



**DAC Tokyo workshop on
Evaluation Feedback for
Effective Learning and Accountability**

DAC WORKING PARTY ON AID EVALUATION

**Performance Evaluation as a Management Tool
: Indonesian Experience**

Submitted by

**Syahrial Loetan
Bureau Head for Financing Monitoring and
Evaluation, Bappenas**

**Hosted by the Government of Japan
26-28 September 2000**

*DAC TOKYO WORKSHOP and SEMINAR on ODA EVALUATION
SEPTEMBER 26 - 29, 2000*

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION as a MANAGEMENT TOOL :
Indonesian Experience¹⁾**

Prepared by :

Syahrial Loetan

Bureau Head for Financing Monitoring and Evaluation, Bappenas

NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING AGENCY
JAKARTA, INDONESIA

¹⁾ The views expressed in the paper are solely of the author and not of the Government of Indonesia

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AS A MANAGEMENT TOOL:

INDONESIAN EXPERIENCE ¹⁾

I. Introduction/Background

- a. Budget Limitation/Scarcity of Resources
- b. Efficiency and effectiveness of government expenditures
- c. Planning - Implementation - Monitoring - Evaluation
- d. Good Governance (accountability and transparency)
- e. Ex-ante evaluation as a tool to set priority

II. Current Condition

a. Policy

- SK Kep.178/K/7/2000
- SK Kep.164/K/6/2000

b. Logical Framework, Performance Indicators and Evaluation Study

c. Institutional and Organizational Arrangements

- Responsibility of line Agencies
- Responsibility of Regional Government
- Responsibility of National Development Planning Agency
(Boppenas)

¹⁾ The views expressed in the paper are solely of the author and not of the Government of Indonesia

d. Problems and Constraints

- Lack of Skill
- Lack of Coordination
- Fund Limitation
- Appreciation of the Importance of Performance Evaluation
- Absence of Data Banks

e. Learning from Case Studies

III. Government Plan for strengthening Performance Evaluation

Activities

a. Short Term/Priority Action

- Performance Indicators for all Project Proposals
- Reward and Punishment System for budget allocation
- Capacity Building
- Coordination Improvement

b. Long Term Perspective

- Institutional Improvement
- Feedback on Planning Cycle.

IV. External Technical Assistance for strengthening in-house capabilities

in Performance evaluation

- a. Technical Assistance
- b. Comparative Study
- c. Data Management/Information System
- d. Equipment/Hardwares and Softwares
- e. Others

I. Introduction/Background

a. Budget Limitation/Scarcity of Resources

After several years of development, the scale and scope of development program have become very large. The number of sectors that have to be financed have also increased. The government has limitation in financing various development program, because the amount of budget and other resources have been limited. For that reason development program have to be put in a priority list. The current condition, especially the last three years after the crisis, budget sources have become very scarce. The program that can be financed out of the development budget should be scrutinized very carefully. Performance indicators, as parts of performance evaluation, are to be used as one of the tools in choosing the proper development program. Selected programs should fulfill criteria that give positive impact on both the beneficiaries and societies.

b. Efficiency and Effectiveness of Government Expenditures

As everywhere else, the Government of Indonesia must adopt the concept of efficiency and effectiveness in implementing its development programs. The government must perform better by providing more benefits with fewer resources. One tool that can assist the government is performance evaluation. The concept of performance evaluation must evolve from concerns about resources to concerns about achievements. This is about inputs and outputs toward an examination of

how resources are properly used and giving out the outcomes, benefits and impacts.

Due to budget limitation, the government has to implement the prioritized development program with sound efficiency and effectiveness. Any possible exercises and tools should be utilized in order to guarantee the optimum achievement. Performance Evaluation is one of the planning tools that can be used.

c. Planning - Implementation - Monitoring - Evaluation

Evaluation is the final phase (sequence) of a standard planning cycle, which normally consists of the following: Planning, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation.

Planning involves setting goals and objectives, and developing strategies and plans to achieve them. Budgetting means committing resources to these ends.

Implementation entails carrying out these plans through the direction of related operations.

Monitoring and Evaluation comprise two closely inter-related but distinct functions.

Monitoring is a continuous function. Its primary purpose is to ascertain whether a program/project is being implemented in line with the plan. Monitoring is an important source of information for evaluation.

Evaluation, on the other hand, is a discontinuous function concerned with assessing the degree of which objective are being achieved and the validity of approaches.

Evaluation entails a more in depth and comprehensive analysis of a relevant information to determine not only what has been accomplished and how much, but

also how and why the achievement possible.

Evaluation can be classified into ex-ante evaluation, on-going evaluation, terminal evaluation, and post-evaluation. Ex-ante evaluation is an early effort to exercise all anticipated outcomes and impacts before the real project starts. Feasibility study is a good example of ex-ante evaluation exercise. On-going evaluation takes place at interval during the implementation and draws on the data and information gathered through on-going monitoring. The primary focus of on-going evaluation is usually on the process of implementation. Therefore the outputs of on-going evaluation can be used to make necessary adjustment in the implementation of a project for its remaining life so that in the end, the objective can be achieved. On-going evaluation on limited scale can be used as a management tool.

Terminal evaluation is the analysis of the program/project at or about the end of its life in order to determine its relevance, effectiveness and likely impact. Terminal evaluation can be carried out shortly after project completion.

Ex-post evaluation concentrates on the impacts of a project. This entails evaluating to what extent the presence of a project felt by the intended beneficiaries, although physical construction has been completed.

The planning cycle in its process should be continuous and become a closed loop. However, much in the practice we hardly find the process as a continuum. It has been good and sophisticated in each isolated activity, but it lacks in consistency in its full cycle. The most problem that has always been found is "evaluation is left behind". Or, if the evaluation is done, it has no meaning, because it has seldomly

used to improve the planning for such program or project in the future. The positive and negative lessons have not been used as feedback and put properly to improve new program or project.

The improved understanding of the achievement of government activities, and in particular, development projects, will enhance the ability of departments/line agencies and of the GOI as a whole to allocate and manage resources in a more effective manner.

d. Good Governance

In the reform-era as it is now, good governance has become an unavoidable agenda to not only the government, but also the rest of the society including other corporate institutions. Performance Evaluation in its logical-framework includes measurable indicators. If they were established from the beginning of the planning process, they would give an opportunity for all members of society to exercise the accountability because the process is transparent. The key words of success of good governance are commitment from all parties including government and society. Good governance will be effective if coordination and interpretation are in place.

e. Ex-ante Evaluation as a Tool to set Priority

Ideally all development preparation involve ex-ante activities such as feasibility study or similar of its kind. However, not all development preparation is going through

the ex-ante process. The reason for that may be due to the limited time to prepare such document or due to other practical reasons. In this process several factors, such as social, economic, political or environmental can be exercised to assure the expected achievement.

II. Current Condition

a. Policy

At the end of 1996, Bappenas (Central Planning Agency) has issued a Ministerial Decree to be used by line agencies, and institutions, including regional government involve in development planning. The decree is guidelines for the implementation of Performance Evaluation System. The main purpose of the guidelines is to focus on how to prepare or select project priority together with giving more attention to the results/outcomes, benefits and impacts. The Decree SK Kep.178/K/7/2000 is an improvement of the previous 1996 Decree. In the last one, performance evaluation has been described and elaborated in much clearer expressions including samples, to make it easier for the users.

Parallel to SK Kep.178/K/7/2000 there is another guideline on monitoring system (SK Kep.164/K/6/2000) that should be used by project managers, line agencies, as well as regional government. The guideline gives direction on what should be monitored and to whom the information should be sent, the formats, the frequencies, etc.

b. Logical Framework, Performance Indicators, and Evaluation Study

Basically, each project should have a logical framework in which one can see all indicators in each element: inputs, outputs, results/outcomes, benefits, and impacts. All indicators should be set up and agreed upon by concerned parties at the beginning before a project starts. By having those indicators at the very early stage, than one can later on measure the performance of individual project at any stage in the element of logical framework: inputs, outputs, results/outcomes, benefits and impacts.

There are two ways of measuring performance of program or project: performance indicators and evaluation studies. For a single purpose or relatively simple project the first method is sufficient.

Performance indicator is a measure of the degree of achievement towards a particular target, goal or objective. Such indicators say very little about the actual achievement of the project's anticipated results, and even less about the expected benefits.

Performance indicators cannot address all performance evaluation aspects. Some tasks, such as assessing the benefit of a development project, its longer term impacts and effects, may require a more concerted efforts, such as an evaluation study. Generally, evaluation study is used for a cluster projects or programs.

These two tracks should reinforce each other over time. Performance indicators should facilitate evaluation studies by providing more information on the

implementation of projects, and the studies should help identify new or more useful indicators.

c. Institutional and Organizational Arrangements

Each line agency/department and Provincial or District Government will organize and should be responsible for evaluating development activities within their task or jurisdiction. The Minister or Governor or Head of District (Bupati) will be the ultimate client for performance information. Bappenas as the central planning agency should be responsible in evaluating development program especially the cross-sectoral program. These evaluation studies could address important issues to the government as a whole.

Since there are so many programs or projects in each line ministry, it is not possible to evaluate all of them, it is up to the line ministry to decide. The same condition applies to each region which has many projects and programs. The evaluation studies that have to be conducted should be decided by them.

The line agencies/departments and provincial or district governments are in good position to successfully carry out performance evaluation because they are the closest party to the projects and have access to the necessary information.

Bappenas will provide overall guidance to line agencies and provincial or district government as to what extent the priorities of the GOI are relative to the performance evaluation function. In other words, what the GOI is most interested in knowing about its programs is aimed at better allocating its scarce development

resources.

In Bappenas, a steering committee has been formed to decide what kind of evaluation studies should be conducted based on the importance of the national interests. The steering committee member consist of all deputy chairman of Bappenas and the membership may be extended included other Deputy Minister of line agencies and the Governor of the Province.

d. Problems and Constraints

Since evaluation has been less developed compared to "planning", expertise in conducting evaluation is very scarce in line agencies as well as in regional government. While, the skill and expertise in the "planning" have accumulated relatively sufficient. Planning exercise is "easier" compared to evaluation exercise that require more factors. Evaluation needs expertise, data, methodology, analysis, budget, and many other back-up supports. Evaluation is an art. There is no best single way to do evaluation. To build-up the skill and expertise one should accumulate their experience in the field of "planning" first before they got the sense to evaluate.

Evaluation effort needs coordination among cross-sectoral institution and regional program. The experience shows that a lot of coordination efforts is not optimally conducted. This weakness has become one of the factors that hamper the result of evaluation.

To conduct an evaluation study, besides other factors, one that is required is a

certain amount of budget for backing up the activities. Doing evaluation exercise will require quite big amount of money. Therefore, experience has shown that budget allocation for executing an evaluation study has always been left behind. The available budget has been mostly allocated for "planning".

Concerning with monitoring and evaluation activities, Project Implementation Unit only has an interest on how to reach the project objective, but never has an interest on building up data-bank. Building up data bank requires a rigorous effort on M&E. This loophole actually should be compensated not by the project unit itself, but other structural (permanent) institution within the structural organization in line agency or regional government. By having this arrangement, data collection in the form of regular monitoring will be available on timely basis.

e. Learning from Case Studies

So far, several case studies have been conducted in order to know what we have learned from previous experience. One of the examples is an evaluation study done in Aceh Province on various projects financed out by a loan (INP-18) of OECF. Some conclusions of the study are (1) infrastructure planning seldomly incorporates human resource and other aspects. Building a school does not always go in parallel with the availability of teachers, the provision of books and laboratory equipments (2) specific needs of the region have not been accommodated properly in the planning document. National Standardization of unit cost or other facilities caused problems for implementation and beneficiaries in the province of Aceh (3) absence

of performance indicators in the early planning process make it difficult to evaluate in judging the final performance of programs or projects.

III. Government Plan for Strengthening Performance Evaluation Activities

a. Short Term/Priority Action

One of the primary steps is that all project proposals have to be consistent with all planning documents (PROPENAS, PROPEDA, and RENSTRA¹⁾). Besides that, the proposals should come together with its logical framework. The logical framework, consisting of elements: inputs, outputs, results/outcomes, benefits and impacts, contains all measurable indicators that can show and demonstrate the importance of achievement to the project or program. This measurement also has a function of accountability. Project proposal that comes without a form of logical framework should be rejected. To the project with the monitoring result that shows something under expectation should be given a punishment. The punishment can be given to those project or program which perform under expectation. Samples of punishments can vary, from not giving full budget

¹⁾ Propenas, Program Pembangunan Nasional, is a national development program; Propeda, Program Pembangunan Daerah, is a regional

allocation for the following year to changing the project management. On the other hand, project which performs higher than expectation then a reward can be given. There are many alternatives for rewards, for instance a special announcement on the project manager achievement.

Regarding capacity building, successful performance evaluation will involve three distinct levels of management:

- (1) the performance evaluators themselves, those either managing the performance indicator systems or carrying out the evaluation studies;
- (2) the performance evaluation managers, those in charge of the management of performance evaluation activities, including both evaluation studies and performance indicators, and;
- (3) the senior managers, including the Minister and Governor or Bupati (Head of District), who will call for and use performance evaluation information in decision making.

Human resources development requirements will be different at all three levels. For the performance evaluators, there will be in-house training, university courses, assignments abroad, as well as learning by doing. For the performance evaluation managers in the performance evaluation unit, who will be responsible in departments for the organization and execution of the performance evaluation function, it will not be so much training on methodology, but rather training on the

development program; Rensira, Rencana Strategis, is a strategic plan of line agency.

design, reporting and use of performance evaluation. Of course, they will have to understand in general the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation tools being used. Most of the training efforts initially will be going to this management level. For senior managers in both Bappenas and departments/line agencies, there will be workshops and seminars so they can better understand the function of performance evaluation in order to direct and use it more effectively.

Regarding coordination activities, improving coordination is really important to guarantee the optimum result of the evaluation exercise. Sharing information, knowledge and experience is prime factor for success. In the cross-sectoral issues sharing each other's experience and information is unavoidable. Otherwise, the result would not give real meaning to the process of evaluation.

b. Long-Term Perspective

The ideal planning cycle would be achieved through institutionalisation of performance evaluation in the whole bureaucratic system and mechanism. Line agencies as well as regional government should have a permanent structural unit/body in charge and responsible to do the task of evaluation. This unit/body should have a direct access to management in order to have an impact on policy-decision maker. Within those bureaucratic arrangement, monitoring and data-bank should be guaranteed to function as optimum as possible.

IV. External Technical Assistance for Strengthening In-house Capabilities in Performance Evaluation

There are several fields of possibilities for external assistance:

a. Technical Assistance

Technical assistance in the field of performance evaluation is certainly required. Transfer of knowhow to officials of executing agencies, line ministries and regional evaluators and planners, in the forms of classical training, workshop, seminar, in-house training, are some of the alternatives. The choices depend upon the condition. The technical assistance should include introduction of appropriate methods and procedures for performance evaluation.

b. Comparative study

Although condition of different countries never be similar, visit to other countries would become one of the effective alternatives in order to draw comparative lessons from other's experience. The comparative study would open a new spectrum to improve policies especially in resource allocation.

c. Data Management/Information System

Improvement of data management/information system is one of key elements to support the success of implementation of performance evaluation. Data and

information is relatively sufficient. However, they are scattered almost everywhere. There should be an alternative to access those information so that they can be used effectively.

d. Equipment/Hardwares and Softwares

Evaluation works require supporting tools including computers, ancillary equipment and softwares. Besides, development of computerized information system for storing and retrieving post-evaluation findings is needed. Latest techniques and methodologies can make jobs easier.

e. Others

Budget support is required to conduct several case studies in selected areas of interests. It may be an evaluation study to know whether the programs designed to overcome the crisis have reached their target groups on low income people. Or, an evaluation study to find out the effectiveness of rural infrastructure development in improving poverty alleviation, etc.

Reference provided by Mr. Tungpalan, Director, Public Investment Staff, National Economic & Development Authority, Philippines

Guidelines on Incorporating Results Monitoring and Evaluation in the ICC Approval Process¹

I. *Policy Framework*

NEDA Board Resolution No. 3, series of 1999, mandates the ICC and implementing agencies to report on project outcomes and impact towards ensuring that the objectives of development projects are indeed achieved.

The Medium Term Philippine Development Plan, 1999-2004 provides for the setting up of an effective public expenditure management system. Among others, this would involve establishing a system to enhance data collection and reporting of outputs and outcomes of agency programs and activities.

Along similar lines, the DBM has introduced a performance-based budgeting process.

This set of guidelines therefore responds to these mandates.

II. *Requirements*

In addition to meeting the requirements of technical, financial, economic, social, and operational viability of proposed projects, proponent agency proposals shall incorporate Results Monitoring and Evaluation (RME) in their submission of project proposals to ICC.

1. Preparation and submission of a Project Framework²

All project proposals shall include a Project Framework (ICC-PE Form 6) with the following information:

- (i) an explicit statement of goal(s) and project purpose;

The goal represents the long-term development objective of the project and relates to the ultimate reason for the project. Goal achievement would then constitute project impact.

¹ As approved by the NEDA Board, 17 December 1999.

² This represents a simplified Logical Framework Matrix or a project LOGFRAME as used in various literature

The project purpose represents the immediate-term development objective(s) of the project, the outcome expected shortly after completion of project implementation. The project outcome stems from the actual use of project outputs by project beneficiaries. In turn, the sustained outcomes is expected to contribute to achieving the longer-term impact.

Entities and events other than those directly controlled by the project influence the likelihood of achieving outcomes and longer-term impact.

- (ii) the measurable outputs the project will produce;

The project outputs refer to the project deliverables, arising from the activities carried out with project resources. The implementing agency is directly responsible for accomplishing the outputs, within approved specifications, budget and timeframe.

- (iii) a set of indicators and corresponding targets for items (i) and (ii);

To objectively measure progress against expected results, a set of key indicators shall be pre-identified for project goal, development objective, and outputs. For goal and objective, the number of indicators should be between three to five. In general, there would be one indicator for each output.

For each selected indicator, the proponent shall establish a baseline value (obtained prior to project implementation) and target values expected to be achieved over the life of the project. In essence, the indicators and the corresponding targets provide the basis for measuring project success.

- (iv) the means of verification for item (iii);

The proponent shall submit an M&E Plan that describes in detail how data required by the set of indicators will be obtained and by whom, the specific sources of data (whether primary or secondary), the frequency of data collection, and how data will be processed, reported, and used in managing project implementation.

- (v) key assumptions for which targets could be achieved and possible risks that could lead to project failure.

It is important that the proponent specify the underlying key assumptions that would contribute to the achievement of targets. These represent the necessary conditions to project success. Corollarily, the proponent must assess what risks could occur that would undermine project success.

2. Reporting on Progress with Expected Results

Should the project meet ICC approval and the project eventually is implemented, the implementing agency (IA) shall submit to NEDA the corresponding RME report, consistent with the approved Project Framework.

- (i) Shortly after project start-up but not beyond the first year of implementation, the implementing agency shall submit to NEDA a confirmed, updated Project Framework and baseline data on the performance indicators. Adjustments from the ICC-approved Project Framework shall reflect changes in actual/current project conditions, including those in the broader environment within which the project is situated. Any such deviation shall be explained clearly.
- (ii) An annual RME report on the project shall be prepared and submitted by the implementing agency to NEDA not later than October 30; this shall be integrated into the Annual ODA Portfolio Review conducted by NEDA, as mandated by RA 8182 or the ODA Act of 1996.

Where indicators do not have annual measurements, the IA shall provide an assessment of the likelihood of achieving project outcomes.

- (iii) Upon completion of project implementation, the IA shall include in its implementation completion report an assessment of project outcome and the likelihood of achieving the expected longer-term impact.
- (iv) Should the ICC deem appropriate, the IA shall provide for the conduct of an impact assessment of the project.

3. Organizational and Institutional Arrangements

The IA shall describe the organizational and institutional set-up for implementing the project's RME within the context of the

agency's regular planning and M&E process, delineating clearly responsibilities among its organic units and other entities (other agencies, LGUs, beneficiaries) for meeting RME requirements.

4. Funding

The IA shall provide the necessary funding out of its agency budget and/or project resources to meet the requirements of implementing the RME for the project. The estimated cost and source of funding shall be presented along with the Project Framework during ICC appraisal.

III. *Institutional Support*

The ICC Secretariat shall provide technical assistance to implementing agencies, towards meeting RME requirements. The ICC may likewise issue additional guidelines on RME.

IV. *Effectivity*

Recognizing RME capacity has yet to be expanded among IAs, the RME shall initially be carried out with ongoing foreign-assisted projects (FAPs) starting CY 2000. Implementing agencies shall therefore undertake to retrofit existing M&E systems to handle RME.

Effective June 2000, implementing agencies shall include a duly accomplished Project Framework and M&E Plan for each proposed project submitted to ICC.

Investment Coordination Committee
National Economic and Development Authority

Project Title :

	Indicator/Targets	Means Of Verification**	Key Assumptions/ Risks
1. Goal			
2. Purpose			
3. Outputs			

* Items may be abstracted from the Project's Logical Framework, where available

** Please attach an expanded description of the M&E System that would be adopted to meet the RME requirements.

Results Monitoring and Evaluation

1. Definition of RME

Results Monitoring and Evaluation (RME) is a development management approach aimed at enhancing the likelihood of achieving the desired outcomes and longer-term impact of development projects. RME enables agencies to assess the effectiveness of projects with respect to their development objectives.

The RME process encompasses the project development cycle, explicitly linking one phase to another, and consistently focusing on the planned results.¹ This contrasts with the input-output monitoring commonly adopted, whereby the main focus is on project activities and outputs, with emphasis on meeting project specifications within the given timeframe and budget.

RME is a project design instrument that explicitly adopts a set of performance indicators of project outcome and impact, defined at project preparation stage, and agreed to between the proponent and the approving authority (the ICC). The indicators provide measurement of project success.

2. Variants of RME

- a. Benefit Monitoring and Evaluation
- b. Objectives-Oriented Project Planning (ZOPP)
- c. Goal Achievement Matrix
- d. Project Cycle Management
- e. Strategic Objectives Results Review
- f. Project Performance Management System

3. Common Elements among RME Variants

- a. Use of a Logical Framework (LOGFRAME) as a design and M&E instrument
- b. Explicit use of performance indicators or objectively verifiable indicators (OVI)
- c. Adoption of systematic but quick reliable and inexpensive means of verification (MOV)

¹ In this context, results refer to outcomes and longer-time impact arising from the use of project outputs.

Glossary of Terms

Appraisal - critical external review of a proposed project in order to arrive at a conclusion regarding the feasibility and desirability of pursuing the project

Baseline information - information obtained prior to project implementation to describe pre-project conditions, particularly on items where changes are to be measured over the project life

Evaluation - periodic assessment of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and impact of the project in relation to stated development objectives

Goal - the long-term development objective of the project which relates to broader sector and/or country concerns

Impact - a state of change over a reference point (baseline or time period), arising from the production of project outputs and other external events. Impact may be classified as short-term impact (also referred to as effects or outcomes) or longer-term impact (when related to achievement of goal)

Indicators - measurement instruments/devices which can facilitate concise, comprehensive and balanced judgment about a situation

Inputs - the activities/tasks to be undertaken and the resources available to produce the outputs

Logical Framework - a project design instrument which clarifies the basic logic of the project, presented in a grid format to show the cause-and-effect linkages among project's inputs, outputs, purpose and goal

Project Framework - a simplified Logical Framework Matrix, reflecting project goal, purpose, and output and their corresponding indicators

Project Output – project deliverables arising from the activities carried out with project resources

Project Purpose – the immediate-term development objective of the project, the immediate reason for the project; the outcome expected shortly after completion of project implementation

Results – outcomes and longer-term impact arising from the use of project outputs

Results monitoring and evaluation – a development management approach aimed at enhancing the likelihood of achieving the desired outcomes and longer-term impact of development projects

Target – an explicit statement of results desired for an indicator over a specified period of time

ODA Evaluation Study Group was established this July to discuss ways to further improve Japan's ODA evaluation system. The Group is an advisory body to Director General, Economic Cooperation Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan. The evaluation feedback system, policy-level and program-level evaluation are among the major subjects.

The following are main points in our discussion on the strengthening of the feedback system:

**MAIN POINTS IN OUR DISCUSSION
ON
STRENGTHENING OF FEEDBACK SYSTEM**

1: Establishment of an effective "Feedback Mechanism" in our aid organizations.

- A mechanism such as a committee should be set up to feedback effectively evaluation results. To make the best use of evaluation results, the evaluation department should act promptly on policy recommendations or lessons learned from evaluations.
- For example, a committee should include senior policy makers, senior evaluation department and operational department staffs.
- Information on evaluation results should be centrally managed by the evaluation department and disseminated among all concerned for application of lessons learned.
- A data-base system and/or a collection of lessons learned should be developed as a reference and possible use for their application.
- There should be regular liaison meetings between project management and operational staff to respond expeditiously to the emerging problems and to adapt effectively to future policy changes.

2: Importance of having a "Positive Evaluation Mind" to feedback whatever we have learned.

- Policy makers, project management staffs, operational department staffs involved with ODA projects, programs and policies should have an "Evaluation Mind" to make the best use of the evaluation results.
- They need to understand that the evaluation process can and should be used as a tool to change policies, and to better manage programs and projects.
- The value of evaluation works should not be based on the thickness, quantity of evaluation reports. Instead, the assessment should be made on how much impact and influence the evaluation results have on improvement of present programs, projects and future ODA policies.

3: More attention to transparency and beneficiaries.

(In a broader sense, feedback includes feedback to the public and beneficiaries in developing countries.)

- Evaluation results should be open to the public of donor countries and beneficiaries of developing countries. The evaluation results should be more transparent. For this purpose, we should make the best use of Internet and website facilities.
- Participation of the private sector in evaluation and active involvement of beneficiaries (developing countries) are highly desirable to make successful the outcome of evaluations.
- There should be more opportunities to include views and opinions of developing countries in order to feedback the findings more effectively.



efela: evaluation feedback for effective learning & accountability

536

workshop summary

Geoff Barnard
Catherine Cameron

Context of the discussion

- Very well organised and chaired
- A great deal of useful discussion and sharing of experience
- High degree of frankness and openness
- Recognition that all agencies need to do better
- Differences between agencies underlined:
 - ... *one medicine cannot cure all patients*
- Important challenges laid down:
 - *partnership, demand side*

Learning & Accountability

- Views differed on relationship and on relative importance
- Attitudes depends on where agency backgrounds, positioning of evaluation units, and who their key stakeholders are
- There are differences in approach
- Not an “either/or” situation - both are vital
- Learning is the new frontier

Obstacles to learning

- **There are many obstacles** (pressure to spend, no incentive to learn, unequal aid relations, time requirement, loss of institutional memory)
- **Many are deep seated - can't be changed overnight**

Communication lessons

- **Relevance a key issue - lessons too specific or too general**
- **Timeliness crucial - “too much too late” - value of mid-term and thematic evaluations**
- **Tendency to be supply driven**
- **Language a key constraint**
- **Face to face communication the most effective - but how to scale up?**
- **How lessons extracted and phrased crucial**
- **Need for specialist skills**

Status of evaluation units

- **Status within agency a big determinant of impact**
- **Decentralisation has a downside**
- **Hot debate over pros and cons of independence**
 - ... some say it's fundamental
 - ... others that it can be a hindrance (if it gets in the way of partnership and dialogue)
- **Is it possible to combine full independence and true partnership?**
- **Pros and cons involved in rotation of staff between evaluation units & operations**

Institutionalising lesson learning

- Useful examples presented
- Essential if real progress is to be made ...
learning cannot be optional
- But recognition of the obstacles (ritual use of evaluation, “dialogue with the deaf”, lack of incentives to learn)
- Senior management has to champion this
- and recognise it may mean working in different ways

Target audiences

- **Crucial to identify audiences clearly - more attention needed, and earlier in the process**
- **Long list of audiences identified - relative importance varies**
- **Some interesting ones key ministers, consultants, NGOs (protectors of global public goods), “ordinary Japanese housewives”**
- **Careful targeting allows intelligent tailoring**

Disclosure

- **Wide consensus on its desirability**
- **Not all agencies so good at it in practice**
- **There are obstacles - but benefits in long term make it worth it ... examples from Congress, the media**

Media

- **Need to use the media but not be used by it**
- **Openness pays in the long run - builds trust and creates opportunities**

Stakeholder involvement

- **Vital but a big challenge**
- **Needs to start at beginning of project cycle**
- **Complicated, takes time, which stakeholders? needs new attitudes and skills**
- **Involvement in monitoring may be more important to partners than evaluation**
- **Risks involved - personal and institutional**
- **Essential if rhetoric of stakeholder involvement (and PM&E) to become a reality**

Changing aid landscape

- **Many aspects - conflict, corruption, governance, globalisation ... SWAPs, CDF, PRSPs**
- **An important reality - changing fast, rhetoric ahead of the reality**
- **Responses require time, but pressure on to deliver lessons now**
- **Presents new opportunities - eg aid effectiveness debate, more inter-agency sharing, opportunities for real partnership**

KM & RBM

- **Enthusiasm and practice varies**
- **Evaluation departments can play a role as advocates of new approaches**
- **Mixed views on how active this role can be**

Internet/intranet

- Widely seen as useful addition to the toolkit
- Needs to be used well - a lot to be learned
- Work being done on better data mining techniques.... search engines, new data storage and retrieval approaches, pop up reminders
- But limits also accepted ... accessibility to key audiences, tendency to be supply driven
- Not a panacea or a substitute

Inter agency data sharing

- **DAC Inventory an important first step**
- **Call for a fresh look at DAC Inventory**
- **Decentralised approach with a central search facility may be more effective**
- **Global Gateway ???**

Resourcing

- A question of time rather than money
- New skills needed
- **DO LESS BUT DO IT BETTER**

Closing Address by Mr. Yushu Takashima,
Vice President of Japan International Cooperation Agency
For
DAC Tokyo Workshop
on
Evaluation Feedback for Effective Learning and Accountability

Mr. Niels Dabelstein, Chair of the DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation, distinguished members of the Working Party, invited guests from southern partners, ladies and gentlemen,

It is my great honor and pleasure to say a few words at the end of the DAC Tokyo Workshop on Evaluation Feedback for Effective Learning and Accountability.

First of all, I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude to all the participants attending here today for their strenuous efforts which have led to lively discussions during the workshop since Tuesday. I also would like to extend my special thanks to the facilitators of the workshop headed by Mr. Ryokichi Hirono, Professor Emeritus, Seikei University, for their excellent guidance and coordination in each session of the discussions. I would also like to express my deep appreciation for the valuable support and cooperation extended to us during the organization of this workshop by members of the Steering Group and the DAC Secretariat.

During the past three days, we mainly focused on discussing three critical issues regarding evaluation feedback, namely, internal feedback, external feedback and sharing lessons learned effectively among donors, multilateral organizations and partner countries. In order to share experiences and good practices of donors, multilateral organizations and partner countries on these issues, we had in total thirteen presentations on

various aspects of the issues. All these presentations provided us with very useful information and keen insights for further analyses of these issues, and formed a very important basis for the subsequent discussions in the working groups in each session. I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to all the presenters for their special contribution to the workshop.

I would also like to mention that the information we gained from the workshop is also very useful for officials of the Government of Japan to prepare for conducting policy evaluation which our Government decided to introduce to all Ministries from the next year as a part of the administrative reform of the central government.

I am very pleased to mention that there were approximately fifty participants in the workshop including eight invited participants from five partner countries in Asia. Japan financially supported participation of six delegates and the Asian Development Bank kindly funded the costs for the other three delegates from partner countries. Moreover, in addition to the participation of regular members and observers of the Working Party and these partner countries, we have one participant from The Republic of Korea, one participant from the Food and Agriculture Organization and two participants from the International Fund for Agricultural Development in this workshop.

I believe that all these contributions and joint efforts among donors, multilateral organizations and partner countries have made this workshop successful. On behalf of the host country, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all the participating organizations for their invaluable collaboration with us.

It is my sincere hope that the fruits of this workshop will facilitate further discussions in the DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation and

promote substantial actions by respective organizations to improve evaluation feedback for effective learning and accountability.

Finally, I wish you a pleasant return journey to your home with fond memories of your stay in Tokyo.

Thank you.

(end)

(仮訳)

記者発表

廣野東京ワークショップ議長
デーベルスタインDAC評価作業部会議長

評価に関するDAC東京ワークショップ

日本は、9月26日から28日まで「効果的な学習と説明責任のための評価のフィードバック」に関するDAC東京ワークショップを主催した。これは日本が主催する初めての評価に関するDACワークショップである。このワークショップの前日(25日)には、日本評価学会が設立された。

DAC加盟国、多国間の開発援助機関・開発銀行及びアジア諸国(6ヶ国)から、80名の関係者が集まり、ODAの評価結果のフィードバックについて議論を行った。日本からは、外務省、JICA、JBICの他に関係政府機関の関係者がこのワークショップに参加した。

多くの開発援助機関は、援助のプログラムや援助政策の効率性及び有効性の改善のために努力している。これらの機関は、かかる努力のために評価の果たす中心的役割を認識するとともに、教訓から学ぶことの重要性とそれらの教訓を更に援助プログラムを改善するために活かすことの重要性について認識した。

ワークショップの参加者は、ODA評価の結果を援助国と途上国における政策決定者、援助実施管理者、国民、更にはメディアに対して知ってもらふ経験について意見交換を行った。

これらの議論における注目すべき主要点は、次の通り。

- 現在の評価のフィードバック体制は、援助国や被援助国における広範な利害関係者の必要性を十分満たすために更に改善される必要がある点について認識の一致を見た。適切なフィードバックの仕組みとして開発援助機関において上層部の政策決定者が十分教訓を学べるようにすべきである。
- 評価の成功した点と改善すべき点を知ってもらふ上で透明性の重要性が強調された。また、評価のフィードバックをより透明にすることによって、開発の分野における挑戦や課題についての国民の理解が深められる。
- 被援助国を評価のフィードバックの仕組みの中に取り組むことが不可欠である。途上国のキャパシティー・ビルディングを進めることが極めて重要である。援助計画の立案、モニタリングや援助戦略において評価のフィードバックが活かされることが必要である点について広範な合意が見られた。これによって援助の有効性が改善され、

また、国民に対する説明責任が増すことになる。また、必要な指標を設定し、収集することの必要性も強調された。この会合と同様なワークショップが途上国の開発援助機関及び利害関係者と援助国の開発援助機関の評価専門家が参加して開催されるべきことが提案された。

●適切なフィードバックなくして、評価の存在理由とその意義は失われる。ODA評価の真の意味は、その評価がいかに現在のプログラムや将来の援助政策に反映されるかによって、判断されるべきである。

●ワークショップの参加者は、新たな援助を取り巻く環境（例えば、紛争、ガバナンス（統治）、人権等）や援助の形態や情報技術の進展等によってもたらされた新たな課題や機会について議論を行った。

OECD・DAC評価作業部会は、ワークショップの結果と議論の意義について11月22日～23日に開催される評価作業部会の会合において議論を行う予定である。東京ワークショップの議論の報告書にとりまとめられ公表される。

それぞれの関係機関は、今回のワークショップで学んだ経験や教訓を持ち帰り、それぞれの置かれた環境においていかなる対応が可能かについて検討する。

Press Release
by Prof.Hirono, Chairman of the Workshop and Mr.Dabelstein, Chairman
of the OECD/DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation

DAC Tokyo Workshop on
“Evaluation Feedback for Effective Learning and Accountability”
26-28 September 2000

Japan hosted the DAC Tokyo Workshop on “Evaluation Feedback for Effective Learning and Accountability” on 26-28 September 2000. This was the first time Japan hosted a DAC Workshop on evaluation. This Workshop coincided with the establishment of the Japan Evaluation Society on 25 September.

Eighty representatives from DAC¹ countries, multilateral development agencies and banks, and participants from six Asian countries met to discuss and share experiences in the feedback of evaluation results. From Japan, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan International Cooperation Agency, Japan Bank for International Cooperation, together with other government agencies, participated in this Workshop.

Many development agencies are seeking to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of aid programs and aid policies. They recognise the central role of evaluation in these efforts and the importance of learning lessons and feeding back those lessons for the improvement of implementation and preparation for better aid programs.

The Workshop participants shared experiences on communicating evaluation results to policy makers, operational managers, the public and the media in both donor and partner countries.

Some highlights of their discussions include:

It was generally recognised that present feedback systems should be further improved to meet the needs of wide range of stakeholders in donor and partner countries. Proper feedback mechanisms should involve senior policy makers in the lesson learning process in development agencies.

The importance of honesty and transparency in reporting evaluation successes and failures was underlined. The public’s understanding of the challenges involved in development cooperation will be enhanced by transparent evaluation feedback.

Engaging partner countries in evaluation feedback systems is essential. The need for capacity building in partner countries is crucial. There was a wide consensus on the need for integrating evaluation feedback into the planning and monitoring programs and strategies in partner countries. This would improve development effectiveness and enhance accountability. The need for establishing and collecting the necessary indicators was also underlined. It was suggested that similar workshops

¹ DAC members are Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States and Commission of European Communities.

should be held involving development agencies and stakeholders in partner countries as well as development agency evaluators.

Without proper feedback, evaluation loses its life and value. The real value of evaluation should be assessed by the impact it has on the improvement of present programs and on future aid policies.

Participants discussed the new challenges and opportunities in evaluation feedback brought about by the new aid landscape (such as conflicts, governance and human rights issues), new ways of delivering aid and new information technology.

The OECD/DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation will consider the results of the Workshop and their implications at its next meeting on 22-23 November 2000. A publication with a summary of the Tokyo Workshop will be prepared. Individual agencies will take home experiences and lessons discussed at the Workshop for possible adaptation in their domestic context.

(参考)

DACの評価ワークショップ・NHK総合テレビ報道振り

(9月26日(火)午後5時から冒頭約1分間)

26日午後5時よりNHK総合テレビニュースにて、「発展途上国への効率的援助を協議」というキャプションのもと、本件会合について以下の報道があった。

「ODA、政府開発援助のあり方を検討するDAC(開発援助委員会)の会合が東京で始まり、各国が発展途上国への援助を効果的に実施するための取り組み等について意見を交わしました。

会合では、外務省の飯村経済協力局長が、発展途上国への経済援助は厳しい財政事情の下で効率的に援助を行うことが必要になっていて、国民からも、援助の質や透明性の向上、それに説明責任を求められていると挨拶しました。

このあと、各国がODAを効果的に実施するための取り組みを報告し、援助した事業が実際に発展途上国のために役立っているかをどのように分析して今後の事業に活かしていくかや、分析結果を国民にどう情報公開するか等について意見を交わしました。

開発援助委員会は、今回の議論等をもとに、年内を目処に提言をまとめることにしています。」

(了)

NHK reported on DAC Tokyo Workshop

Nippon Hoso Kyokai(NHK) reported yesterday(at 17:00 on 26th September) on DAC Tokyo Workshop in its TV News programme. The following is the main point of report.

"DAC Workshop to discuss ODA is now being held in Tokyo. In this workshop DAC Members discuss the ways and efforts to implement their economic assistance in more effective ways.

Director-General Mr.Limura, in his opening speech, said 'Aid effectiveness should be pursued for domestic reasons as well. Particularly, given severe budgetary constrains, the public is even more concerned with the quality of aid and ask for more transparency and accountability'.

Members reported on their efforts for more effective ODA assistance and discussed the ways to analyze and evaluate their ODA projects' usefulness and effectiveness for developing countries. They also exchanged their views for access to information on ODA evaluation results.

Based on This Workshop's discussion, DAC will issue recommendations on ODA evaluation feedback within this year".

