

Report of the Workshop on ODA Evaluation in Malaysia

Kuala Lumpur, 28 - 29 November 2007



The Workshop on ODA Evaluation in Malaysia





Welcome Speech (Above)

Plenary (Below)





Working Group A (Above)

Working Group B (Below)



The Workshop on ODA Evaluation in Malaysia

Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Co-Chair's Summary	1
1. Plenary Session 1: Opening.....	3
1. Opening Remarks.....	3
<i>1) Co-chairs' Opening Address.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>2) Welcome Speech by the Japanese Representative</i>	<i>4</i>
2. Presentation: Japan's Official Development Assistance (ODA) to Malaysia	4
3. Presentation: Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.....	6
4. Presentation: DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.....	7
2. Working Group A: 'Institutional Evaluation Capacity Development'	10
1. Presentation: Evaluation Capacity Development in Viet Nam.....	10
2. Presentation: Evaluation for MfDR: The Philippines Experience.....	11
3. Presentation: Strengthening M&E System in Sri Lanka	11
3. Working Group B: 'Human Resource Development for Enhanced Evaluation Capacity'	14
1. Presentation: Evaluation Capacity Development: Case Studies of JICA Cooperation.....	14
2. Presentation: Capacity Development for Monitoring and Evaluation by ADB.	14
3. Presentation: ODA Evaluation in Nepal	15
4. Plenary Session 2: Closing.....	16
1. Reporting Back to the Plenary by the Chairpersons of Working Groups	16
2. General Discussion	17
3. Adoption of Co-Chair's Summary.....	18
 Appendix 1: Workshop Program	 20
Appendix 2: List of Participants.....	21
Appendix 3: List of Abbreviations.....	24

Report of the Workshop on ODA Evaluation in Malaysia
28 - 29 November 2007, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Co-Chair's Summary

29 November, 2007

Mme. NORANI Ibrahim and
Ryokichi HIRONO

The 7th ODA Evaluation Workshop was organized jointly by the Governments of Malaysia and Japan in Kuala Lumpur on 28 and 29 November, 2007.

The plenary session of the Workshop was opened with the two remarks by two co-chairs, Dato' Dr. Ali Hamsa of Economic Planning Unit of the GOM and Professor Ryokichi Hirono of Seikei University, Tokyo. Mr. Oda, Deputy Director-General of International Cooperation Bureau of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs gave a welcome speech, thanking the GOM for co-organising the Workshop and for a warm hospitality extended to all the participants in the Workshop.

The first presentation was made by representatives of the Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ISIS) of Malaysia on their evaluation of the Japanese ODA to Malaysia during the last few decades, singling out several important projects covering various areas of the country's concern. There were several questions and remarks made on the presentation. There was a general consensus on the usefulness of the Japanese assistance in Malaysia, particularly with respect to human capital formation and institution building, though with a few hiccups in the implementation of some of those projects. It was emphasized that those lessons learnt from the evaluation of the Japanese assistance in Malaysia have already been applied to the formulation and implementation of national and local development projects and programmes in the country.

The second presentation was made by Danida on the on-going progress and evaluation of the Paris Declaration, delving into some of the important dimensions of project and programme evaluation to further improve aid effectiveness. Attention was drawn to a series of events leading up to the Ghana HLF in 2008 and up to the 2012 meeting to finalise the on-going evaluation involving management and reference groups. The Danida presentation was followed by OECD/DAC presentation on the DAC Quality Standards. Questions and remarks were mainly on the need for allowing some variation among partner countries in evaluation, while recognizing the importance of universal standards of evaluation methodologies and procedures.

The Workshop had two breakout sessions on the first day afternoon, WG A focusing on the Institutional Evaluation Capacity Development and WG B on Human Resources Development for Enhanced Evaluation Capacity. In WG A there were three country

presentation on their respective experiences, Vietnam, the Philippines and Sri Lanka. In WG B presentation was given by JICA, ADB and Nepal. The main points of two WG presentation and the discussion that followed were as follows.

WGA highlighted the critical importance of a) the strong political commitment at the top to evaluation, b) the balance between learning and accountability functions of evaluation, c) the engagement of policy makers in different stages and levels of evaluation process, d) improvement of the quality of evaluation and e) the promotion of regional network of evaluation dedicated to ECD in partner countries as well as regional standards setting and methodology improvement. Consensus also emerged on the importance of the five principles of the Paris Declaration, Ownership, Alignment, Harmonisation, Management for Results and Mutual Accountability which all call for effective evaluation both in partner and donor countries/organizations. Question, however, did remain in regard to the implementation of these five principles which is often related to the extent of ECD in the partner countries and the headquarter policies in donor countries concerned.

WG B presentation and the discussion reflected responses to the four major questions regarding: a) skills and methods in project management, data analysis, project goal setting, budget management and performance auditing, b) various types of national organizations providing evaluation services and training programmes for ECD, c) potential candidates of evaluators in the future, with both positive and negative aspects of different evaluators, and d) different users of evaluation results ranging from policy makers through implementing agencies to academic institutions, each requiring its respective dimensions.

In the discussion that followed the presentation of the WG Summary at the second-day plenary session, there were a number of points raised which were common to the summary of two WG presentation, such as how to meet the funding requirements for ECD and how to link project, programme and country evaluations, as well as others felt important in relation to specific situation facing different partner countries and the implications of globalization of economic and social development to evaluation requirements in different partner countries.

The participants in the 7th ODA Evaluation Workshop expressed their deep appreciation to the two organizers of the Workshop for their excellent organization of the Workshop and to the presenters for their comprehensive and enlightening presentation of their country and organizations' experiences on the two main Workshop agenda items as well as to the Government of Malaysia for their warm hospitality that made the Workshop both fruitful and pleasant to all. They all expressed an urgent need for continuing this sort of exchange of country experiences and straight-forward dialogue in order to improve evaluation and enhance the evaluation capacity in partner countries of this region as well as to expedite the process of establishing a regional network of evaluation professionals in the region.

1. Plenary Session 1: Opening

1. Opening Remarks

1) Co-chairs' Opening Address

Dato' Dr. Ali Hamsa, Deputy Director General, National Transformation and Advancement, Economic Planning Unit (EPU), Malaysia

Dato' Dr. Ali Hamsa welcomed workshop delegates to Malaysia on the occasion of the 50th 'Japan-Malaysia Friendship Year', and proceeded to describe the role of self-evaluation in Malaysian government developmental initiatives. In Malaysian development, called the Indicative Development Process, all development-related plans, except for the writing of the annual budget, are made by the Economic Planning Unit of the Prime Minister's department. Since 1956, each plan has had two major parts, the Progress, i.e. "the evaluation of what happened in the last five years", and the Prospect, i.e. "the way forward", therefore, comprehensive evaluation is inbuilt. Currently in the Ninth Malaysia Plan period, which lasts from 2006 through 2010, the Malaysian government has responded to the development failures and successes of its past.

Dato' Dr. Ali Hamsa expressed his hope that the idea for the establishment of an Asia-wide method for evaluation would be firmed up during the two-day workshop.

Prof. Ryokichi Hirono, Professor Emeritus, Seikei University, Japan

Professor Hirono, recalled some of the history of the ODA Evaluation Workshop, which began in 2001. He applauded the contributions of the Government of Japan at the annual workshops over the years, which helped to improve the evaluation of development strategies, policies, programs, and projects in partner countries through productive exchanges of country experiences and views. These exchanges also improved aid effectiveness from bilateral and multilateral institutional donors.

Prof. Hirono hoped that the evaluation concerns of participants specific to the respective countries would be answered through the workshop, that the high expectations for reform from partner and donor countries and organizations would be discussed, and that the discussion would contribute to resolving major aid policy and implementation issues singled out by the 2006 Survey of Monitoring on Paris Declaration, which he deemed relevant to the workshop: deeper ownership, more accountable institutions and systems, strengthened partner country systems, increased aid efficiency and donor harmonization, management for results, mutual accountability, reoriented corporate level incentives and improvements on the

Paris Declaration. Prof. Hirono also stressed the importance of the formation of an Asia-Pacific Evaluation Association.

2) Welcome Speech by the Japanese Representative

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

Japan has been holding ODA Evaluation Workshop since 2001 as part of its efforts to reinforce evaluation capacity development of partner countries in Asia. There has been a consensus feeling that strong commitment, institutional arrangement, awareness and incentives are the keys to effective evaluation, which is necessary to achieve development results. In 2006 it was also agreed that evaluation is an overarching issue, covering all five dimensions of the Paris Declaration. Mr. Oda hoped that discussions in this workshop will be shared among Asian countries and generate concrete actions to encourage evaluation capacity development, in addition, give an impetus to the ongoing evaluation of the implementation of the Paris Declaration.

Mr. Oda stated that Japan attaches importance to the evaluation capacity development in Asia as it can be said that evaluation is an essential skill for getting most successful results. He concluded that this workshop will serve participants an opportunity to build network of evaluators.

2. Presentation: Japan's Official Development Assistance (ODA) to Malaysia

Dr. Sharifah Mariam Alhabshi, Deputy Director, International Institute of Public Policy and Management (INPUMA). INPUMA undertook the study on behalf of Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ISIS), Malaysia

Dr. Alhabshi stated that the purpose of her evaluation was to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of Japanese ODA to Malaysia, and to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the Japanese ODA processes with respect to Malaysia. Of the ten Japanese ODA projects to Malaysia, Dr. Alhabshi focused on these: the Japanese Language Center at the University of Malaya, the JMTI and the MATRADE, Slope Disaster Management Study for Federal Highway, DID Project, Malayan Railway, and KLIA.

Regarding the Japanese Language Center at the University of Malaya, sponsored by MOFA Japan and the Japan Foundation, the Center has been successful in training students to learn Japanese and the engineering subjects in Japanese, with the goal of entering elite Japanese universities. Unfortunately, many Malaysian students have had trouble finding suitable jobs and have not been readily promoted in Japanese industry. But overall, students who have

returned to Malaysia from Japan are more disciplined than their peers from the US, UK, and other countries.

The objective of another project, the Japan Malaysia Technical Institute (JMTI), was to produce skilled industrial technologies to meet the needs of industrial technological development in Malaysia. JMTI is standing and operational now, but delay in construction of the building posed a significant obstacle along the way. Nonetheless, resourceful, disciplined Japanese experts and their Malaysian counterparts cooperated to move the project forward.

ODA assistance to the Malaysia External Trade Development Corporation (MATRADE) encountered problems similar to JMTI; the building project was delayed by eight years. Nonetheless, by 2007, MATRADE was fully functional and internationally recognized.

The ODA Slope Disaster Management Study for the Public Works Department (PWD) was intended to produce guidelines and systems to manage road and highway slopes. Problems arose when the Japanese experts left project guidelines to a Malaysian system unable to support it. The Slope Information Management System (SIMS) was not fully implemented, but the elements within SIMS have been used as touchstones.

The Study of Integrated Urban Drainage Improvement for Melaka Tengah and Sungai Petani in Malaysia aims to produce a “drainage structure plan” or guideline. All the elements proposed to the Malaysian Department of Irrigation and Drainage (DID) were fully adopted.

JBIC funding for the Malaysian Railway Improvement Project provided the momentum to electrify the rail system and make sweeping infrastructure repairs. This is one of Malaysia's great success stories with regard to JBIC loans; another is the Kuala Lumpur International Airport (KLIA).

All the ODA projects evaluated were relevant to both the short- and longer-term development needs of Malaysia. All the projects were effective and efficient after successful implementation. However, many projects suffered from challenges of implementation but overcame hurdles and have had an excellent impact on Malaysian growth. Involvement on the part of the Malaysian government and the strength of Japanese ODA to Malaysia transfer of expertise was an important factor in almost all projects.

The suggested improvements for Japan's ODA to Malaysia are as follows: Malaysia needs to build better project management skills; Japan's ODA needs to further focus on capacity building and exchange of experts and knowledge; ODA projects should be backed by strong domestic leadership, either from within the organization or from the national government.

Discussion

In replying to the question from Prof. Hirono on the independence of evaluation, Dr. Alhabshi described how she was able to conduct a critical, independent evaluation of the Japanese assistance to Malaysia. She credited her background as an academic, the fact that she is a neutral policy maker, and that the interviews captured multiple viewpoints and the findings were fully transparent. Dato' Dr. Ali Hamsa added that, in terms of objective evaluation, it is important to consider more than the final output of projects, but also their economic and developmental impact along the way. Mr. Thomas of Malaysian Evaluation Society suggested that evaluators submit to a Code of Conduct and Ethics.

Dr. Alhabshi responded to questions from the floor and clarified that a Malaysian Steering Committee dictates the TOR of the evaluators. She stated that Malaysia went through the problems and learned from them, then currently is helping ASEAN countries to learn from the past mistakes as it has experienced through the capacity development.

She reported that she had witnessed a lot of transfer of expertise via the ODA program, and that Malaysia admires the discipline and work culture of Japan. Prof. Hirono added that unlike in the past Malaysian engineers would no longer just sit in the office and separate themselves from technicians and workers on the production floor; finding it is vital to mingle with the rest of the workforce. He stated that the sense of togetherness thus installed had already created tremendous value in Malaysian society.

3. Presentation: Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness

Mr. Niels Dabelstein, Evaluation of the Paris Declaration, Danish Institute for International Studies, Denmark

Why do we want to evaluate the Paris Declaration? The simple answer is that there is a need to assess the reasons behind progress or lack of progress. He expressed the need to cover all five dimensions of the Declaration: ownership, harmonization, alignment, results and mutual accountability. Mr. Dabelstein called for a truly joint evaluation, which means that the partner countries and donor partners together should develop the evaluation framework and references.

The key elements of the ongoing evaluation are to develop a common framework for the entire evaluation, a series of country-level evaluations led by the countries, a series of donor-level, headquarter-level evaluations, and then a program of thematic studies to supplement the country and donor-level evaluations.

The participant countries of the country-level evaluation are Bangladesh, Bolivia, Mali, the Philippines, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Uganda and Viet Nam. They have all volunteered themselves; individual country ownership of the process is very important. The country-level evaluation asks three questions: What is the overall utility of the Paris Declaration as a tool for aid effectiveness? Has the Paris Declaration actually led to changes in behavior? Are there any signs of emerging results?

The countries that has participated in the donor side, again self-selected, are Australia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, UK, and on the multilateral side, UNDP and UNEG, and the Asian Development Bank (ADB). Different questions are posed at this level: What are conducive or prohibiting factors at headquarter-level? Has the Paris Declaration really been turned into policies and strategies? The country-level evaluation has been looking at the change of behavior, and the headquarter-level evaluation looking at the level of leadership and commitment as expressed in policies and strategies.

The first key challenge in conducting the evaluation is to properly capture, document, and measure the positive behavior change amongst the partner countries and the development partners. It is very difficult to make a qualitative assessment of perceptions. The second key challenge is that there is very little time to design and commission these evaluations. Another challenge is that procurement rules are extremely cumbersome and have delayed the process considerably in many of the partner countries. Fourth is the lack of technical expertise and qualified evaluators, particularly in Africa. And finally, the fifth challenge involves the independence of evaluation teams and transparency of their reporting.

Mr. Dabelstein outlined the forthcoming work to be done on the Paris Declaration. January through April they will synthesize the reports from these 20 different studies. At the end of January, they will have a workshop on the initial findings. After that workshop, the synthesis team will prepare a proper draft that will be finalized at the end of March. Then there will be follow-up studies, where outcomes and results for the next high level forum in 2011 will be forecasted.

4. Presentation: DAC Evaluation Quality Standards

Mr. Hans Erik Lundgren, Head of Section Evaluation, Development Co-operation Directorate, OECD

Mr. Lundgren explained that the DAC Evaluation Network is a working group under the Development Assistance Committee of OECD, with the purpose of increasing the effectiveness of international development programs through robust, informed and independent evaluation. The Network brings together 30 development agencies and has

produced a number of outputs essentially in the areas of norms and standards for evaluation and joint evaluations of the effectiveness of aid.

The presentation focused on the draft DAC evaluation quality standards which have been developed out of the identified need for the better quality, more harmonized approaches, and for an agreed basis to work together and in joint evaluations. The draft standards had been developed in consultation with development agencies, partner countries, and were approved for a 3-year test phase application in 2006. The standards specifically aim to provide standards for the process and the product of evaluation, to facilitate partnerships and the collaboration in using each other's evaluations across agencies/countries.

The Standards have been published in English, French, and Spanish and they are working as tools to be applied in practical evaluation work. A survey conducted revealed that the standards are currently widely used by the central evaluation offices of DAC development agencies. Mr. Lundgen invited interested participants and partners to try out the standards and apply them in the future evaluations and help inform their final shape. There are plans to organize a workshop in 2009, where the committee will take stock of the experience with the use of the standards and reach agreements on international standards for development evaluation.

Discussion

Prof. Hirono opened the floor for comments and questions for these presentations. Presenters were asked how much real progress donors have made in aligning their strategy not with other donors, but with the recipient countries. Mr. Dabelstein replied that he could not give a full response because evaluation has not finished, but the monitoring exercises show some progress and that the problem lies in the lack of confidence in partner country systems. There is a dichotomy that in order to rely on country systems, there must be confidence in them, but a reliable system is never generated if unused.

Dato' Dr. Ali Hamsa commented that the fundamental link for consideration is between aid effectiveness and development effectiveness. Procurement rules in recipient countries are important, but when donor countries enter the arena, sometimes up to 80% of their aid actually travels back to their home countries.

Mr. Thomas of the Malaysian Evaluation Society proposed that evaluation be less focused on the final product. He asked for initiatives to assist partners in the planning process itself, because that is where he has experienced major monetary and information-flow weaknesses. Mr. Dabelstein agreed that it is the weakest point for evaluation, and he advised that senior management of each project take interest in and demand assistance to planning and evaluation.

Speaking from experience in ADB, Mr. Serrat conceded that monitoring evaluation in that institution (as in developing member countries of ADB) was still not as strong as they certainly should be. Notwithstanding, planners and administrators were better able to prepare results-based management frameworks, including the design and monitoring framework, identify the impact of an intervention, formulate its outcome, specify outputs and inputs, identify performance indicators, set targets, monitor and report results, evaluate results, and use the information to improve performance. ADB's Operations Evaluation Department, in collaboration with ADB's Central Operations Services Office, has played an instrumental role in evaluating project performance management, supporting actions initiated to create quality assurance, mentoring, and training capacity within originating departments, and giving these clear responsibility and accountability for quality, quality assurance, and tracking. As a result, the quality of design and monitoring frameworks improved between 2000 and 2005.

Mr. Oda of Japan mentioned that harmonization and alignment should not be regarded as the goals, but as the means to development effectiveness. Mr. Dabelstein responded that evaluators attempt to assess the attribution of development assistance with respect to development effectiveness, however, there are many other factors, including climatic factors, policy factors, trade relations, conflicts etc. big issues that are much more important to development effectiveness than development assistance.

Mr. Abeygunasekara of Sri Lanka briefly shared his country's experience with the Paris Declaration. Sri Lanka has harmonized its procurement guidelines with multilateral agencies, but has run into problems with bilateral procurement procedures because they are different from multilateral guidelines.

Ms. Kawabuchi of JBIC asked how the Paris Declaration evaluation developed. Mr. Dabelstein explained that the evaluation was requested in the Declaration itself. The basic concept was drafted by the DAC Evaluation Network and further developed in regional development effectiveness workshops. The major breakthrough was the formation of the Reference Group in Paris in March 2007 and then the inception workshop in Copenhagen in June 2007. The evaluation approach evolved through discussions of the framework and terms of reference.

Ms. Kubota of UNDP, contributed from the UN perspective. There is a group of evaluation offices in the UN system; called the United Nations Evaluation Group, represented by more than 40 UN agencies. The UNEG has been engaged in a country-level joint evaluation with the Government of South Africa, in which greater ownership of the national government is demonstrated. Ms. Kubota expressed interest in sharing experiences from other countries in

joint evaluations, as this South Africa evaluation may present a new model for country led evaluations.

Prof. Hirono commented that although there might have been some differences among Asian countries, they have gone through the first stage where the critical importance of all components of Paris Declaration was understood by all stakeholders concerned and are now already in the second stage. Prof. Hirono explained that it was very important to translate the commitment into actual action and stressed the need of further improvements in those measures taken in both donor countries and partner countries.

2. Working Group A: ‘Institutional Evaluation Capacity Development’

Co-Chair: Mme. Norani Ibrahim, Director, International Cooperation Section, EPU and Prof. Hirono

1. Presentation: Evaluation Capacity Development in Viet Nam

Mr. Tran Manh Cuong, Deputy Director General, Ministry of Planning and Investment (MPI), Foreign Economic Relations Department, Viet Nam and Mr. Keishi Miyazaki, Consultant, OPMAC Cooperation, Japan

Mr. Cuong first gave the presentation on development of the Viet Nam ODA Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E). Viet Nam issued the Hanoi Core Statement in response to the Paris Declaration to address aid effectiveness, and the government has continuously improved M&E system of ODA programs and projects to realize effective utilization of the ODA resources. Firstly, the government has institutionalized and performed M&E through various decrees, decisions, and circulars. Secondly, pilot-based M&E were implemented under the framework of technical assistance by “Vietnam-Australia Monitoring and Evaluation Strengthening Project” (VAMESP) supported by AusAID. Thirdly, the government has actively promoted partnership with donors through sharing of experiences as well as conducting joint evaluations.

Mr. Miyazaki introduced the framework of the ongoing joint evaluation work with MPI and JBIC. MPI and JBIC signed 3-year MOUs in July 2007 which aims at harmonizing evaluation mechanism between them and set several objectives; (1) ensure effective and efficient implementation of JBIC-assisted ODA projects, and make institutional improvement through the harmonization of evaluation mechanism of two organizations, (2) jointly establish and annual “Implementation Program of Joint Evaluation”, (3) hold policy dialogues including feedback seminars on projects evaluated each year and take actions based on the outcomes.

Lastly, Mr. Cuong offered seven lessons from his country's experience: institutional arrangements provide an enabling environment; adults learn through practice on the job; practice should be country-led; monitoring and evaluation practice should be linked; donor partnerships strengthen experience and learning; regional evaluation networks add value; and presenting results engages leaders.

2. Presentation: Evaluation for MfDR: The Philippines Experience

Mr. Roderick M. Planta, Director IV, National Economic and Development Authority, the Philippines

Mr. Planta presented his country's experiences with evaluation. The government has made several executive and legislative arrangements such as the establishment of a harmonization committee, the formulation of a harmonization agenda with action plan, and the appointment of a national evaluation coordinator, constituted an in-country reference group. However, Mr. Planta noted that there is still a need for building capacity not only within government but also externally as the evaluation is still a young field.

Challenges in implementing the Paris Declaration were presented on ownership, alignment, harmonization, and procurement system. In the end, Mr. Planta picked up "Community of Practice of MfDR (CoP-MfDR)" and expressed the view that it will deepen the results orientation in Philippines and the government will need much help from CoP-MfDR.

3. Presentation: Strengthening M&E System in Sri Lanka

Mr. Amarananda Abeygunasekara, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Plan Implementation, Sri Lanka

Mr. Abeygunasekara pointed out the importance of strengthening monitoring systems, and summarized Sri Lanka's efforts such as introducing a web-based electronic monitoring system to track progress, the quarterly progress report to be submitted to the cabinet of ministers, and arranging Progress Review Meetings chaired by the President. He presented that the monitoring and the evaluation are equally important, but raised the importance of the evaluation mentioning the fact that the evaluation synthesis revealed that 50% of development projects and programs are underperforming so that we need to find reasons for failures. He added that the evaluation as a tool will help to provide feedback to improve budgeting, policy formulation, and national and sectoral development strategies.

Sri Lanka's evaluation capacity has been built on these initiatives: a central agency with committed chairpersons for evaluation, establishing strong M&E units in all line ministries, donor assistance for Evaluation Capacity Development (ECD) through ADB regional Technical Assistance (TA) for mainstreaming MfDR and UNDP's support to introduce

result-based M&E, conducting model evaluations, establishing an Evaluation Information System, and the training of officers. The establishment of a Sri Lanka Evaluation Association was presented as the involvement of a civil society in ECD.

Based on the identified key issues and challenges, the following strategies were stated to strengthen evaluation system; policy commitment and support, legal and budgetary support, institutional arrangements, improve quality evaluation, strengthen methodology and practices, ECD, and strengthen feedback arrangements.

Discussion

Mr. Dabelstein commented on the need for both quality and credibility in the evaluation, as well as the importance of transparency of the whole process and dissemination of feedback.

Mr. Fook of Singapore warned against overemphasizing on having an evaluation system, which may divert scarce resources and precious expertise from the actual implementation and execution of the project.

Mr. Triyono of Indonesia stated that his country's evaluation challenges are very much those of Sri Lanka. The government continues to repair its M&E mechanism with regulations, to improve transparency, and to determine performance indicators. He stressed that the most salient needs are qualified staff, user-friendly and timely evaluation.

Mr. Kim of ADB expressed concern over the limited use of evaluation results in the decision making process. In this regard, he emphasized greater balance between learning and accountability. Prof. Hirono gave a snapshot of an approach taken by the Economic Policy Committee and the DAC of the OECD in producing their evaluation reports for every member state, and recommended a similar model. Mr. Dabelstein introduced a very straightforward follow-up system on evaluations by DANIDA for forcing management to make decisions and take action. He also commented on making effective use of limited resources by doing selective evaluation rather than routinely evaluate all projects.

Dr. Chen of Malaysia raised the issue of evaluation timing that is appropriate to both donor and participant countries. Mr. Krishna of India gave examples of succeeding in linking between planning and evaluation. Mr. Thomas of Malaysian Evaluation Society posed a question on what role development organizations can play in assisting governments to establish institutional structure looking at both capital expenditure and operating expenditure in tandem to see real effectiveness of a program.

Prof. Hirono asked presenters about improving political and policy commitment. Mr. Abeygunasekara of Sri Lanka responded with the need to sensitize politicians to create

demand. Others contributed ideas about workshops and resource-based legislation. Mr. Cuong of Viet Nam presented its legal framework on M&E issued by the Prime Minister which has induced the participation of higher ranking level politicians.

Mr. Reza of Pakistan emphasized harmonization between donor and recipient country evaluation standards for the quality evaluation. Prof. Hirono indicated that some kind of incentives and information disclosure are important to improve the quality of evaluation. Ms. Kubota of UNDP spoke about recent experiences from UNDP on the full disclosure policy through the public on-line based data base. The disclosure of management responses is also important as it gives managers incentives to use evaluations and respond to issues raised in the evaluation. Mr. Minato of FASID proposed a meta-evaluation as an effective tool for the feedback in a host country. Mr. Kim of ADB introduced having self-evaluation together with the independent evaluation in a balanced way would be useful to have the real time feed back for the operation.

In response to the question by Prof. Hirono how the report done by ISIS could be brought into the planning process, Madam Norani briefly presented an in-built system where implementation and coordination is being undertaken at the very early stage, and Project Planning Management for high impact projects that the national implementation task force get the feedback on status of implementation. She hoped that the report could be incorporated in the next round of planning process.

Prof. Hirono asked participants if they have encountered any policy evaluation in their respective countries, and stated that there was a general understanding that evaluation was done on sector policies, but not on national strategies. Prof. Hirono raised questions on country experiences in establishing a national evaluation society, and asked if any barriers were found in so doing. The Malaysia Evaluation Society pointed the problem of funding. It also commented that countries which already established country-based association should assist other countries, and the increase of country-based association would lead a larger regional evaluation body. Based on the experience of Japan, Mr. Minato of FASID explained exchange of view and discussions through the association is a great benefit. Prof. Hirono also emphasized the donor countries' support for evaluation capacity building in their partner countries.

3. Working Group B: ‘Human Resource Development for Enhanced Evaluation Capacity’

Co-Chair: Dr. Gazali Abas, Director, Human Capital Development Section, EPU and Prof. Hiromitsu Muta, Tokyo Institute of Technology

1. Presentation: Evaluation Capacity Development: Case Studies of JICA Cooperation

Mr. Kazunori Miura, Director of Office of Evaluation, Planning and Coordination Department, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

Mr. Miura outlined three cases of JICA’s contributions for Evaluation Capacity Development (ECD): Forum on Institutionalization of Evaluation System, a training program for central ministries officials engaging in evaluation policy; Distance Learning Course for Management-focused Monitoring and Evaluation; and the Project for Capacity Building in Public Investment Program Management in Lao P.D.R.

JICA’s activities of ECD were summarized as follows: providing technical assistance programs focusing on ECD, recognizing the importance of developing evaluation capacity which contributes to improving overall ODA management. In ECD, JICA always puts emphasis on active involvement of partner countries and pays careful attention that the cooperation matches with their needs. These approaches promote the ownership of partner countries and then ensure the sustainability of their activities.

2. Presentation: Capacity Development for Monitoring and Evaluation by ADB

Mr. Olivier Serrat, Senior Evaluation Specialist (Knowledge Management), Asian Development Bank

From the outset, Mr. Serrat underlined the close relationship between human resource development and the institutional strengthening, and argued that one could not be considered separately from the other. He explained that a regional technical assistance (TA) project administered by ADB, which he then outlined to participants, revealed a fairly integrated attempt at linking this relationship.

The strategic and operational thrust of the regional TA for Capacity Development for Monitoring and Evaluation is in fact a relatively new to ADB. Its Operations Evaluation Department has backed evaluation capacity development since 1990 to raise awareness of its role in promoting transparency, accountability, results orientation, and effectiveness of management systems. But the changing development context of the Asia and Pacific region and the advent of learning organizations and knowledge-based economies have fed

stocktaking exercises that have warranted placing a stronger accent on evaluation capacity development.

From experience with national and sector monitoring and evaluation systems, ADB is moving to strengthen evaluation capacity development at the regional level in the framework of ADB's regional initiatives and the experience of its developing member countries. Here, the Greater Mekong Sub-region Economic Cooperation program is at the forefront of ADB's work on regional cooperation and integration. The impact of TA is expected to be higher efficiency and effectiveness in providing public sector services, leading to poverty reduction. In the evaluation agencies targeted in that region, the outcome is intended to be improved ranges of skills, resources, systems, and attitudes for performance of results-based monitoring and evaluation of country partnership strategies, sector strategies, policies, programs, and projects. Three outputs will accomplish the outcome of the TA: (1) proficiency in monitoring and evaluation will be raised, (2) research and special studies on evaluation capacity development will be conducted, and (3) knowledge sharing and learning for monitoring and evaluation will be boosted.

3. Presentation: ODA Evaluation in Nepal

Mr. Lal Shanker Ghimire, Under Secretary, Foreign Aid Co-ordination Division, Ministry of Finance, Nepal

Mr. Ghimire presented the arrangement of ODA and its evaluation in the government. There are three levels for the evaluation; the inter-ministerial level, the organizational level, and the project/program level. For the joint evaluation by the government and the donor, Nepal has set up arrangements such as the local donor meeting and the thematic group meeting. Nepal has also undertaken "Nepal Portfolio Performance Review" which is the joint portfolio review exercise with JBIC, World Bank, and ADB, and held "Nepal Development Forum" since 2002 to have the discussion between the government and the donor.

The question was posed; why the evaluation and why it needs to be strengthened. He pointed out problems which require the evaluation, then analyzed some faults both in the recipient government and the donor causing such problems. To overcome the mentioned situation, Mr. Ghimire stressed the need of the capacity building through the technical cooperation by ODA. Mr. Ghimire also emphasized the need of the commitment, the ownership of the recipient countries and the support by donors, the alignment, the coordination of activities between donors, and the simplification of the procedure of aid activities.

4. Plenary Session 2: Closing

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

Madam Norani reported on Working Group A's presentations and the discussion among participants. The presentation from Viet Nam introduced its work on strengthening the M&E based on three-layer strategy; institutional arrangements, implementation of the pilot-based M&E program with AusAID assistance, the partnership with AusAID and JBIC. The Viet Nam experience provides many lessons: institutional arrangements must foster an enabling environment; on-the-job training is extremely useful; M&E practices should be linked together; donor partnerships can strengthen experiential learning; and regional evaluation networks have the potential to add value. Most importantly, presenting results engages leaders.

The presentation from the Philippines showed how its evaluations have been useful in raising public investment and garnering support from executive and legislative branches. In implementing Paris Declaration, some challenges have been identified in getting the cooperation from donors in the coordinated consultation process and the procurement process. There is a need to develop M&E system and CoP-MfDR shows possibility for the future regional cooperation in M&E.

The Sri Lanka presentation enumerated many challenges that are common to many developing countries, and the need for strengthening the monitoring system to address under-utilization of budgetary allocations and ODA allocations. There have been several efforts to strengthen monitoring system in Sri Lanka like introducing web-based monitoring system to track progress and the submission of the quarterly progress report. It is also trying to strengthen cultivating an evaluation culture as it is most useful to avoid repetition of past mistakes and improve linkage between budgeting, policy formulation and development strategies.

There was a consensus on the importance of political commitment, particularly political support on the quality of evaluation and feedback, though questions about exactly how to promote each of them were unsolved. The need for more focus on credibility and attention to internal feed back within bureaucracy and accountability to the taxpayers was raised. The balance between learning and accountability was discussed, and it was agreed that there is no need to strictly separate them though it is important to establish horizontal linkage. How to deal with budget constrains is a major challenge to most developing countries. The concern was also expressed on the proposal for setting up an Asia-Pacific Evaluation Association; it is a good idea, however it doesn't address country-specific activities or problems.

Prof. Muta reported on the three presentations of Working Group B from JICA, ADB, and Nepal. JICA presented three types of cooperation on evaluation capacity development: forums in Japan, long distance education, and project-specific training. JICA emphasized development effectiveness with respect for ownership. ADB reported on the history of its support for capacity development for M&E, and mentioned about the regional TA. Nepal explained its experience with ODA evaluation; capacity building, utilizing M&E, and improvement of evaluation reporting, etc.

Four questions were discussed among participants after presentations. The national evaluation association would serve for ECD. Though the number of national evaluation association is limited, strengthening of its networking would serve the set up of such association which is considered as a potential candidate for the joint evaluation mechanism in the future. There are many beneficiaries of the evaluation results, such as policymakers, implementation agencies, and academics, on the other hand, those users are very much irritated with the level of evaluation. Lastly, Prof. Muta added the importance of the institutional evaluation capacity development along with the human resource evaluation capacity development, the need of localization of the evaluation system, and the importance of the integration of the evaluation results into decision making and planning.

2. General Discussion

Mr. Minato of FASID commented on the proceedings of his group and noted that evaluation reports are not always user-friendly. He suggested formulating evaluation design by involving stakeholders from the host country.

Mr. Serrat of ADB cautioned the participants not to lose sight of the ultimate purpose of evaluations, namely, that they be used by their intended recipients to improve organizational performance. He explained that one of the principal beneficial outcomes of the independence of the Operations Evaluation Department in ADB in December 2003 has been a reorientation toward this end. Evaluation reports that sit on a shelf provide no return on investment. The highest value can be realized only when what is learned from evaluation impacts decision making and improves practice relevantly, effectively, efficiently, and sustainably. Making recommendations better also means that evaluations must become user-centric, meaning situationally responsive. Audiences for evaluations have a variety of information needs, be they operational or developmental, that they may or may not be able to express formally. This calls for understanding of the users of recommendations and their information-seeking tasks. Other measures taken by the Operations Evaluation Department after independence to increase value added from operations evaluation relate to adhering to strategic principles, sharpening evaluation strategies, distinguishing recommendation typologies, reporting evaluation findings, and tracking action on recommendations.

Mr. Abedin of Bangladesh spoke about the monetary limitations that evaluation efforts face in Bangladesh. Mr. Dabelstein agreed that insufficient funding is a tremendous barrier, and he proposed an “evaluation tax” (evaluation cost to be included in the budget) on all donor funded programs and projects. Such a “tax” would allow to pool funding for evaluations.

Ms. Kubota of UNDP mentioned the emerging trends in the localization and regionalization of evaluation norms and standards. While it is important to meet global standards, to enhance the utility of evaluations, a number of initiatives are underway to tailor global standards to local needs. She gave the example of the initiative by the African Evaluation Association to develop standards for evaluation in the African context.

Mr. Cuong of Viet Nam stressed that capacity building is very important in Viet Nam now, particularly in the context of assistance from the Australian Government and the Japanese Government.

Mr. Serrat of ADB brought the Evaluation Cooperation Group to the attention of participants. The Group was established in 1996. It regroups the heads of evaluation in the multilateral development banks, as well as observer members, and meets every six months to: (1) strengthen the use of evaluation for greater effectiveness and accountability, (2) share lessons from evaluations and contribute to their dissemination, (3) harmonize performance indicators and evaluation methodologies and approaches, (4) enhance evaluation professionalism within the multilateral development banks and to collaborate with the heads of evaluation units of bilateral and multilateral development organizations, and (5) facilitate the involvement of borrowing member countries in evaluation and build their evaluation capacity. ADB has revamped the communication platform of ECG, and enhanced the flow of communications. In this context, Mr. Serrat cautioned that there may not be a good justification, as some participants had queried, for particularizing evaluation approaches at the country or sector level. Rather evaluation agencies should keep abreast of developments in evaluation methodologies and approaches.

The speaker from the floor agreed that standards and common criteria should not be viewed as a constraint, but rather a practical tool and a means of promoting effective dialogue.

3. Adoption of Co-Chair’s Summary

Prof. Hirono read out the Co-Chair’s Summary, and it was adopted with the full approval of the participants.

Prof. Hirono emphasized some major points agreed in the Co-Chair’s summary, and hoped to have opportunities for the further dialogue in the future with the continuous support from

Japanese government. Madam Norani concluded that she also hoped this kind of international discourse would continue in-house for the benefit of all countries.

Appendix 1: Workshop Program

28 November 2007 (Wednesday)		
AM	Plenary session 1: Opening <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Co-chairs’ Opening Address● Welcome Speech by the Japanese Representative● Presentation: Japan’s Official Development Assistance (ODA) to Malaysia● Presentation: Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness● Presentation: DAC Evaluation Quality Standards	
Noon	Lunch Break	
PM	Working Group A ‘Institutional Evaluation Capacity Development- 1’ Co-Chair: Mme. Norani and Prof. Hirono (Presentations) <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Viet Nam● The Philippines● Sri Lanka	Working Group B ‘Human Resource Development for Enhanced Evaluation Capacity- 1’ Co-Chair: Mme. Dr. Abas and Prof. Muta (Presentations) <ul style="list-style-type: none">● JICA● ADB● Nepal
	Coffee Break	
	Working Group A (continued) ‘Institutional Evaluation Capacity Development- 2’	Working Group B (continued) ‘Human Resource Development for Enhanced Evaluation Capacity- 2’
Evening	Reception	
29 November 2007 (Thursday)		
AM	Plenary session 2: Closing <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Reporting Back to the Plenary by the Chairpersons of Working Groups● General Discussion by the Co-Chair	
	Coffee Break	
	Co-Chair’s Summary Closing	

Appendix 2: List of Participants

Partners

COUNTRY	ORGANIZATION	TITLE	NAME
Bangladesh	Ministry of Planning Implementation Monitoring and Evaluation Division (IMED)	Director General	Mr. Md. Jainal Abedin
		Director	Ms. Rowshan Ara Begum
Bhutan	Planning Commission Planning Monitoring and Coordination Division	Planning Officer	Mr. Wangchuk Nil Namgay
		Assistant Planning Officer	Ms. Wangmo Leki
Cambodia	Council for the Development of Cambodia (CDC)	Director	Ms. Heng Sokun
		Staff member in the department of aid coordination policy	Mr. Chhan Paul
China	Ministry of Commerce	Director Executive Bureau of International Economic Cooperation	Ms. Jiang Ling
		Deputy Division Chief ASEAN Division, Department of Aid to Foreign Countries	Mr. She Weihua
India	Ministry of Finance Department of Economic Affairs	Joint Secretary	Mr. Kumar Sanjay Krishna
Indonesia	Ministry of National Development Planning National Development Planning Agency (BAPPENAS)	Head of Sub Directorate/Deputy Director for Asian Bilateral Funding Directorate of Bilateral Foreign Funding Senior Planner	Mr. Kurniawan Ariadi
		Directorate of System and Procedure of Development Funding	Mr. Bambang Triyono
Laos	Department of International Cooperation Committee for Planning and Investment	Deputy Director General	Mr. Houmphanh Soukprasith
		Acting Director of Asia Pacific Division	Ms. Saymonekham Mangnomek
Nepal	Ministry of Finance Foreign Aid Co-ordination Division	Under Secretary	Mr. Lal Shanker Ghimire
	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Under Secretary	Mr. Yagya Bahadur Hamal
Pakistan	Ministry of Economic Affairs and Statistics Economic Affairs Division	Joint Secretary (ADB/Japan)	Mr. Zafar Hasan Reza
	Planning Commission Public Investment, Planning and Development Division	Assistant Chief	Mr. Gul Badshah
PNG	Department of National Planning and Monitoring	Assistant Director - Bilateral Branch	Mr. Karl Nil Sopol
		Aid coordinator Japan/Asia Desk	Ms. Jenny Tumun
the Philippines	National Economic Development Authority (NEDA)	Director IV Project Monitoring Staff	Mr. Roderick Mari Planta
		OIC Chief Economic Development Specialist	Ms. Marlene Roquid Vinluan
Singapore	Ministry of Foreign Affairs Technical Cooperation Directorate	Director	Mr. Tin Fook Koh
		Technical Cooperation Officer	Mr. Muthiah Kasiviswanathan
Solomon	Ministry of Development Planning and Aid Coordination	Director - Aid Codination Unit	Mr. Allan Christian Daonga
Sri Lanka	Ministry of Plan Implementation	Additional Secretary	Mr. Amarananda Abeygunasekara
	Ministry of Finance and Planning Department of External Resources	Additional Director General	Ms. Gabadage Dona Chandra Ekanayake

Thailand	Ministry of Finance Public Debt Management Office, Project Loan Operation Bureau	Director	Ms. Arunwan Yomjinda
	Ministry of Foreign Affairs Thailand International Development Cooperation Agency (TICA)	Programme Officer	Ms. Suthanone Fungtammasan
Vietnam	Ministry of Planning and Investment Foreign Economic Relations Department	Deputy Director General	Mr. Tran Manh Cuong

Donors

ORGANIZATION	TITLE	NAME
Asian Development Bank (ADB)	Senior Evaluation Specialist (Knowledge Management)	Mr. Olivier Serrat
	Country Director Lao PDR Resident Mission	Mr. Gil-Hong Kim
	Assistant Knowledge Management Administrator	Ms. Irish Cutaran De guzman
Danish Institute for International Studies	Evaluation of the Paris Declaration	Mr. Niels Dabelstein
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)	Head of Section Evaluation	Mr. Hans Erik Lundgren
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Evaluation Office	Evaluation Analyst	Ms. Azusa Kubota
Council for the Development of Cambodia (CDC)	JICA Aid Coordination and Partnership Advisor	Mr. Mikio Masaki
OPMAC Cooperation	Consultant	Mr. Keishi Miyazaki

JAPAN

ORGANIZATION	TITLE	NAME
Seikei University	Professor Emeritus	Prof. Ryokichi Hirono
Tokyo Institute of Technology	Executive Vice President	Prof. Hiromitsu Muta
Embassy of Japan	Counselor	Mr. Takuya Sasayama
	Second Secretary	Mr. Hiroshi Kusakabe
Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)	Director, Office of Evaluation, Planning and Coordination Department	Mr. Kazunori Miura
	Evaluation Officer, Office of Evaluation, Planning and Coordination Department	Mr. Masashi Yamamoto
	Resident Representative, JICA Malaysia Office	Mr. Hiroshi Umezaki
	Deputy Resident Representative, JICA Malaysia Office	Mr. Yoshinobu Ikura
Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC)	Deputy Director Development Assistance Operations Evaluation Office	Ms. Kiyo Kawabuchi
	Chief Representative, JBIC Malaysia Office	Mr. Hideo Ezaki
	Representative, JBIC Malaysia Office	Mr. Takeshi Toyoda
	Operation Officer, JBIC Malaysia Office	Ms. Florence Tan
Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA)	Deputy Director General, International Cooperation Bureau	Mr. Katsuki Oda
	Senior Deputy Director, ODA Evaluation Division	Mr. Yuichi Iizuka
	ODA Evaluation Division	Ms. Masami Fujimoto
	ODA Evaluation Division	Ms. Aya Moriya
Foundation for Advanced Studies on International Development (FASID)	Acting Director, International Development Research Institute (IDRI)	Mr. Naonobu Minato
	Program Officer, IDRI	Ms. Yuki Nakamura
	Junior Program Officer, IDRI	Mr. Hiroaki Hamana

Malaysia

ORGANIZATION	TITLE	NAME
Economic Planning Unit (EPU)	Deputy Director General, National Transformation and Advancement	Dato' Dr. Ali Hamsa
	Director, International Cooperation Section	Mdm. Norani Ibrahim
	Director, Human Capital Development Section	Dr. Gazali Abas
	Assistant Director, International Cooperation Section	Mr. Sivaneswaran Ramachandran
	Principal Assistant Director, International Cooperation Section	Mdm. Hidah Misran
Ministry of Finance	Senior Principal Assistant Secretary	Dr. Chen Chaw Min
	Assistant Secretary	Mr. Jaya Kumaran s/o P. Vengadala
Malaysian Evaluation Society	President	Mr. Koshy Thomas
	Vice President	Mr. Mahalingam Mariappan
Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ISIS)	Director-General	Dr. Mahani Zainal Abidin
	Assistant Director-General	Dr. Stephen Leong
	Deputy Director I, International Institute of Public Policy and Management (INPUMA)	Dr. Sharifah Mariam Alhabshi
	Analyst	Ms. Zarina Zainuddin

Appendix 3: List of Abbreviations

ADB: Asian Development Bank
AusAID: The Australian Government's overseas aid program
DAC: Development Assistance Committee
DANIDA: Danish International Development Agency
DID: Malaysian Department of Irrigation and Drainage
ECD: Evaluation Capacity Development
ECG: Evaluation Cooperation Group
EPC: Economic Policy Committee
EPU: Economic Planning Unit
FASID: Foundation for Advanced Studies on International Development
GOM: Government of Malaysia
HLF: High Level Forum
INPUMA: International Institute of Public Policy and Management
ISIS: Institute of Strategic and International Studies
JBIC: Japan Bank for International Cooperation
JETRO: Japan External Trade Organization
JICA: Japan International Cooperation Agency
JMTI: Japan Malaysia Technical Institute
KLIA: Kuala Lumpur International Airport
M&E: Monitoring and Evaluation
MATRADE: Malaysia External Trade Development Corporation
MDBs: Multilateral Development Banks
MfDR: Managing for Development Results
MOU: Memorandum of Understanding
MPI: Ministry of Planning and Investment
ODA: Official Development Assistance
OECD: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PWD: Public Works Department
SIMS: Slope Information Management System
SLEVA: Sri Lanka Evaluation Association
TA: Technical Assistance
TOR: Terms of Reference
UNDP: United Nations Development Programme
UNEG: The United Nations Evaluation Group
VAMESP: Vietnam-Australia Monitoring and Evaluation Strengthening Project