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Take Away Message

Participants will learn

1. Findings of the review of national evaluation systems and capacities conducted for the Philippines

2. Ongoing evaluation capacity initiatives being done to enhance capacities and systems, and to generate quality evaluation results
The National Evaluation System at a Glance

• Push for evaluations in public sector and Congress; strong in ex-ante and process but needs more work on ex-post evaluations

• Shift from input-output to outcome or results-based planning, budgeting and M&E as part of reforms in public sector management

• Introduction of performance monitoring linked to the performance incentives of employees

• Issuance of National Evaluation Policy Framework to coordinate evaluation in government

• Conduct of thematic National Plan-level evaluations and program and project-level evaluations
Implementing the SDGs

• Mainstreaming the SDGs in national and regional development plans and frameworks
• Review & identification of priority SDG targets and indicators, including baselines and targets
• Incorporating these into existing statistical systems and Results Matrices
• Identifying SDG-related priority investments, for implementation and subsequent M&E
• Reporting through the Annual Socioeconomic Reports, Results Matrices and Voluntary National Review
## Competency Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Factors</th>
<th>SDG Principles</th>
<th>Enabling Environment</th>
<th>Institutional Capacity</th>
<th>Individual Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Evidence-based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Self-Assessment Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zero</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enabling Environment (1)

• Mostly external, donors requires conduct of evaluation of funded projects. Internal demand usually comes from oversight, and implementing agencies to support planning, budgeting, to improve design and implementation, and Congress in support of policy making.

• Evaluations have been used to improve program design, expand scope, improve implementation, or provide personnel incentives, design new policies and programs, recommend ways forward.

• Planning, Financing and Budgeting agencies, and Congress taking initiative to lead evaluation activities in the government.
Enabling Environment (2)

- Varied sources of funding – development partners, agency budgets for M&E unit, HR training budget, 2-3% of program funds,
  - Centralize annually appropriated budget (M&E Fund) for conduct of evaluation studies and capacity building activities
- Procurement process and supply of evaluators pose challenge to commissioning evaluation studies
- Policy frameworks and guidelines for evaluation and results-based M&E and participation to the Voluntary National Review to report on SDG accomplishments
- National data system to support monitoring of SDGs in place; global indicators reviewed and prioritized, proxy and supplemental indicators identified, base lining and target setting substantially completed
Institutional Capacity

• M&E regularly performed by agencies but mostly monitoring and tracking of performances

• Most types of evaluation being done in government as a whole, but more on pre-project, formative evaluations

• Highly uneven evaluation capacity across agencies depending on presence of foreign-funded programs, presence of dedicated M&E unit, newness of agency, and mandates

• Agency-wide M&E policy and plan being introduced to coordinate planning & implementation, reduce duplication, harmonize standards & practice, increase learning across units

• Lack of dedicated M&E units in many agencies, absence of positions with specific M&E responsibilities
Individual Capacity

• Need for management and decision makers for better appreciation of the value and uses of evaluation; Middle managers and technical personnel tend to have better understanding of the importance and utilization of evaluation results

• Supply of evaluators from academe, government research institutes, private sector; but feasibility/evaluability, budget, and procurement issues discourage participation

• Widespread access to training provided by local institutions and multilateral agencies and international organizations

• Absence of formal courses on evaluation, and some gaps in areas of evaluability assessment, TOR and evaluation proposal preparation, contract management, quality assurance and effective utilization identified
Strengths

• Availability of data systems to support SDG monitoring & evaluation
• Issuance of policy frameworks for performance monitoring and evaluation
• Presence of evaluation capacity in sectors responsible for critical SDGs
• Linkages with development partners, non-state stakeholders and international organizations
• Supply of qualified evaluators and capacity building experts
Gaps

• Commitment and policy to evaluate the SDGs and not just to monitor indicator performance
• Leadership and central coordination is critical
• Evaluation capacity is highly uneven across agencies, although progressing as demand for capacity focus not only on tools and methods but shifting in terms of evaluability assessments, quality assurance, TOR and proposal preparation, procurement and management of contracts, and
• Awareness of SDG evaluation requirements and principles
SDG Alignment Chart

- 2 - Good
- 1 - In Progress
- 0 - Stagnant
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Recommendations

• Develop a national policy to evaluate the SDGs; endorse legislation creating a system for the evaluation of the SDGs.

• Create the Evaluation Task Force to lead and coordinate evaluation of the SDGs; provide adequate funding for a dedicated program management unit or secretariat.

• Formulate an evaluation agenda and action plan around the SDGs; make evaluation an integral part of the National Action Plan for the implementation of the SDGs.

• Strengthen the institutional base for evaluation through capacity development and collaboration with state and non-state stakeholders

• Develop capacity development strategy; provide general and specialized trainings.

• Ensure open and inclusive stakeholder engagement processes that mobilize local, national and global partners; encourage participatory approach in the evaluation of the SDGs.
Formulation of Evaluation Guidelines

- Finalization and launch of the **Guidelines for the National Evaluation Policy Framework** in the M&E Network Philippines Forum in November 2019
- The Guidelines defines the content, roles, process and timelines in conducting evaluation studies
Capacity Building Activities and Strengthening Partnerships

- Forge partnerships with various agencies and institutions (e.g. UNDP, UNICEF, DFAT-Australia, 3iE, Innovations for Poverty Action, IFAD and local institutions) for conduct of capacity building activities and assessments
- **Certificate Course on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results (UNICEF)**
- **Conducting and Managing Real-world Evaluations (DFAT, 3iE)**
- **Training on Impact Evaluation Methods (AKI, 3iE, PIDS)**
- **Procurement, TOR Preparation, Evaluation Planning, Evaluability Assessments, Quality Assurance, Managing Evaluations (UNDP, IPA, 3iE)**
- **Development of Curriculum Course and Training Modules on Evaluation (Development Academy of the Philippines)**
- **Development of Competency Framework for Evaluation (UNDP)**
Dissemination of Evaluation Findings

• Develop of a **National Evaluation Portal** as repository of evaluation studies and references

• Prepare **Evaluation Communication Plan** to monitor and track management responses on specific recommendations based on agreed timelines

• Present to the **higher policy making bodies** such as the Cabinet Secretary, and NEDA Board Committees and Development Clusters (Social, Economic, Infrastructure, Governance)
Strengthening Community of Practice on Evaluation

• Conduct of country’s Annual M&E Network Forum which serves as venue on knowledge sharing and highlighting of evaluation practices. Attended by various M&E stakeholders from government, development partners, academe, civil society and private sector. This year’s forum will be conducted in November.

• Prepare Roster of Evaluators (government institutions, private firms, VOPEs, individual consultants)

• Prepare knowledge products

• Formulate Stakeholder Engagement Strategy to identify learning needs and capacity building requirement.
Quality Assurance

- Commission to **Third Party Evaluators** to address issue of independence and impartiality

- Conduct of **peer reviews** to ensure quality of TOR proposals, methods and approaches, accuracy of data and information, validity of evaluation results and findings

- Establish **Evaluation Reference Group** (ERG-composed of representatives from Research Institutions, Agencies, DBM and NEDA) that reviews evaluations outputs of consulting firms to ensure consistency with the TOR, Evaluation Plan, and Inception Report and to ensure quality of evaluation results and findings.

- Regular **monitoring of implementation progress** at each phase of the evaluation cycle to ensure target deadlines and risk or issues are acted upon.

- Conduct of **action planning** to firm-up management responses to the identified recommendations of the study and set appropriate timelines
Ongoing and Proposed SDG-related Evaluations

Ongoing Evaluations Under the M&E Fund and Partnership with UNDP

- **Anti-Red Tape Act** – final report completed, ongoing peer review & communication plan development
- **National Nutrition Program** – ongoing data analysis, initial findings presented to partners
- **PAMANA (Peace and Order)** – ongoing data collection process, with initial draft report
- **Early Childhood Care Development** – inception phase
- **Rural Road Network Development Project** – final report completed
- **Mass Rail Transit Development Project (LRT 2)** – final report completed
- **Technical Schools Development Project** – ongoing data collection stage

Ongoing evaluations under the 3ie Policy Window Philippines (DFAT Australia)

- **Special Program for the Employment of Students** – final report completed
- **Sustainable Livelihood Program** – ongoing
- **Small Claims Procedure and e-Court Program** - ongoing
- **Continuous Trial Program/Process Evaluation** - ongoing
Output 1
Ongoing and Proposed SDG-related Evaluations

Evaluations for Tender Under the M&E Fund and Partnership with UNDP

- RoRo (Ports)
- Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (Industry/Trade)
- Climate Change Adaptation-Food Security
- Evaluation of programs and projects at the regional and local levels on various sector areas – irrigation, health, coastal resource management, ports, flood control projects

Development of a National Evaluation Agenda

- Pipeline of programs, projects and sectoral areas to be subjected for evaluation in time for the preparation of the Philippine Development Plan 2022-2028
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Strategic Evaluations</th>
<th>Enabling Environment</th>
<th>Agency Capacity</th>
<th>Individual Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3/7 evaluations commissioned</td>
<td>NEPF Guidelines drafted &amp; stakeholders consulted</td>
<td>Engagement with NEDA &amp; key agencies on evaluations has helped identify capacity gaps</td>
<td>M&amp;E Network Forum conducted annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial pipeline of evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>7/7 evaluations commissioned and 4/7 completed</td>
<td>Evaluation portal developed &amp; launched</td>
<td>NEPF Guidelines Pilot-released with coaching for 6 agencies</td>
<td>Professional learning program established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scoping study done</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluability assessment of 6 agencies’ programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>All 7 &amp; additional evaluations completed</td>
<td>Guidelines provisions adopted in budget call</td>
<td>Key agencies propose (under project or GAA) &amp; roll-out evaluations on priority programs</td>
<td>First batches of grads from key agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2020-2022 National Evaluation Agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td>2023-2028 PDP shaped by evaluations &amp; released with an evaluation agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tier 2 budget proposals backed by evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Central evaluation unit in NEDA organized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation units of key NGAs fully organized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By 2022

Evaluation Champions capable of leading evaluation in government

Final ARTA reference group meeting
Agencies have robust M&E systems and capacity to purposively conduct evaluations on programs.
By 2022

Cadre of M&E professionals strengthened to take on increased demand for evaluations
Strategic evaluations that could inform the 2023-2028 Philippine Development Plan have been completed.