at the end of March 2010 as a part of a comprehensive review of ODA. Along with that, a new system of ODA evaluation is currently under consideration and no conclusion has been made yet.

3.2 Presentation: Introduction to Policy Evaluation of Participating Countries: Some Observations from Nepal (Nepal)

Dr. Mahesh Banskota, Dean, School of Arts, Kathmandu University

Dr. Banskota gave a presentation titled “Introduction to Policy Evaluation of Participating Countries:

Some Observations from Nepal.” Dr. Banskota started with the current situation that Nepal is struggling to adopt a new constitution, new administrative regions and power sharing structure. He then outlined the history of Nepal-Japan ODA since 1954 and the ODA policy of Japan to determine a Country Assistance Program. JICA’s assistance strategy in Nepal focusing on priority areas for Nepal’s development issues was explained. The priority areas are ‘Poverty Alleviation in Rural Regions’, ‘Democratization and Peace Building’ and ‘Establishment of Social/Economic Infrastructure’ which have been covered by a number of sectors with a combination of aid tools: technical cooperation projects, dispatch of experts, country focused trainings, social medical equipment, loans, grants and so forth. According to the presentation, the PDCA applications have been successful in Vietnam, Thailand and Bangladesh; however the situation of Nepal is still at the planning stage. As to policy evaluations, the presenter compared developed countries and developing countries in three stages of Formulation/Implementation/Evaluation of the policy. When the developed countries formulate a policy, there are politically-driven agenda, intense debates, and media broadcasting before a decision is made. Once the decision is made, it is science, technology and bureaucracy that take over. On the other hand, most developing countries must have gone through a low level of participation, lack of information, limited formulation capacity, and uncoordinated articulation of demand. However, once implementation sets forth, cost/benefits would be realized, conflicts would emerge and the agenda would change back and forth. For the evaluation stage, the developed countries conduct evaluations regularly with a transparent process, whereas the developing countries do mostly ad hoc evaluations due to the lack of resources.

Dr. Banskota emphasized that an aid-receiving country interface would face big problems if they do not have an ODA evaluation system. For instance when there are 7 donors in the country, the interface must be busy following up the evaluations all the time.

After explaining the economic growth and poverty rate of the country with MDGs report evaluations, the presenter mentioned the fragile state of the Nepal and moved on the challenges for policy evaluations. Finally, he concluded his presentation emphasizing the following points; 1) improvement in policy environment 2) reduction of fragmentation in thinking and acting, and 3) an increase in the role of evidence in decision-making.

3.3 Discussion

The two presentations were followed by a discussion moderated by Prof. Wada, in which participants exchanged their experiences and opinions regarding the role of evaluation in the PDCA cycle and feeding back of evaluation results. At first, Prof. Wada posed three discussion points prepared for this policy session, which are; 1) how the governments of donor or partner countries

reflect the evaluation findings/recommendations to their PDCA cycles for the economic and also development? 2) what are the necessary capacities (governance, culture etc) for implementing PDCA cycles? 3) how far should the government follow-up evaluation results? And what are the particular benchmarks for terminating the follow-up? These three discussion points were all related to each other. Therefore the participants did not follow the discussion order and made comments freely. He also encouraged the participants to speak out if they had any comments or questions from the morning session.

First, a participant gave a comment on the morning session about external and internal evaluation. Acknowledging that both types of evaluations are important, he mentioned that even a third party of experts can be biased at times. Therefore, it was recommended that third party evaluations not rely on just a single group of experts, but incorporate a wider variety of interests to secure objectivity and transparency.

Regarding the first discussion point, a participant pointed out who the target for recommendations and quality of recommendations would be. He mentioned that it was difficult enough for evaluators to make recommendations for their own mother organizations. Moreover, he pointed out that for a country, it was also somewhat dangerous to guide policy based on a single evaluation. It was difficult to identify whether that represented a broader pattern and it would really fit within the circumstances of the country.

There was a question raised by a participant whether JICA made recommendations specifically for countries, and also where they saw the line between learning aspects that countries need to address versus accountability where it was probably a matter of transparency. The answer was that in the case of the Kazakhstan evaluators, JICA could make recommendations to the partner country government because the subject matter was very specific. However, when it comes to evaluation of broader policies and programs, that would be another issue.

Moreover, another participant raised the issue about who was actually in the political decision-making role. He recommended that as part of any planning exercise, it was very important to introduce and identify the political actors, identify the policy drivers, and identify of the policy mapping and which institutions were playing a more important and influential role than others through conducting a stakeholder analysis.

There was another discussion of whether recommendations should be made or not. A participant pointed out that it was very difficult for the government to take policy recommendations more

seriously than others because they usually had sectoral recommendations from various donors. Therefore, he recommended that for many recommendations especially on the policy side, they should leave it up to the respective governments to adopt them as they deem appropriate.

The third discussion point was about how far the government should follow-up evaluation results. The participants shared their opinions and experiences. A participant introduced his experience on ODA evaluation. He claimed that he rarely or never heard that donors, including JICA, proposed to defer, postpone, or modify project proposals based on evaluation results. He recommended that the conclusion of evaluation in the projects could be used to improve policy in the sector as a whole. Another participant commented that there should be an evaluation before the project as to whether the project was likely to enhance the economic development. Moreover, a participant pointed out that they needed to consider more factors including the well-being of the local people to evaluate efficiency and effectiveness of any project. He considered that the public opinion was the most vital in identifying and evaluating any project's success, and therefore, in formulating any evaluation document or evaluation mechanism, we must take public opinion into consideration.

Another participant raised the point that in regard to the findings, it was important to consider how to adopt the findings as well as recommendations from the evaluations, and how to reflect these to new projects or programs. It was critical for both partner countries and for donor countries as well. To make use of the results of the evaluation was a very important issue. In the case of Japan, they made follow-ups for recommendations by which they would measure or observe the actions taken by the government reacting to the recommendations. And the key point in that process was to disseminate the follow-up to the public. A participant recommended making the process obligatory, which was a very effective way to ascertain the usefulness of the evaluations.

4. Item 3: The Present State of the System for ODA Evaluation, Improvements, and Their Results

4.1 Presentation: Efforts to Improve Development Evaluation: The Philippine Story (Philippines)

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

Mr. Tungpalan made a presentation on a case study of improvement of development evaluation in the Philippines. Mr. Tungpalan used the slides to explain major timelines of development: 1) pre-

1996, 2) 1996-1999, 3) 2000-2004, 4) 2005-2008, and 5) 2009 onwards, in order to trace the progress of development evaluation respectively.

Focal points of each period are: 1) in pre- 1996, efficiency of infrastructure projects, particularly of ODA-funded projects; 2) between 1996-1999, call for an annual report on the performance of ODA as a result of the passage of the ODA Act in 1996, and emphasizing results at the project-level, 3) between 2000-2004, Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) etc, and sectoral orientation (ODA plus local funds), 4) between 2005-2008, international agreement on aid and development effectiveness and aid harmonization, the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, and lastly 5) from 2009 onwards, integration of various results-based management tools and systems.

The presenter moved on to the policies and initiatives. The Integrated Sectoral Results Monitoring and Evaluation (RME) Framework is a current development evaluation thrust in the Philippines. There are three kinds of activities: 1) Strengthen alignment between sector plan and specific agency sector results indicators, supported by budget, 2) establish links among several results-based management systems used by various oversights, implementing and statistical agencies, and 3) conduct a pilot test of the integrated sectoral RME framework in the rural development sector. In the preliminary road map, firstly, a Management for Development Results (MfDR) framework for the rural development sector is finalized, and secondly, an action plan to build MfDR capacity in the sector for the short-term aim, followed by MfDR capacity building of rural development sector agencies is formulated, and finally the MfDR initiatives would be replicated with a long-term aim.

4.2 Presentation: Pakistan's Efforts to Improve ODA Evaluation System and Their Results (Pakistan)

Mr. Zuhfran Qasim, Assistant Chief, Economic Affairs Division, Ministry of Economic Affairs & Statistics, Pakistan

The second presenter, Mr. Qasim gave a presentation titled "Pakistan's Efforts to Improve ODA Evaluation System and their Results." He mentioned that Pakistani people are faced with many problems such as economic problems, and lack of access to health care, education and social opportunities. Moreover, after 9/11, the situation became worse due to political instability in the region. Considering these current problems, JICA identified and focused on three priority areas; 1) ensuring human security and human development, 2) development of sound market economy, and 3) achievement of a balanced regional socio-economic development. He provided the detailed information on the contribution of Japan's ODA in Pakistan. Pakistan ranks 7th position among all the recipients of Japanese ODA. Infrastructure development has been the largest beneficiary with 75% of Japan's total ODA followed by irrigation and agriculture, health, industry, and education

with the percentages of 9.78%, 7.5%, 4.2% and 2.6% respectively.

Mr. Qasim also explained some challenges in implementing ODA in Pakistan. For instance, even though Pakistan is one of the biggest aid recipients in the world, many of the socio-economic indicators are still below those of other countries with similar per capita income. Moreover, it is necessary to build the capacity of agencies responsible for implementation. In order to deal with these challenges, he pointed out the importance of the Paris Declaration.

In relation to the Paris Declaration, the Government of Pakistan is fully committed to the transparent, accountable and efficient use of development assistance. Government of Pakistan established a steering committee under the chairmanship of Minister of State for Economic Affairs, and all the important donor countries are members of this committee. All the ministries are stakeholders of this committee which is a high level decision-making body. Moreover, an Independent Aid Effectiveness Unit was established in the division of the Ministry of Economic Affairs to track the assistance of all donors, and four working groups were established. The Paris Declaration Baseline Survey 2006 was already conducted and results were turned in to OECD-DAC.

Finally, Mr. Qasim raised four points to improve ODA utilization; 1) establishing a collective dialogue mechanism, 2) developing a foreign assistance policy framework, 3) formulating a joint action plan with the development partners, and 4) strengthening institutional arrangements within the Economic Affairs Division (EAD).

4.3 Discussion

In discussion of Item 3, Prof. Wada invited participants to make comments on the presentations and the following discussion points: 1) How do you evaluate the evolution of the ODA monitoring and evaluation systems in your country?, 2) what are the effective ways to enhance the sector development results by the existing monitoring and evaluation systems?, and 3) how do you foresee the future of the monitoring and evaluation system in your country?

A number of country cases were shared between participants such cases as Bangladesh, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Timor Lester, Cambodia, India, Singapore, Mongolia and EVALUNET. Some countries stated that the evaluation system had been improved, while some other countries were in process of establishing an evaluation system.

With regard to an effective way to enhance the sector development results, Laos introduced three slogans of Ministry of International Cooperation to commit and utilize the ODA effectively, namely

“3 Ps” (each slogan starts with the letter “P” in Laotian): 1) How they can utilize foreign aid for the people, 2) the transparency, and 3) how they can use it more effectively. In Malaysia most of the ODA evaluation and outcomes had been fed back into the planning process in line with the national interest, which contributed to develop a well-planned strategic plan for Malaysia.

A couple of comments were made on the future of monitoring and evaluation systems in partner countries such as that partner countries would have their vision to be aligned with the vision or the country assistance strategy of donor countries, whereas the country assistance strategy of the donors had to be in alignment with the broad strategy of the partner countries’ goals, strategy, and vision. Moreover, a participant gave an opinion that joint evaluation should be a norm in every country, which would increase awareness in the significance of evaluation among policy makers.

A participant pointed out the importance of numerical indicators which were to be measured as defined by the DAC and Paris Declaration, and the EVALUNET representative added that there were publicly-available reports on the monitoring exercises of the Paris Declaration in about 56 countries, which described both how the country had been performing and how the donor country had been performing in those countries.

5. Item 4: Key Note Address by Participating Donor Country and International Agency

5.1 Presentation: Singapore’s Experience in Effective Evaluation (Singapore)

Ms. Denise Cheng, Assistant Director for Technical Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Singapore

Ms. Cheng started her presentation by explaining Singapore’s technical assistance to developing countries under a single framework called the Singapore Cooperation Program (SCP) since 1960s. The SCP focused on human resource capacity building, and provided training for over 65,000 government officials from about 170 countries in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, the South Pacific and Latin America. At the same time, Japan was one of the largest and longer standing partners in technical assistance, and their collaboration came under the framework of the Japan-Singapore Partnership Program for the 21st Century. Under this program, Singapore and Japan had been collaborating and organizing some 240 training programs in diverse areas for the benefit of more than 4,000 government officials from ASEAN, South Asia, Africa and the Asia-Pacific countries.

The presentation focused on experiences of Singapore and Japan in effective evaluation under the Japan-Singapore Partnership Program for the 21st Century.

At first, she explained the details of monitoring and evaluation of training programmes which were carried out by three stakeholders; Technical Cooperation Department (TCD) Singapore, JICA Singapore, and training agencies. Regarding monitoring, she pointed out several efforts made by each stakeholder. For instance, a TCD liaison officer is assigned to each course, and they actively obtained feedback from participants on programme, logistical arrangements, accommodations, etc. Moreover, JICA staff also joins course participants in some site visits conducted by the training agency.

In regard to evaluation, Ms. Cheng provided information about what tools and methods they employed for evaluation of the training programmes. She mentioned five tools and methods which were: 1) Joint evaluation questioners, 2) open discussion session with participants, 3) the training agency's post-course evaluation report, 4) the SCP liaison officer's report, 5) a post-course joint evaluation meeting. These were all done for improving the training programmes for the following year. Therefore, she mentioned that the recommendations which came from the evaluation were recorded as part of the work plan document for the following year.

Ms. Cheng summarized the presentation with the statement that Singapore and Japan had founded the system of M&E to be effective in ensuring continual improvement to the quality and effectiveness of the programs and relevant partner countries. The rigorous M&E process ensured close monitoring during the course and sourcing and documentation of feedback from multiple stakeholders for the broadest possible range of feedback that could be corroborated. Moreover, it provided a platform for analysis of feedback and a mechanism to incorporate the recommendations into the implementation of the next year's program.

5.2 Presentation: Evaluation of the Paris Declaration (EVALUNET)

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

Mr. Dabelstein started his presentation by expressing his appreciation for the progress on evaluation systems made by the participants' countries. At first, he explained that the evaluation of the Paris Declaration is an independent exercise that is taking place outside but in close cooperation with the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness. It is governed by a body comprising of 48 agencies, exactly

24 donor and multilateral agencies and 24 partner countries. He said that they were making every effort to both cooperate with the working party but also keeping a distance from it to make sure that they had an evaluation that is reasonably independent.

According to Mr. Dabelstein, the evaluation is assessing how the Paris Declaration is implemented, and what results and outcomes are gained in terms of improvement of aid effectiveness and development effectiveness at the country level. Along with the country-level evaluation, donor headquarter-level studies and supplementary thematic studies are done. The first round of evaluations was completed early in 2008 and fed into the Accra High-Level Forum, and the Phase II evaluation was halfway completed. Mr. Dabelstein explained that they had 7 country-level evaluations in Phase I, and 24 studies in Phase II. All countries participated in the evaluation on a completely voluntary basis.

There are several key factors in implementing the country-level evaluation. First, each evaluation should be managed by the partner country's government. Second, in each country, there should be a reference group comprising various stakeholders in order to secure the involvement, cooperation and ownership of the main stakeholders in the Paris Declaration. A broad-based reference group also safeguards the independence, credibility and quality of the evaluation.

Regarding contracting and financing of the country-level evaluations, the principle is that contracting should be done by national procurement procedures and systems. Mr. Dabelstein considered that it should be financed from national sources or local donors. But if that is not possible, they can complementarily or, in some cases, completely be funded by the trust fund, which is held by the Paris Declaration Evaluation Secretariat. Moreover, Mr. Dabelstein introduced another less desirable but most widespread funding mechanism; direct funding from the donor's evaluation department. These funds are managed by the national coordinator in the partner countries regardless of the funding source.

As a matter of evaluation capacity building, the Paris Declaration Evaluation Secretariat and the Core Evaluation Team provide necessary support to the partner countries, such as guidance to design the Generic Terms of Reference, 'Getting Started' pack for evaluation teams, and troubleshooting capacity service. Mr. Dabelstein concluded his presentation by giving information about their work plan until 2011.

5.3 Presentation: CLEAR: Centers for Learning on Evaluation and Results (the World Bank)

Mr. Hans-Martin Boehmer, Manager, Communication, Strategy and Learning, Independent Evaluation Group (IEG), The World Bank Group

Mr. Boehmer started with expressing gratitude for the invitation to the workshop. The presentation first explained the background of the establishment of the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG). It was explained that the IEG is part of the World Bank Group. It is independent from management, but part of the organization and subject to the rules of the organization. For years the Independent Evaluation Asian Group has been involved in capacity development on results-based monitoring and evaluation, and the initiative was called the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET), a collaboration with Carleton University in Canada 10 years ago. About 4 years ago the IEG started collaboration with the Ministry of Finance of China, to support developing capacity within China through the program called the Shanghai International Program for Development Evaluation Training (SHIPDET). The SHIPDET has two components: the first component is capacity development of M&E, framework for evaluating ODA, and also framework for evaluating the public investment programs in China. The second component is to do the same training for a much broader part of East Asia, working together with the Asia Development Bank and other partners.

The emphasis was on demand and greater accountability and M&E for public investment programs. It was added that the mandate of the Independent Evaluation Group was explicitly included to help countries develop their monitoring and evaluation capacity. It was explained that an initiative of Centers for Learning on Evaluation and Results (CLEAR) was based on the experience of evaluation training in Shanghai. Lastly the presenter stressed that it depends ultimately on countries truly wanting to move forward on evaluation capacity development by engaging in this network and the partnership.

5.4 Discussions

After the three presentations, Prof. Muta opened the floor for questions and answers. Participants asked the presenters for more detailed information and the presenters responded as described below.

(Questions for Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Singapore)

Question: Regarding Singapore's training program, is the evaluation of the training programs comprehensive or of one particular program? And when you deliver training for the evaluation, who took the initiative and leading role for the evaluation?

Answer: What I presented on evaluation is basically what we do with Japan on the Japan-Singapore

Partnership Program for 21st century, which is specific to our program with Japan. However, we also evaluate all other programs under the Singapore Cooperation Program. I think both partners have consulted and agreed that this is the approach they would like to take for our programs, to have this certain structured approach, to enable them to apply the PDCA cycle, and for evaluations of our programs to actually feed into the following years' work plan to ensure that there is continuity and continual improvement.

Question: One of the important areas of evaluating in the training program is its application in the workplace. What is the application of this training in the workplace while evaluating this training program?

Answer: I think that basically it comes down to the fact that Singapore and Japan would like for our programs to be relevant to the needs of the partner countries. In order to achieve this, basically we need to listen to the needs of the developing countries, and this is done through various channels. I think we also work with our missions in the various ministries in the various countries to find out what their needs are so that when they come to be trained in Singapore under our programs, they go back and they will be able to apply what they have learned at the workplace. And as part of the evaluation, we do also ask them to indicate how you will actually apply what you have learned when you go back; will you be presenting it to others; will you be sharing what you have learned? We hope that when they go back participants will be able to apply what they have learned.

(Questions for Secretariat for the Evaluation of the Paris Declaration)

Question: Regarding the Paris Declaration survey, were there any interactions between donors and recipient countries for addressing the issues shown by the first survey?

Answer: There had been consultations in the taskforce or task team under Working Party on Aid Effectiveness. And actually the task team is meeting in Paris today and tomorrow to try to look into that. But all indications that I have seen so far is that there are not going to be any significant changes in the original indicators, but there probably is going to be more added onto it. So we're very interested to see what comes out of the meeting in the next couple of days in Paris. The partner countries are definitely involved in it.

(Questions for the World Bank)

Question: Does a training center set up in China support only Chinese officials or also other countries in the region in terms of the training of evaluation? Have you got any plan to provide the consulting services in case some other country in the region needs the support?

Answer: The center in Shanghai does both, one part is specifically for Chinese officials and the second part that is for the entire region. At this point, we want to start with one regional center per

region which would develop into a consortium of several centers that work together. But part of the difficulty that we have on results-based monitoring evaluation is they're just beginning to develop a common language and a common practice. So, we do want to make sure that those centers work together so that when one talks about learning from one another in monitoring and evaluation that there are similar frameworks and language developing.

Question: I noticed that you have two major components. One is of course training and capacity building. The other one is of course advisory services. How do you place yourself in terms of these advisory services?

Answer: The idea behind these centers is that they do have a business model that actually also tries to generate income. So many of the centers or potential centers already are in the business of providing advisory services, providing expertise and are providing that for ODA-funded projects or otherwise. So in that sense, that will expand probably and that will be part of the business model of these centers. The idea is not that they will be forever funded by donor funding. In fact, donor funding ought to come through with the regular projects perhaps. But under the projects, there are components that deal with monitoring and evaluations, which can be provided from these centers.

6. Other

6.1 Progress in Establishing an Asia Pacific Evaluation Association (APEA)

Mr. Ryokichi Hirono, Professor Emeritus, Seikei University

Mr. Ryokichi Hirono, Professor Emeritus at Seikei University, gave an announcement on the progress in establishing an Asia-Pacific Evaluation Association Network (APEA NET). At first, he introduced to what extent preparations were made for establishing the APEA. In Japan, in the 1970s, discussion for setting up the evaluation committee was started between the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI) and MOFA. As a result of the discussion, the evaluation committee was established in 1978. MOFA started to publish an evaluation report in 1981, which was the first evaluation report open to the public.

Prof. Hirono also explained how the Japan Evaluation Society (JES) was set up. He explained that as a result of mounting interest on the evaluation of ODA as well as the evaluation of developing programs in Japan, there was a great interest emerging among professionals who were doing two things; evaluation of ODA, and evaluation of public administration. The Japan Evaluation Society

(JES) was composed of about 450 professional evaluators as members, and works for 1) evaluation of public administration, and 2) evaluation of ODA projects. There are three objectives for the society; 1) exchange information and experiences among evaluators and evaluation organizations for enrichment in terms of information, knowledge, analytical ability and so forth, 2) innovate new evaluation methodologies such as evaluation system, manual and so forth, and 3) assist partner countries to enhance their capacity for evaluation.

In 2002, the International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS) was set up in Beijing. Since then, IDEAS had taken important role in disseminating information and improving the methodologies at the international level. Among Asian countries, when MOFA started this evaluation workshop back in 2001, a lot of people began to be interested in this aspect. In view of this emerging situation, The Japan Evaluation Society (JES), together with the other national evaluation societies realized it is necessary to establish a network on evaluation in the Asian region. As progress for establishing APEA NET continued, some evaluation societies had already emerged in Asian countries such as Malaysia, India, Bangladesh, Pakistan and Vietnam, and Nepal is in the process of establishing such a society. Prof. Hirono invited all the participants who were interested in the APEA NET to a separate preparatory meeting after the official program.

7. Closing Session

7.1 Adoption of Chair's Summary

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

Appendix 1: Workshop Program

The 9th ODA Evaluation Workshop – Schedule

February 17 (Wed.)	
Afternoon	Participants arrive at Narita airport and travel to hotel (Hyatt Regency).
February 18 (Thu.)	
Morning	<p>Participant registration</p> <p>Opening session</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ① Chair's opening address (Prof. Hiromitsu Muta, Executive Vice President, Tokyo Institute of Technology) ② Address by Mr. Hiroki Owaki, Deputy Director-General, International Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) of Japan ③ Address by Mr. Atsuo Kuroda, Vice-President, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) <p>Discussions based on each theme (roundtable)</p> <p>Item 1: A study on examples of project-level and program-level (joint) evaluations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) “Case Studies on Project-Level Evaluation of Japan’s ODA Projects ” Ms. Takako Haraguchi, Senior Consultant, International Development Associates, Ltd. (2) “Example of Joint Evaluation and Vietnam’s Efforts for Monitoring and Evaluation” Mr. Cao Manh Cuong, Deputy Director General, Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of Planning and Investment, Vietnam (3) Discussion Identifying issues and good practices.
	Lunch (at JICA Tokyo International Center)
Afternoon	<p>Item 2: “The Role of Evaluation in the PDCA Cycle” and “Feeding Back of Evaluation Results”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) “System for ODA Evaluation (Policy-level) and Feedback at MOFA” Mr. Seizaburo Fujisawa, Senior Deputy Director, ODA Evaluation and Public Relations Division, International Cooperation Bureau, MOFA and “Introduction to Policy Evaluation of Participating Countries: Some Observations from Nepal” Dr. Mahesh Banskota, Dean, School of Arts, Kathmandu University

	<p>(2) Discussion Identifying issues and good practices.</p> <p>Item 3 : “The Present State of the System for ODA Evaluation, Improvements, and Their Results”</p> <p>(1) “Efforts to Improve Development Evaluation: The Philippine Story” Mr. Roland G. Tungpalan, Deputy Director-General, National Economic and Development Authority, the Philippines and “Pakistan’s Efforts to Improve ODA Evaluation System and Their Results ” Mr. Zuhfran Qasim, Assistant Chief, Economic Affairs Division, Ministry of Economic Affairs & Statistics, Pakistan</p> <p>(2) Discussion Identifying ways in which to improve effects of ODA and increase sense of ownership in partner countries.</p> <p>Item 4 : Keynote address by participating donor country and international agency.</p> <p>(1) “Singapore’s Experience in Effective Evaluation – Japan-Singapore Partnership Programme for the 21st Century” Ms. Denise Cheng, Assistant Director for Technical Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Singapore “Evaluation of the Paris Declaration - A contribution to Evaluation Capacity Development” Mr. Niels A. Dabelstein, Head of the Secretariat, The Secretariat for the Evaluation of the Paris Declaration “CLEAR: Centers for Learning on Evaluation and Results - A Multilateral Initiative” Mr. Hans-Martin Boehmer, Manager, Communication, Strategy and Learning, Independent Evaluation Group, The World Bank Group</p> <p>Other: Progress in establishing an Asia-Pacific Evaluation Association (APEA) Mr. Ryokichi Hirono, Professor Emeritus, Seikei University</p> <p>Closing session Chair’s summary Meeting concluded</p>
	Dinner party (at JICA Tokyo International Center)
February 19 (Fri.)	
	Participants depart from hotel to Narita airport.

Appendix 2: List of Participants

Chairperson

Country	Name	Title/Organization
Japan	Prof. Hiromitsu Muta	Member of the Board/Executive Vice President, Tokyo Institute of Technology

Moderator

Country	Name	Title/Organization
Japan	Prof. Yoshio Wada	Professor, National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies

Presenters

Country	Name	Title/Organization
Japan	Prof. Ryokichi Hirono	Professor Emeritus, Seikei University
Japan	Mr. Seizaburo Fujisawa	Senior Deputy Director, ODA Evaluation and Public Relations Division, International Cooperation Bureau, MOFA
Japan	Ms. Takako Haraguchi	Senior Consultant, International Development Associates Ltd.
Nepal	Dr. Mahesh Banskota	Dean, School of Arts, Kathmandu University
Pakistan	Mr. Zuhfran Qasim	Assistant Chief, Economic Affairs Division, Ministry of Economic Affairs & Statistics
Singapore	Ms. Denise Cheng	Assistant Director, Technical Cooperation Directorate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
The Philippines	Mr. Rolando G. Tungpalan	Deputy Director-General, National Economic and Development Authority
Vietnam	Mr. Cao Manh Cuong	Deputy Director General, Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of Planning and Investment
EVALUNET	Mr. Niels A. Dabelstein	Head of the Secretariat, The Secretariat for the Evaluation of the Paris Declaration
World Bank	Mr. Hans-Martin Boehmer	Manager, Communication, Strategy and Learning, Independent Evaluation Group, The World Bank Group

Participants

Country	Name	Title/Organization
Bangladesh	Mr. Muhammad Alkama Siddiqui	Deputy Secretary, External Economic Policy, Economic Relations Division, Ministry of Finance
Cambodia	Mr. Oul Nak	Deputy Director of Aid Coordination Policy Department, CDC

Country	Name	Title/Organization
China	Mr. Kang Bing Jian	Acting Division Director, Department of International Trade and Economic Affairs, Ministry of Commerce
Fiji	Ms. Elina Lobendahn-Volavola	Acting Chief Economic Planning Officer and Head of ODA Unit with the Ministry of Finance
India	Mr. Surendrakumar Bagde	Director, Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance
Indonesia	Mr. Kurniawan Ariadi	Deputy Director for Asian Bilateral Funding – National Development Planning Agency
Laos	Mr. Vanpheng Sengmanothong	Acting Director of Asia-Pacific Division, Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Planning and Investment
Malaysia	Mr. Sivaneswaran Ramachandran	Principal Assistant Director, International Cooperation and Knowledge Management Section, Economic Planning Unit, Prime Minister's Department
Mongolia	Ms. Bayarmaa Mijiddorj	Senior Officer of the Development Financing and Cooperation Department, Ministry of Finance
Myanmar	Mr. Maung Maung Khin	Director, Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of National Planning and Economic Development
Nepal	Mr. Shyam Nidhi Tiwari	Under Secretary, Foreign Aid Coordination Division, Ministry of Finance
Pakistan	Mr. Waqar Hussain Abbasi	Deputy Secretary (Japan), Economic Affairs Division, Ministry of Economic Affairs & Statistics
Papua New Guinea	Ms. Jenny Tumun	Senior Aid Coordinator, Department of National Planning & Monitoring
Solomon	Ms. Lynn Legua	Director Planning, Ministry of Development Planning and Aid Coordination
Sri Lanka	Ms. Deepika Chrishanthi Wickramaratne Hapugoda	Director, Department of External Resources, Ministry of Finance and Planning
Thailand	Ms. Somsuan Howe	Development Cooperation Officer, TICA
Thailand (own-expense)	Ms. Romyavadi Sarakshetrin	Development Cooperation Officer, TICA
The Philippines	Mr. Roderick M. Planta	Director, Project Monitoring Staff, National Economic and Development Authority
Timor Leste	Mr. Mario Mesquita	Program Officer, Aid Effectiveness Directorate, Ministry of Finance
Vietnam	Mr. Cao Thanh Phu	Official, Foreign Economic Relations Department, Ministry of Planning and Investment
ASEAN Secretariat	Dr. Raman Letchumanan	Head, Environment Division, ASEAN Secretariat

Organizers

Country	Name	Title/Organization
MOFA Japan	Mr. Hiroki Owaki	Deputy Director General, International Cooperation Bureau
MOFA Japan	Mr. Kaoru Hata	Director, ODA Evaluation and Public Relations Division, International Cooperation Bureau
MOFA Japan	Mr. Akinori Tajima	Deputy Director, ODA Evaluation and Public Relations Division, International Cooperation Bureau
MOFA Japan	Ms. Aya Moriya	Official, ODA Evaluation and Public Relations Division, International Cooperation Bureau
JICA	Mr. Atsuo Kuroda	Vice-President
JICA	Mr. Mitsukuni Sugimoto	Deputy Director General, Evaluation Department
JICA	Mr. Naoki Kamijo	Director, Evaluation Planning Division, Evaluation Department
JICA	Mr. Kei Toyama	Director, Evaluation Division 1, Evaluation Department
JICA	Mr. Hikoyuki Ukai	Director, Evaluation Division 2, Evaluation Department
JICA	Ms. Eriko Mukasa	Evaluation Planning Division, Evaluation Department
JICA	Mr. Tomoki Kobayashi	Advisor, Evaluation Division 1, Evaluation Department
JICA	Mr. Hiroki Katayama	Evaluation Division 1, Evaluation Department
JICA	Mr. Eisuke Tachibana	Evaluation Division 1, Evaluation Department
JICA	Mr. Tatsuhiro Mitamura	Assistant Director, Development Partnership Division
JICA	Ms. Izumi Takei	Consultant, Development Partnership Division
JAICAF	Mr. Tsuneo Takahata	Director, Second Operations Department
JAICAF	Ms. Hanako Otani	Second Operations Department
JAICAF	Ms. Makiko Koyabu	Second Operations Department
JAICAF	Ms. Risako Imai	Second Operations Department
JAICAF	Ms. Maiko Mori	First Operations Department

Appendix 3: List of Abbreviations

AAA	Accra Agenda for Action
APEA NET	Asia-Pacific Evaluation Association Network
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
CLEAR	Centers for Learning on Evaluation and Results
GRIPS	National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies
HCS	Hanoi Core Statement
IDEAS	International Development Evaluation Association
IEG	Independent Evaluation Group (World Bank Group)
IPDET	International Program for Development Evaluation Training
JBIC	Japan Bank for International Cooperation
JES	Japan Evaluation Society
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
METI	Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry
MfDR	Management for Development Results
MOFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPI	Ministry of Planning and Investment in Vietnam
NMES	Project on Networked Multimedia Education System
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD/DAC	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Co-operation Directorate
PDCA	Plan-Do-Check-Action
PMU	Project Management Unit
RME	Result Monitoring and Evaluation
SCP	Singapore Cooperation Program
SHIPDET	Shanghai International Program for Development Evaluation Training
TCD	Technical Cooperation Department
TICA	Thailand International Development Cooperation Agency