

**THE ASEAN AUSTRALIA DEVELOPMENT
COOPERATION PROGRAM (AADCP)**

INDEPENDENT COMPLETION REPORT

JANUARY 2009

BY DAVID BARBER AND GEORGE COLLETT

ACRONYMS

AADCP	ASEAN Australia Development Cooperation Program
AAECP	ASEAN Australia Economic Cooperation Program
AEC	ASEAN Economic Community
AEM	ASEAN Economic Ministers Meeting
AFTA-CER	ASEAN Free Trade Area- Closer Economic Relations
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
ASEC	ASEAN Secretariat
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
CLMV	Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam
EU	European Union
HRD	Human Resource Development
ICR	Independent Completion Report
ODA	Official Development Assistance
PS	Program Stream
REPSF	Regional Economic Policy Support Facility
RPS	Regional Partnerships Scheme
SEOM	Senior Economic Officials Meeting
VAP	Vientiane Action Programme
WTO	World Trade Organisation

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Independent Completion Report was commissioned by the East Asia Regional Section, AusAID. Independent consultants Mr David Barber and Mr George Collett are the principal authors of this report. The views represented in this report do not necessarily reflect the views of the Australian Government or ASEAN.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Summary Program Data

Key AADCP Details	
Form of Aid	Program
Primary Sector of program	Economic
Region/ Institution	Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN)
Country Coordinators	Thailand (2008), Vietnam and Brunei Darussalam (2002)
Counterpart Organisation	The ASEAN Secretariat
Counterpart Organisation Contact	Mr Dhannanjaya Sunoto, Bureau of External Relations and Coordination (BERC), ASEAN Secretariat
AusAID Program Contacts	Joanne Ronalds, Kerrie Anderson, Rosemary McKay, Geoff McConnell and Marilou Drilon
ICR Authors	David Barber (David Barber and Associates) and George Collett (PDM)
Key AADCP Dates	
1 August 2002	Memorandum of Understanding between the Government of Australia and the Governments of ASEAN Member Countries signed
29 March-30 June 2005	Mid Term Review of AADCP
1 August 2007	Joint Declaration on ASEAN Australia Comprehensive Partnership signed
May- October 2008	Development of Independent Completion Report (ICR)
Program Stream	
Implementing Contractor	Cardno Acil Pty Ltd
August 1999- June 2000	Program concept developed at three ASEAN Australia meetings
November- December 2000	Planning and Design Mission
January 2002	Program Stream and Round 1 Project Design Mission
26 May 2003	Commencement of Program Stream
February 2004	Round 1 projects commence
August 2004	Round 2 projects commence
October 2005	Round 3 projects commence
August 2006	Round 4 projects commence
25 May 2008	Program Stream ends
25 August 2008	Final end date of Program Stream (including 3 month extension)
Number of projects implemented	12
Initial Contract Value	AU\$19,011,486 plus GST
Final Contract Value	AU\$21,481,388 plus GST
Actual Cost (including 3 month extension)	AU\$20,379,813.63 plus GST
Aidworks ID	INF034
Final Initiative Quality Rating	4 (<i>Adequate quality initiative</i>)

Regional Partnerships Scheme	
Implementing Contractor	Cardno Acil Pty Ltd
17 July- 11 August 2000	Design Mission
13 August 2002	Commencement of the Regional Partnerships Scheme
30 June 2008	Regional Partnerships Scheme ends
Number of projects implemented	29
Initial Contract Value	AU\$15,599,986 plus GST
Final Contract Value	AU\$15,755,726 plus GST
Actual Cost	AU\$15,100,00 plus GST (estimated as at 30 April 2008)
Aidworks ID	INE979
Final Initiative Quality Rating	4 (<i>Adequate quality initiative</i>)
Regional Economic Support Facility (REPSF) Phases 1 and 2	
Implementing Contractor	MDI and from 1 November 2007, GRM International
October 2000	Phase 1 Facility Design
21 January 2002	Phase 1 Facility Commencement
5 March 2002	Team Mobilisation
21 January 2007	Phase 1 Facility Completion
3 August 2006	Phase 2 Facility Design
22 January 2007	Phase 2 Facility Commencement
31 July 2008	Phase 2 Facility Completion
Number of reports produced	58
Final Contract Value	AU\$14,414,787 plus GST
Actual Cost	AU\$12,595,842 plus GST
Aidworks ID	INE953
Final Initiative Quality Rating	5 (<i>Good quality initiative</i>)
AADCP Overall	4 (<i>Adequate quality initiative</i>)

Background

The ASEAN-Australian Development Cooperation Program (AADCP) covered the six year period 2002-08 at a cost of A\$45 million with the goal of promoting sustainable economic and social development and integration within the ASEAN region. Australia and ASEAN agreed that the AADCP should focus on addressing development challenges that were regional in nature, requiring regional solutions and which strengthened ASEAN as a regional group.

The AADCP comprised three separately designed and contracted components. The Program Stream (PS) comprised a number of pre-selected and designed projects; the Regional Partnerships Scheme (RPS) was designed as a responsive facility allowing ASEAN and Australian proponents to submit proposals for activity funding; and the Regional Economic Policy Support Facility (REPSF) was also designed as a responsive facility to address emerging ASEAN demands for action orientated economic policy analysis.

The AADCP ICR provides an assessment of the appropriateness of the AADCP design and objectives (relevance), the extent to which objectives were achieved or are expected to be achieved (effectiveness), the quality of program management and delivery (efficiency) and the extent to which the program made a difference in terms of ASEAN regional development and integration (impact).

Relevance

In general, AADCP was a relevant and important activity for Australia's aid program and its engagement with ASEAN.

Australia has significant national interests in the Asian region encompassing economic, political, security and environment concerns which are pursued through both bilateral and regional engagement. The AADCP had a clear rationale to support regional cooperation and regional economic integration. It built upon a well regarded existing program (The ASEAN Australia Economic Cooperation Program III) and expanded to include new areas of demand (economic policy research).

The AADCP preparation process ensured the close involvement and ownership of ASEC and ASEAN member country representatives in the design process; and the objectives of the AADCP are consistent with key ASEAN strategic planning documents, in particular the Vientiane Action Programme (VAP), as well as AusAID's Asia regional strategies.

However, while the rationale, intent and relevance of the AADCP objectives is clear, there are a number of limitations in the design which have impacted upon program efficiency and the achievement and measurement of AADCP outcomes. In particular, each component stream was designed, tendered and contracted separately. There was no overarching design document and no responsibility assigned for coordination or exploitation of potential synergies between component streams. Nor did the design specify the responsibility for monitoring and evaluation, either for individual component streams or collectively.

Further, the AADCP goal and objective hierarchy and the internal logic lacks simplicity, clarity and consistent terminology. The goals and objectives are ambitious, vague and difficult to evaluate. There are few clear, measurable and attributable indicators of success. There is no results framework either in the individual component streams or for the AADCP overall to assess the outcome of a large number of individual projects, activities and research studies.

Efficiency

In general, management and delivery of the AADCP component streams was well regarded by ASEC and ASEAN regional members. The program was inclusive, covering all 10 member countries; the facility model was flexible and responsive to ASEAN needs; activity selection and appraisal was transparent and disciplined; management requirements were demanding but contractor and sub contractor performance was sound and outputs were delivered to a high standard. The AADCP was valued by ASEAN stakeholders.

AADCP was also well regarded by other donors and there was good cooperation at a working level in an effort to avoid duplication and to leverage similar donor project activities.

The downside of a facility model is that activity preparation, approval and implementation is management and resource intensive. In all component streams there were multiple levels of management and reporting. The contracting model, based on administrative milestones, further added to the onerous level of process and progress reporting. Administrative costs exceeded 30% of the budget, although this is not unusual compared with other facility mechanisms in AusAID programs.¹

Cost sharing arrangements were ambiguous. The participation of all ASEAN member countries was funded in AADCP activities with nominal in-kind contributions from ASEAN (Program Stream) and activity proponents (Regional Partnership Scheme). Other donors adopted a less complicated approach where funding was not provided to workshop/training participants from states ineligible for ODA (Brunei, Singapore).

Particularly in the Program Stream and Regional Partnerships Scheme it proved challenging and costly to design and implement activities to meet the needs and the requirement for participation of all 10 member countries with different capacities and different national priorities. In most instances the type and depth of assistance that could be provided was limited to short term training and workshops and with a few exceptions, there was limited scope to assess the capacity, needs and suitability of attendees.

The AADCP design did not emphasise or fund policy engagement at a technical level. There was (initially) little focus on dissemination of economic research findings and often limited opportunity to present or debate project outputs/issues at officials meetings.

¹ From The ASEAN Australia Development Cooperation Program Mid-Term Review Mission Revised Report, June 2005.

Effectiveness

The lack of an agreed, workable monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework and the broad, high level objective statements, makes assessment of component and program effectiveness (and impact) difficult.

Stakeholder interviews confirm AADCP had some notable successes at the output level. AADCP delivered quality regional economic policy analysis, small-scale demand driven activities and medium size projects in key sectors identified by ASEAN that contributed to policy development, provided input into the deliberations of ASEAN bodies, fostered regional networks and strengthened capacity. Key success factors in the delivery of AADCP outputs included sound contractor and sub-contractor management, ASEC desk officer commitment, the active participation of working groups and sound activity selection and design.

However, in the absence of a viable performance assessment framework, the extent to which many diverse, small-scale, albeit quality outputs, including research studies, policy papers, guidelines, manuals, training, etc, contributed to the AADCP high level program and component objectives is difficult to determine. The effectiveness and contribution of the AADCP to strengthening regional cooperation, assisting ASEAN economic integration, enhancing ASEAN competitiveness, and strengthening ASEAN capacity to address regional development challenges, cannot be readily measured.

Impact

The RPS and PS and to a lesser extent REPSF identified strengthened regional partnerships through the creation of public and private networks between Australian government agencies, the private sector and economic researchers with ASEAN policy makers, technical experts and agencies, as a key impact of the AADCP. ASEAN stakeholders also emphasised the importance of intra-ASEAN regional networks strengthened through AADCP activities that involved face-to-face contact.

While not an explicit objective of the AADCP, both Australian and ASEAN stakeholders indicated the creation of linkages was an important outcome of the AADCP and supported the processes of intra ASEAN integration and sustainable development as well as ASEAN engagement with Australia as a dialogue partner and trading partner.

Building relationships and networks are clearly important for advancing most ASEAN regional agendas, but ultimately regional activities will only have an impact if agreements are implemented at the national level.

Some estimates suggest that currently there are in excess of 100 regional agreements supported by ASEAN/ASEC that are yet to be implemented nationally. ASEC has only a regional mandate and there are no formal processes or penalties within ASEAN for non implementation of regional agreements by member countries.

The AADCP design provided no specific support for national level implementation of agreements, detailed assessment of national policy implications, or support for national policy development and legislative reform, capacity building of key national agencies, or monitoring of national implementation and compliance. The contractor Completion Reports acknowledge that the impact of regional activities is compromised by an inability to provide support for national implementation.

The sustainability of AADCP benefits is difficult to assess. ASEAN has identified five stages or building blocks for regional integration. Most AADCP activities (and those of other donors) contributed through policy formulation and capacity building to the early stages of ASEAN integration (confidence building and harmonisation) reflecting in large part ASEAN's own progress towards integration. ASEAN structures have proven durable and have benefited from AADCP support. The benefits of the AADCP will be sustainable to the extent that ASEAN continues to make progress on regional cooperation and integration.

Lessons Learned

The AADCP has been successful in supporting Australia's broad regional engagement objectives. It has facilitated and forged new and lasting private and official linkages within ASEAN and with Australia; it has political credibility both in ASEAN and Australia; and it has paved the way for other donor involvement at a regional level to support ASEAN integration.

The AADCP has been less successful against its stated (ambitious) economic integration objectives. Integration will be driven by the ASEAN countries themselves and will occur at a different pace among different countries and sectors. In the future a deeper understanding of national institutional and political constraints to implementation of regional agreements and frameworks will be required, along with national support.

A review of donor experiences of regional programs worldwide highlights the advantages of economies of scale, common standards and approaches, etc but also the difficulties in ensuring the effectiveness and impact of regional aid programs. Fundamentally, the success of regional programs depends on progress in national implementation of regional agreements.

Some of the key lessons emerging from the AADCP include:

- The importance of analysing and understanding differences in member country capacities, priorities and readiness and designing interventions to address these needs, ensuring strong links (ownership) between national and regional counterparts and, where necessary, providing support for national implementation;
- The need to develop prior to program commencement an appropriate M&E framework based on realistic and measurable objectives with a focus on outcome reporting;

- The need to adopt innovative and cost effective approaches to capacity building and provide more focussed and continuous project support through progressive engagement to minimise preparation and management costs;
- The need to clarify and adhere to cost sharing arrangements between AusAID and ASEAN/ASEC;
- The importance of greater engagement and participation with the private sector in project identification, preparation and implementation;
- The need to ensure opportunities for leverage and synergies between research studies and project implementation are maximised;
- The importance of establishing stronger linkages between AusAID bilateral and regional strategies to enhance potential synergies and avoid duplication of effort in the implementation of bilateral and regional programs;
- The importance of effective ASEAN dialogue partner coordination to reduce duplication, maximise program synergies and minimise the different donor project management systems and requirements imposed on ASEC and desk officers; and
- The need to adopt more strategic approaches to gender analysis in sectors impacted by trade and economic policies and reforms and promoting gender appropriate support or mitigative measures as required.

1. INTRODUCTION

AusAID requires that an Independent Completion Report (ICR) be prepared for all projects with expenditure in excess of \$3 million. The purpose of the ICR is to assess the performance of an activity and in particular determine what worked well and what might be done differently and more effectively in the future. By documenting achievements and lessons learned, Independent Completion Reports contribute to the needs of AusAID, partner agencies and other stakeholders in improving the effectiveness of development cooperation.

This report² provides an overall assessment of the appropriateness of the AADCP design and objectives (relevance), the extent to which objectives were achieved or are expected to be achieved (effectiveness), the quality of program management and delivery (efficiency) and the extent to which the program made a difference in terms of ASEAN regional development and integration (impact).

The AADCP ICR assessment is based on a review of available program documents, including separate contractor Completion Reports³ and discussions with key stakeholders. The ICR does not seek to duplicate preparation of the individual contractor Completion Reports or review activities in the same degree of detail. Rather the ICR has independently reviewed the assessments and conclusions of contractor Completion Reports with the aim of providing an overview of the achievements of the AADCP⁴ and in particular identifying lessons that can be applied to the design and implementation of similar programs in the future.

Stakeholders consulted in the preparation of the ICR include the prime contractors, a range of sub-contractors, relevant Australian government department officials, ASEAN Secretariat officials and ASEAN member country participants of program activities. Terms of Reference for preparation of the ICR (Annex 1), key reference documents (Annex 2), a list of activities implemented under the AADCP (Annex 3), program cost summaries (Annex 4), the ICR methodology including the stakeholder consultation strategy (Annex 5), persons interviewed (Annex 6), the participant survey form (Annex 7) and the field mission debriefing note (Annex 8) are attached.

2. BACKGROUND

Australia became ASEAN's first dialogue partner in 1974 and has provided support to ASEAN through a number of economic and development cooperation programs since that date. The ASEAN-Australian Development Cooperation Program (AADCP) covered the six year period 2002-08 at a cost of A\$45 million. The AADCP evolved from its predecessor program, the ASEAN Australia Economic Cooperation Program (AAECP)

² The ICR preparation team comprised David Barber (Team Leader), George Collett (M&E Expert), Joanne Ronalds (AusAID Desk Officer) with field assistance provided by ASEC staff.

³ Regional Partnerships Scheme Completion Report, Cardno ACIL, April 2008; Program Stream Completion Report, Cardno ACIL, April 2008; Regional Economic Policy Support Facility Completion Report, MDI, (undated).

⁴ While individual program strengths and weaknesses are identified, the Report does not seek to undertake a comparative assessment of the three very different programs implemented under the AADCP.

Phase III. The new element under AADCP was inclusion of an economic policy research component.

The Goal of the AADCP was to:

- Promote sustainable development within ASEAN by assisting ASEAN tackle priority regional development challenges through regional cooperation.

The Objectives were to:

- Strengthen regional economic and social cooperation (including macro economic and financial cooperation, economic integration, social policy formulation and systems, AFTA-CER linkages);
- Strengthen regional institutional capacities;
- Strengthen science, technology and environmental cooperation; and
- Expedite the new ASEAN member Countries' integration into ASEAN by supporting their participation in ASEAN cooperation programs.

AADCP comprised three separately designed and contracted components (the Program Stream, the Regional Partnerships Scheme and the Regional Economic Policy Support Facility), each with the same Goal:

- To promote sustainable economic and social development within the ASEAN region in line with the objectives and priorities of Vision 2020, the Hanoi Plan of Action and subsequent summit meetings⁵

Program Stream (PS)

Objectives

- To assist ASEAN integrate into one market for goods, services and investment, including the development of appropriate HRD and labour market policies; and
- To support the establishment of a regional ASEAN environment for the development of a competitive private and SME sector with a particular focus on the quality and safety of food and agricultural products

Key features

- Commenced in June 2003
- Completion date August 2008
- Estimated expenditure A\$21.5 million
- Comprised 12 medium term projects (and two consultancies) addressing issues of economic integration (5) and competitiveness (7) with a focus on agriculture and fisheries, customs, ASEAN standards and conformity, e-commerce, animal health and food safety.

Regional Partnerships Scheme (RPS)

Objective

⁵ The more important recent documents include the Vientiane Action Program (VAP) 2004-10 which introduced the concepts of economic, security and social/cultural pillars and the ASEAN Charter and ASEAN Economic Community Blueprint, 2007.

- To strengthen the capacity of ASEAN to address regional development challenges by implementing short to medium term development activities delivered through partnerships between Australian and ASEAN organisations

Key features

- Commenced in August 2002
- Completion date 30 June 2008
- Estimated expenditure A\$15.8 million
- Comprised 29 small scale collaborative activities between ASEAN and Australian government and/or private sector entities with a focus on agriculture and fisheries, finance, environment, tourism and energy.

Regional Economic Policy Support Facility (REPSF)

Objective

- To provide various ASEAN bodies and member countries with high quality, high priority and timely regional economic policy analysis.

Key features

- Commenced in January 2002
- Completion date January 2007 (Phase 1)⁶
- Estimated expenditure A\$9.5 million
- Comprised 50 research and economic policy studies with a focus on ASEAN economic integration including shipping and aviation, customs harmonisation, taxation, tourism, energy and trade liberalisation of financial services, telecommunications, etc.

AADCP was the first multi-year donor development program partnered by the ASEAN Secretariat (ASEC)⁷. ASEC has now entered into similar initiatives with other dialogue partners including the United States and the European Union.

Although its functions are nominally broader, since its establishment in 1976, ASEC's primary role has been to service the needs of ASEAN meetings - working groups, committees and summits⁸. The highest decision making body of ASEAN is the annual meeting of the ASEAN Heads of State (the ASEAN Summit). The ASEAN Economic Minister's meeting (AEM) is the main driver for establishment of the ASEAN Economic Community. The AEM is supported by the Senior Economic Officials Meeting (SEOM) and assisted by various sectoral committees and working groups. Working groups comprise member country line agency technical specialists, often drawn from the international bureau of the line agencies. Working groups are responsible for developing regional agreements and, once approved, supporting adoption of these initiatives at national level. The National Secretariats of member countries are located within

⁶ REPSF Phase II commenced in January 2007 and completed in July 2008. It had a focus on supporting economic integration initiatives among participant countries of the East Asia Summit (EAS).

⁷ Prior to the AADCP, Australian assistance was linked to specific ASEAN committees, notably Science and Technology.

⁸ The ASEC Secretary General has recently developed a proposal to re-structure ASEC and increase member country funding to enable ASEC to increase its capacity for analytical and policy work and for monitoring compliance in the implementation of ASEAN agreements.

Ministries of Foreign Affairs and are responsible for coordination of their country's regional engagement⁹.

3. RELEVANCE

Relevance refers to the appropriateness of the AADCP design and objectives in terms of recipient priorities and AusAID policies and objectives.

Australia has significant national interests in the Asian region encompassing economic, political, security and environment concerns which are pursued through both bilateral and regional engagement. At a regional level, the Asia Regional Strategies (AusAID, 2000-2003 and 2005-2009) provide a framework for Australian aid support to the region. The strategies focus on addressing priority regional development issues, enhancing regional capacity to progress economic integration, improve security and tackle trans-boundary challenges.

In 2003, ASEAN leaders agreed to the establishment of an ASEAN Community comprising three pillars:

- An ASEAN Security Community to be achieved through political dialogue, shared norms, conflict prevention and post conflict peace building;
- An ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) to be achieved through economic integration and enhanced trade competitiveness; and
- An ASEAN Socio-cultural Community involving member countries undertaking regional advocacy and cooperation in areas including public health, human resource development, the environment and natural resources.

The three pillars form the basis of ASEAN's medium term planning framework encapsulated in the 2004-2010 Vientiane Action Programme (VAP). The VAP also includes the objective of 'narrowing the development gap' between the newer members Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, Vietnam (CLMV) and other members of ASEAN.

Australia and ASEAN formally agreed¹⁰ that the AADCP (2002-2008) should focus on addressing development challenges that were regional in nature, requiring regional solutions and which strengthened ASEAN as a regional group.

The goal of the broader AADCP as well as the goal and objectives of the Program Stream, the Regional Partnerships Scheme and the Regional Economic Policy Support Facility were consistent with both ASEAN and Australian development policies and strategies at the time of AADCP design. The purpose or objective level statements applicable to each of the three component streams have been modified and updated over the duration of the program to reflect changes in priorities, the AADCP Mid-Term Review (2005) and in an attempt to facilitate better assessment of performance.

The AADCP had a clear rationale to support regional cooperation and regional economic integration. It built upon a well regarded existing program (AAECP III) and

⁹ By comparison, the counterparts for AusAID bilateral programs in ASEAN member states are aid coordination agencies/units which in most cases are separate from the foreign affairs portfolio.

¹⁰ The Memorandum of Understanding between the Government of Australia and the member countries of ASEAN on the AADCP, 2003.

expanded to include new areas of demand (economic policy research). The sector assistance provided was consistent with the VAP and following the mid-term review greater emphasis was given to CLMV countries.

The preparation process for AADCP followed normal AusAID procedures. This ensured the close involvement and ownership of ASEC and to the extent possible a range of ASEAN member country representatives in the design process.

However, while the rationale, intent and relevance of the AADCP is clear, there are a number of limitations in the design which have impacted on the implementation and measurement of AADCP outcomes. In particular:

- Each component stream was designed, tendered and contracted separately; primarily it would seem, because of the size of the AADCP. There was no overarching design document and no responsibility assigned for coordination or exploitation of potential synergies between programs, for example utilising research activities under REPSF to guide project development for RPS.
- Both the broader AADCP and the component streams have numerous goals, purposes and objectives. The goal and objective hierarchy and the vertical logic lack simplicity, clarity and consistent terminology. The goals and objectives are ambitious, imprecise, often overlapping and difficult to measure and attribute success. In some cases (RPS, REPSF) activity level objectives are essentially process oriented – that is, the logframe focus is on completing administrative tasks and outputs (eg preparing guidelines, registering requests, etc) rather than on results or outcomes of activities undertaken; in other cases (PS) the linkages between relatively small project level outputs/outcomes and higher level objectives is tenuous at best. There is no results framework either in the individual component streams or for the overall AADCP to assess the outcome of a large number of individual projects, activities and research studies.
- The responsibility for monitoring and evaluation (M&E) was not specified in the design, either for individual component streams or collectively¹¹. The limitations of M&E were identified in the mid-term Review (2005) but subsequent efforts to develop and implement a results framework had little success.
- The role of the private sector could be considered a key ingredient in successful regional economic integration. However, the AADCP design gave little prominence or guidance for engagement with the private sector.
- The AADCP feasibility studies provide no indication of efforts to explore potential synergies between AusAID bilateral and regional programs¹²; the experience of other donor regional/bilateral programs; or differences in national capabilities. At the time these issues were perhaps not viewed as particularly relevant by either AusAID or ASEC. With the benefit of hindsight the lack of focus on national implications of regional initiatives, in particular, has been a significant deficiency in the implementation of the AADCP.
- The design of the AADCP made no reference to donor harmonisation, alignment or policy dialogue. This became more of a relevant issue in the

¹¹ At the activity level the delivery and quality of outputs (as opposed to outcomes) were adequately identified and documented.

¹² Some efforts were made by AusAID staff during program implementation to align regional and bilateral programs as well as the activities of other Australian government agencies, but with limited success.

latter stages of AADCP following signature of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) and as ASEAN received increasing interest and support from other dialogue partners as progress on economic integration increased¹³. Some donor coordination occurred informally at the activity level through donor representatives and ASEC staff.

- While the AADCP objectives included social cooperation and social policy formulation only the RPS stream included support under this pillar¹⁴.

The AADCP was relevant and appropriate in terms of both ASEAN and AusAID policies at the time. The key deficiencies relate to the detail of the design and implementation strategies.

4. EFFICIENCY

Efficiency relates to the quality of program management and delivery.

In general, management and delivery of the AADCP component streams was well regarded by ASEC and ASEAN regional members. The program was inclusive, covering all 10 member countries; it was flexible and responsive to ASEAN needs; the program approach provided a sound structure for the provision of assistance; activity selection and appraisal was transparent and disciplined; and, despite demanding management requirements, contractor and sub contractor performance was sound. The resulting activity outputs, capacity building and contribution to ASEAN objectives were valued by stakeholders.

AADCP was also well regarded by other donors. REPSF outputs in particular have been useful in supporting other donor programs and there has been a close relationship and good coordination at a working level in an effort to avoid duplication and to leverage similar donor sector/project activities. However, the scope for increased donor specialisation should not be overstated. Donors have multiple interests and there will inevitably continue to be fragmentation and overlap of donor projects in key economic sectors including, finance, customs and trade.

The AADCP involved a 'facility' model for funding economic research (REPSF) and for funding small scale partnership activities in a range of sub sectors (RPS). The key advantage of this delivery model was the high degree of flexibility and responsiveness to ASEAN requirements. Flexibility and responsiveness was clearly appreciated by ASEAN stakeholders¹⁵. The disadvantage was that activity preparation, approval and implementation was management and resource intensive¹⁶. For example, the RPS assessed in excess of 150 concept papers of which around 30% were accepted to proceed to design and following further preparation and appraisal, 20% were subsequently approved for implementation¹⁷. This involved a substantial time and resource input from

¹³ ASEC is waiting on a mandate from ASEAN member countries to conduct formal donor coordination.

¹⁴ Following the midterm review ASEC confirmed the focus of AADCP should be on the economic pillar.

¹⁵ The key stakeholders in all AADCP activities were ASEC desk officers and sector working groups. Working groups meet 1-2 times per year; some are more active than others; some working groups have clear work plans, some do not. Working groups report to ASEAN senior officials meetings.

¹⁶ Funding rounds were initially held quarterly but after the first year reverted to 6-monthly.

¹⁷ Forty-five percent of the RPS projects implemented were proposed by Australian partners (of which half were private companies, and 5 out of 29 were Australian government agencies), 45% by ASEC and 10% by other ASEAN organisations.

contractor and ASEC appraisal staff. While not a facility model, the PS preparation process was also resource intensive. It involved separate design, contracting and implementation of pre-determined project concepts. Many of these required considerable subsequent efforts to modify designs to make them more relevant and appropriate to ASEAN needs.

In all component streams there were multiple levels of management and reporting. The contracting model, based on administrative milestones, contributed to an onerous level of process and progress reporting.

The administrative costs of each of the three component streams (essentially prime contractor staff involved in process management, activity preparation/assessment and management of sub contractors) exceeded 30% of the budget¹⁸. This level of administrative cost is not unusual compared with other facility mechanisms in AusAID programs.

ASEC capacity and systems for supporting the delivery of donor programs is limited. Donor numbers and budgets are growing and involve different approval and implementation processes. Desk officers service around 100 working groups and between 800-1000 meetings each year. The AADCP delivery model was labour intensive and contractor support was therefore essential¹⁹.

Cost sharing arrangements were ambiguous. The participation of all ASEAN member countries was funded as part of AADCP activities. Under PS there was a nominal 20% contribution in kind from ASEAN calculated on the basis of participant's time inputs and host country provision of meeting venues, etc. Under RPS the activity proponent (most commonly the Australian partner through nominally uncharged inputs or the ASEAN partner in kind) contributed 20% of the activity budget. The 20% charge was based on the proportion of ASEAN member countries (Brunei, Singapore) ineligible for ODA. Other donors adopted a less complicated approach – while inviting and encouraging participation of all ASEAN member countries, funding is not provided to participants from states ineligible for ODA.

In all component streams of the AADCP it proved challenging and costly to design and implement activities to meet the needs and the requirement for participation/policy research in all 10 member countries. Member countries have different capacities and different national priorities. PS and RPS activities tended to focus on workshops, short term training and preparation of guidelines and manuals. Nevertheless, informal feedback suggests all ten member countries appreciated the opportunity to participate in the program and to develop networks and relationships with counterparts from other member country agencies²⁰.

¹⁸ From The ASEAN Australia Development Cooperation Program Mid-Term Review Mission Revised Report, June 2005. The exact proportion of administrative costs depends on the classification of expenditure items as an activity expense or overhead expense. Administrative costs in some cases may have accounted for 50% or more of the activity budget.

¹⁹ The planned re-structure of ASEC and increased member budget contributions is designed to enable desk officers to undertake increased policy and analytical work and compliance monitoring of ASEAN agreements. The design of AADCP II places emphasis on ASEC systems and capacity to deliver activities rather than reliance on management by an Australian contractor.

²⁰ In the ASEAN context, face-to-face contact and building relationships is important for advancing regional initiatives.

The AADCP design did not emphasise or fund policy engagement at a technical level. There was little dissemination or promotion of economic research findings beyond the posting of studies on the REPSF website²¹ and often limited opportunity to present or debate project findings at Working Group meetings.

5. EFFECTIVENESS

Effectiveness relates to the extent to which program and component outputs and objectives were achieved or are expected to be achieved.

The following qualitative assessment of AADCP effectiveness is based on primary stakeholder consultations, a participant survey²², review of Contractor Completion Reports (that include extensive stakeholder effectiveness reviews) and program documents including the Mid-Term Review.

AADCP had some notable successes at the output level. Contractor Completion Reports and stakeholder interviews confirm sound management practices and delivery of high quality outputs. In particular:

- REPSF delivered high quality, high priority and timely regional economic policy analysis that provided input into the deliberations of ASEC staff, Working Groups, ASEAN bodies and other donor programs. These contributed, for example, to the preparation of regional action plans for air/maritime transport, financial services liberalisation and customs valuation practices; best practices approaches for telecommunications regulation; information for evidence based decisions on the extent of intra ASEAN trade and integration in priority sectors; and promotion of debate and further investigation in areas such as labour mobility and migration.
- RPS funded timely, demand driven activities in priority sectors that supported regional training and capacity development (eg intellectual property issues, counter terrorism, capital market regulation, financial risk management, project design and monitoring); development of regional competency standards (eg tourism); preparation of regional guidelines (eg water quality regulation, aquatic animal health management and bio-security, health certification of live finfish); and developed regional networks and capacity for testing and surveillance of infectious diseases (eg foot and mouth disease).

²¹ Following the completion of Phase I REPSF published a book (November 2007) on selected economic policy research, *Brick by Brick: The Building of an ASEAN Community* which contributed to the dissemination of research issues; and under Phase II a dissemination strategy was incorporated in terms of reference for all research studies.

²² A simple survey questionnaire agreed with ASEC was used to collect information from training/workshop participants from ASEAN member countries who had been involved in AADCP activities. A random sample of 16 AADCP projects was selected (6 from the Program Stream and 10 from the Regional Partnerships Stream). The questionnaire was emailed to all participants in the sample of 16 projects. The emphasis of the survey was on the usefulness and application of training skills, and other outputs such as guidelines and standards, in each participant's agency. The survey results were used to validate information provided by other stakeholders consulted and presented in the contractor Completion Reports.

- PS funded medium size projects in key sub-sectors identified by ASEAN that facilitated policy development, enhanced capacity, promoted the sharing of information and strengthened institutional mechanisms. For example, regional networks were established and cooperation promoted in areas of food safety and animal health; regional policy papers were developed to support enhancement of e-commerce and skills recognition systems; technical assistance supported the strengthening of ASEC capabilities; training upgraded the skills of trade negotiators; and production of training manuals and guidelines enhanced quality assurance programs for fruit and vegetables, fishery products and animal health disease management.

The key factors in the successful delivery of AADCP activity outputs included sound contractor and sub-contractor management, ASEC desk officer commitment, the active participation of working groups and sound activity selection and design. However, the extent to which the quality output of research studies, guidelines, manuals, policy papers, etc, contributed to the achievement of AADCP component stream and program objectives is less easy to determine.

The Mid-Term Review (2005) considered the AADCP program objectives to be only partially addressed. In particular, the Mid-Term Review noted:

- AADCP contributed to regional economic cooperation but less to social cooperation;
- There had been minimal direct capacity building of ASEAN overall, but some capacity building of officials in some member country participating institutions;
- There had been little activity in the area of science and environmental cooperation (and presumably minimal effectiveness), but more in technological cooperation in selected fields;
- There had been little emphasis on supporting accelerated integration of, and participation by, new ASEAN members (CLMV countries)²³.

A rigorous assessment of the effectiveness of the AADCP is compromised by limitations of the program design – in particular, a focus on diverse, small-scale activities (typically training modules, workshops, policy papers, preparation of guidelines/manuals, research studies, etc) that have tenuous linkages to poorly specified objectives; and the absence of measurable program performance indicators within a usable performance assessment framework.

Consequently, the ICR is circumspect about a definitive statement regarding achievement of program level objectives (although the available evidence suggests the Mid-Term Review findings remain accurate) or component stream objectives to assist ASEAN economic integration and enhance competitiveness (PS); and strengthen ASEAN capacity to address regional development challenges (RPS). REPSF may be considered to have achieved its objective – but the objective is simply process related (undertake economic policy analysis) and has no development content.

²³ In responding to the Mid-Term Review ASEC indicated that the AADCP should continue to give priority to economic sectors/economic integration, but supported enhanced assistance to CLMV countries consistent with the ASEAN objective of ‘narrowing the development gap’. This resulted in some limited but additional AADCP regional support for CLMV countries.

The difficulties in assessing effectiveness is more a reflection of failings in the program design – particularly unrealistic objectives, the constraints of working regionally and the limitations of small training and workshop activities rather than a comment on the projects/outputs delivered or the effort put into implementation by all involved.

It is noted that both the PS and RPS contributed broadly to the establishment of regional networks, information sharing, capacity building and support for the work programs of various ASEAN Working Groups through development of standards, guidelines, policy papers and manuals. The effectiveness of contributions to program and component objectives was likely to have been stronger where:

- Support was provided in sectors which were a high priority for integration with a clear strategic agenda (eg tourism, fisheries);
- The activity design was focussed with achievable outputs and objectives, and there was an established relationship between stakeholders and a credible implementing partner;
- Member countries recognised a clear economic benefit from participation and implementation of agreements;
- There was strong support from ASEAN individuals, Working Groups, institutions or regional networks to drive and achieve desired project outcomes; and
- There was national interest, readiness and capacity (human resources and funding) to implement changes and agreements proposed and adopted at a regional level.

Conversely, effectiveness of the PS and RPS component streams of the AADCP was constrained by:

- The limited scope to support national implementation of agreements adopted at a regional level;
- Missed opportunities to leverage and benefit from synergies between component streams (eg customs, trade and finance);
- The limitations in designing and delivering regional assistance, requiring a focus on common training, workshops and development of guidelines, etc. Typically, there was little opportunity to screen the suitability of participants and their capacities varied; often it was difficult to ensure continuous involvement of participants over the project life; or provide follow-up support. Similarly, there was little opportunity to investigate the capacity constraints of national institutions in the sectors concerned.

REPSF enjoyed a high profile within ASEC and was effective in producing high quality economic research studies consistent with the REPSF (process related) purpose. Most of the REPSF program was initiated by and designed to assist ASEC in providing member states with policy options. The main constraint on REPSF effectiveness in terms of the AADCP program level objectives relates to the limited extent to which the national policy needs of specific member countries could be addressed and the level of national ownership of research results given the focus on regional analysis. There was limited dissemination or promotion of research studies beyond immediate stakeholders in ASEC and some Working Groups; and there was no systematic monitoring of how research was used.

A total of 71 participants responded to the email questionnaire on how they or their agency had used skills or outputs from the PS or RPS activity (see Annex 4 for a copy of the survey form)²⁴. On average, participants had spent a total of 7 days attending PS/RPS training activities or workshops. Fifty-eight (82%) reported that they had gained skills from the activity and had used these skills at their workplace; 61 (86%) had shared these skills with their work colleagues or with other agencies (sometimes through ‘echo’ training). Forty (56%) reported that their agencies had used, adopted or further developed the outputs of the PS/RPS project (eg guidelines, standards, curriculum etc). Of the 23 (32%) who reported that their agency had not used these outputs, common reasons were that: the necessary legislation was not yet in place; it was not the responsibility of their agency; the outputs were not applicable in their circumstances; or, that the agency faced other capacity or resource constraints²⁵. A larger number (49, or 69%) claimed that their agencies would use these outputs in the future.

Respondents indicated that the strengths of the AADCP activity were:

- High quality of training provided;
- The practical nature of training or cases studies;
- The technical expertise provided for the development of guidelines and standards etc; and
- The opportunity for representatives of ASEAN member countries to share experiences and work together (enhancing regional cooperation).

Reported weaknesses included:

- The time available was too short;
- There was little or no follow-up once activities were completed; and
- Lack of support at the country level (to make projects more relevant, or to support implementation of outputs).

While most of their recommendations were specific to the concerned projects, a number of common areas were evident, notably:

- Further or extended training/workshops would be beneficial;
- Training and workshop outcomes need to be practical and relevant to the needs of member countries;
- Communication and country level consultation should be strengthened;
- There should be ongoing follow-up by ASEAN after the AADCP project is completed; and
- Further support should be provided at the national level to overcome constraints to implementation.

6. IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY

Impact and sustainability relates to the extent to which AADCP has made a difference in terms of the overall goal to promote sustainable regional economic and social development.

²⁴ A total of 76 forms were forwarded to the ICR team but these included several duplicates, and forms completed by sub-contractors or observers who were not from ASEAN member countries.

²⁵ It should be noted that not all of the PS/RPS projects focused on the production of tangible outputs that could be used by ASEAN member countries.

The RPS and PS and to a lesser extent REPSF identify strengthened regional partnerships through the creation of public and private networks between Australian government agencies, the private sector and economic researchers with ASEAN policy makers, technical experts and agencies, as the key impact of the AADCP. ASEAN stakeholders also emphasised the importance of intra-ASEAN regional networks strengthened through AADCP activities that involved face-to-face contact. Around 3000 ASEAN (85%) and Australian (15%) participants were involved in RPS activities. Similarly, PS involved around 1100 participants from nearly 100 agencies in ten countries.

While not an explicit objective of the AADCP, both Australian and ASEAN stakeholders indicated the creation of linkages was an important outcome of the AADCP and supported the processes of intra ASEAN integration and development as well as ASEAN engagement with Australia as a dialogue partner and trading partner.

Other impacts identified in contractor Completion Reports and verified by stakeholder consultations include:

- Increased sharing of information and cooperation among ASEAN member countries in key sectors (PS, RPS, REPSF);
- Formulation of guidelines, standards, manuals and research to support implementation of harmonised policies and associated legislative amendments at the national level (PS, RPS, REPSF);
- Capacity building of ASEC staff including a strengthened research ‘culture’ and research skills, improved research planning and improved quality of policy debates within ASEC and among member country representatives at Working Group level (REPSF) and strengthened ASEC project management skills including project monitoring (PS, RPS) to support regional integration;
- Strengthened ASEC management and planning capacity through the Enabling ASEAN Project (PS);
- Increased capacity of some member countries to meet World Trade Organization (WTO) accession requirements through assistance in reducing technical barriers to trade (PS).
- Increased understanding of ASEAN economic policy and reform options and implications amongst the broader ASEAN and research community (REPSF)²⁶; and
- Improved understanding of ASEAN economies within Australian research bodies (REPSF) enhancing regional cooperation.

The direct and attributable gender impacts of AADCP have been minimal. The design did not specifically target gender as a program objective. The focus on gender was largely limited to collecting disaggregated data on activity participants. Although efforts were made to encourage women’s participation in PS and RPS projects through training or workshop activities this would have limited impact on gender inequality. In the latter part of REPSF, sub-contractors were required to consider how findings and recommendations would affect gender.

²⁶ As at May 2008, REPSF research reports had been downloaded from the REPSF website more than 75,000 times.

However, the opportunity for more strategic gender analysis in the sectors and sub-sectors that were the focus of AADCP activities was not maximised. Greater emphasis could have been given to the analysis of gender and other distributional impacts of policy development in all component streams²⁷.

Evidence from donor programs worldwide supports the view that tangible impacts from regional initiatives are difficult to achieve²⁸. Some of the key constraints include a focus by member countries on national interests to the detriment of a regional vision/cohesion and a lack of recognition and support for regional institutions. In such cases progress towards regional agreements may be little more than ‘motherhood’ statements of intent or only achievable where the cross border interests of countries are compatible and major trade-offs are not required.

Conversely, successful regional initiatives are typically based on detailed analysis of the national implications of policy reforms, strong linkages (ownership) between regional institutions and national level institutions and counterparts and support for national implementation where required.

The AADCP had an agreed focus on regional issues and activities. The need to engage in a range of sectors and involve officials from all ten member countries placed limitations on the type and depth of assistance that could be provided. However, regional activities will only have an impact if agreements are implemented at the national level. Some estimates suggest that currently there are in excess of 100 regional agreements supported by ASEAN/ASEC that are yet to be implemented nationally. ASEC has only a regional mandate and there are no formal processes or penalties within ASEAN for non adoption or non compliance with regional agreements by member countries.

The AADCP design provided no specific support for national level implementation of agreements, or support for national policy development and legislative reform, capacity building of key national agencies, or monitoring of national implementation and compliance. Following the Mid-Term Review some additional but limited assistance was provided through Working Groups and in some instances nationally to CLMV countries. However, this limited short-term support was unlikely to be sufficient to address a lack of local funding and underlying institutional development and capacity needs.

Both the PS and RPS Program Completion Reports acknowledge the limited scope for analysis of the implications of national level policy reforms and inadequate support for national level capacity building, translation of agreements, training manuals, etc and distribution for use by key national agencies.

²⁷ Following the midterm review a gender specialist was engaged to conduct research on gender issues; assess how the program had impacted on gender; and provide practical advice on how gender could be better addressed under future assistance programs. ASEC noted greater efforts were required to encourage ASEAN member states to recognise and internalise gender concepts and that in accord with the gender specialist’s report (Dr Lorraine Corner, An approach to equality between men and women within AADCP, February 2008) this should include increasing the understanding of the relevance and importance of gender equality and providing the financial and human resources to support gender equality objectives.

²⁸ See for example, The Development Potential of Regional Programs, World Bank, Independent Evaluation Group, 2007; Caribbean Regional Program Evaluation, DFID, 2007.

Similarly, at least initially, under REPSF the involvement of national decision makers (ownership) in research studies was often limited, as was the dissemination and translation of key research papers and findings; and there was insufficient analysis of national implications in policy studies and/or limited capacity within some member countries to translate technical research findings into appropriate policy options for national implementation.

The PS, RPS and REPSF Program Completion Reports identify a number of instances of follow-up activities giving momentum to change at the national level - REPSF reported that 67% of research activities led to further studies and 50% were used in the development of regional action plans; and RPS reported that 27 out of 29 projects had follow-on activities undertaken by ASEC, Working Groups or ASEAN member countries - but most sub-contractors consulted were unaware of the national progress of regional activities upon project completion and there was no provision under the AADCP design for systematic evaluation at this level²⁹.

The contractor Program Completion Reports recognise that downstream impacts will only occur “...when a regional framework is integrated into a national policy framework” (PS); where greater focus and progressive engagement is possible at the sector or sub-sector level and where there is a demonstrated national interest, rather than through “a portfolio of eclectic projects” (RPS); and where research studies are relevant and appropriate to national policy formulation (REPSF).

REPSF did not include a requirement to develop a research capacity either in ASEC or ASEAN research institutions. A partnership or counterpart arrangement with ASEAN researchers would have strengthened ASEAN research capacity, although it may have affected the timeliness and cost of research outputs.

The sustainability of AADCP benefits is difficult to assess. The demands on ASEC staff are considerable and staff turnover is high. Working Groups similarly have considerable turnover in representation. Nevertheless, ASEAN structures supported by ASEC have proven durable and it is likely ASEAN networks developed and strengthened under AADCP activities will be maintained, including networks with Australian technical experts and institutions. Guidelines and manuals and the skills and knowledge of participants gained through AADCP workshops and training will need to be applied and supported in their national agencies to be sustainable. The strengthening of ASEC as an institution supported by AADCP can be expected to have lasting benefits.

Research studies provide useful baseline data and policy analysis – they remain as accessible reference documents supported by a growing research culture developed in ASEC. The broader strengthening of ASEC as an institution, supported by AADCP, can be expected to have lasting benefit.

ASEAN has identified five stages or building blocks for regional integration. Most AADCP activities (and those of other donors) have contributed through policy formulation and capacity building to the early stages of ASEAN integration (confidence

²⁹ Caution is warranted in attributing subsequent ASEAN policy initiatives, implementation of agreements or changes in regulations at the national level solely or largely to earlier AADCP support. Most donor support has had its highest impact in awareness raising and confidence building among member states – providing a basis for taking initiatives forward themselves.

building and harmonisation) reflecting in large part ASEAN’s own progress towards integration.

7. PROGRAM QUALITY

The objectives of the AADCP and component streams were poorly specified. This lack of clarity and logic compromising effective measurement is the main reason for a low rating on achievement of objectives³⁰. Similarly, while all component streams were able to measure activity outputs, this was less the case for systematically and robustly measuring outcomes at a program level, notwithstanding efforts by AusAID and the Managing Contractors following the midterm review to address deficiencies in the design monitoring and evaluation framework and the conduct of a number of ex post, mostly qualitative, assessments.

Contractor management and reporting was demanding but undertaken to a high standard. Consequently, most outputs were sound and provided reasonable value for money³¹. Lessons learned were documented by contractors and applied to subsequent activities. Technical quality was compromised only by the limitations of delivering assistance regionally, particularly a focus on short course training and workshops (PS, RPS). All activities contributed at the level sought by ASEAN for donor funded assistance – awareness raising, confidence building, supporting linkages and enhancing ‘readiness’ (and in some cases more specifically) - to the early stages of ASEAN economic integration and in this sense are sustainable.

Quality Ratings

1(a) To what degree did the initiatives achieve objectives?	
Program Stream	3
Regional Partnerships Scheme	3
Regional Economic Policy Support Facility	5
1(b) How well did initiatives contribute to higher level objectives in the program strategy?	
Program Stream	3
Regional Partnerships Scheme	3
Regional Economic Policy Support Facility	3
2. How robust was the system to measure ongoing achievement of objectives and results?	
Program Stream	3
Regional Partnerships Scheme	3
Regional Economic Policy Support Facility	3
3(a) How effectively was the initiative managed?	
Program Stream	5
Regional Partnerships Scheme	5
Regional Economic Policy Support Facility	5
3(b) To what degree did the initiatives provide good value for money?	

³⁰ REPSF is rated higher in Category 1(a) simply because component objectives were process rather than development related. Largely the processes were achieved.

³¹ REPSF is rated higher in Category 3 (b) because of its more narrow and defined focus on research.

Program Stream	4
Regional Partnerships Scheme	4
Regional Economic Policy Support Facility	5
4. How appropriate was the sustainability of the initiatives outcomes?	
Program Stream	4
Regional Partnerships Scheme	4
Regional Economic Policy Support Facility	4
5. Was the initiative of the highest technical quality, based on sound analysis and learning?	
Program Stream	4
Regional Partnerships Scheme	4
Regional Economic Policy Support Facility	5

AusAID Rating Scale: 6 – very high quality; 5 – good quality initiative (could have been improved with minor work); 4 – adequate quality initiative (could have been improved with some work).

3 – less than adequate quality (needed improvement in core areas); 2 – poor quality; 1 – very poor quality.

8. LESSONS LEARNED

A review of donor experiences of regional programs worldwide suggests that regional aid programs generally tend not to be very successful. Typically, the regional advantages of economies of scale, common standards and approaches, etc have been offset by a lack of regional vision and cohesion (political, socio-cultural, economic) by member countries; a lack of recognition and support for regional institutions and a focus on national interests.

Successful regional programs require a strong political commitment to regional solutions and strong linkages between regional institutions and national level counterparts and decision makers. Fundamentally, the success of regional programs depends on national implementation of regional agreements.

The key lessons emerging from the AADCP include:

- a. Assistance at a regional level to support development of regional agreements and frameworks is comparatively easy, particularly if it essentially involves agreement on broad principles. However, translating regional commitments into national implementation is challenging. Member countries have differing institutional capabilities and priorities and different levels of ‘readiness’; decision makers require a detailed understanding of the national implications of and constraints to regional agreements; stakeholders (including the private sector) need to be made aware of the benefits and rationale for adopting regional agreements; and funding and capacity development is often required to support national reforms and implementation³²;
- b. To assess effectiveness program design requires an appropriate M&E framework based on realistic and measurable objectives;

³² This assumes agreed project objectives/outcomes involve carrying forward regional initiatives to national implementation.

- c. Activity design needs to include an assessment of the benefits and costs of policy reform at the national level and the readiness of member states to adopt regional agreements; the roles of national and regional institutions need to be clearly delineated; and strong links (ownership) to national institutions and national counterparts established. In particular:
 - more cost effective and innovative approaches to capacity building should be considered that target relevant participants, recognise staff commitments and availability and accommodate differing national capacities and skills;
 - fewer projects and more focussed and continuous support should be provided through progressive engagement to minimise preparation and management costs and increase impact;
 - research findings should be widely disseminated;
 - greater engagement and participation with the private sector should be encouraged in project identification, preparation and implementation.
- d. The opportunities for leverage and synergies between research studies and project implementation should be enhanced;
- e. Stronger linkages should be established between AusAID bilateral and regional programs in the development and implementation of country and regional strategies. This might include consideration of the scope for supporting national capacity building, where required, to implement regional initiatives; consideration of the potential synergies (or alternatively, avoiding duplication of effort) in bilateral and regional programs. For example, a number of AusAID bilateral and regional programs address similar issues of financial reform, trade liberalisation, and customs uniformity through training programs and technical assistance;
- f. Effective ASEAN dialogue partner coordination is required to reduce duplication, maximise program synergies and minimise the different donor project management systems and requirements imposed on ASEC and desk officers. Donors are likely to maintain a focus on economic sectors and key institutions - a more coordinated and strategic approach to addressing ASEAN economic and institutional reform would increase effectiveness;
- g. More strategic approaches to gender analysis are required in sectors impacted by trade and economic policies and reforms and promoting gender appropriate support or mitigative measures as required.
- h. Cost sharing arrangements between AusAID activity funding and ASEAN/ASEC should be clarified and adhered to.

9. CONCLUSIONS

9.1 The AADCP is well regarded by ASEC, regional members and other donors. The program was flexible and responsive and, in general, the quality of outputs has been good. The approach to activity selection and appraisal was transparent and disciplined, and contractor and sub contractor performance has been of high quality.

9.2 Notwithstanding, the AADCP design had a number of limitations that influenced program performance and effectiveness. Higher level goal and objectives were unrealistic, the responsibility for program monitoring and evaluation was not clearly specified, and there was no mechanism for coordination and promoting synergy between AADCP components. Similarly, the delivery model for AADCP was labour intensive and contractor support was essential to augment the limited time available of ASEC management and desk officers.

9.3 The AADCP support in developing standards, roadmaps, guidelines and manuals in a number of key sectors has been an essential and valuable step in providing input and building confidence towards regional coordination and integration. Economic policy research has similarly contributed to regional understanding of economic integration issues in priority areas.

9.4 Nevertheless AADCP, in common with other regional programs, was constrained in its ability to support national implementation. It is largely at this level that the outcomes and impacts of regional integration will be realised. However, the different capacities and priorities of member countries affect their readiness to implement regional agreements and frameworks at the national level. AADCP had an appropriate regional focus at the time of design, but limited scope to provide support to strengthen national capacities and national implementation.

9.5 Outcomes and impacts have also been limited by the small size and short-term nature of project inputs, and the diversity of sectors covered. The flexibility and wide scope of AADCP is a trade-off against greater strategic focus and more in-depth, progressive support of fewer activities. Regional training and workshops can be effective in building networks, awareness and consensus but less so in building capacity.

9.6 The AADCP has been successful in supporting Australia's broad regional engagement objectives. It has facilitated and forged new and lasting private and official linkages within ASEAN and with Australia; it has political credibility both in ASEAN and Australia; and it has paved the way for other donor involvement at a regional level to support ASEAN integration.

The AADCP has been less successful against its stated (ambitious) economic integration objectives. Integration will be driven by the ASEAN countries themselves and will occur at a different pace among different countries and sectors. In the future a deeper understanding of national institutional and political constraints to implementation of regional agreements and frameworks will be required, along with national support.

ANNEX 1

INDEPENDENT COMPLETION REPORT

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Background

Australia's relationship with ASEAN dates back to 1974 when Australia became ASEAN's first Dialogue Partner. Over the past six years, Australia has supported ASEAN through the ASEAN Australia Development Cooperation Program (AADCP). This is a \$45 million program (2002-mid 2008), which aims to promote sustainable development within ASEAN by assisting them to:

- strengthen regional economic and social cooperation (including macro-economic and financial cooperation, economic integration, social policy formulation and systems, AFTA-CER linkages);
- strengthen regional institutional capacities;
- strengthen science, technology and environmental cooperation; and
- expedite the new ASEAN Member Countries' integration into ASEAN by supporting their participation in ASEAN cooperation programs.

The AADCP consists of three components: Program Stream (a program of inter-related activities addressing issues of ASEAN economic integration and competitiveness); Regional Partnerships Scheme or RPS (a flexible mechanism for smaller collaborative activities); and the Regional Economic Policy Support Facility or REPSF 1 (an economic policy research facility).

Program Stream

The Program Stream commenced in June 2003 and is expected to end in August 2008. It has a current budget of \$21.4 million. The objective of the AADCP Program Stream is twofold:

- to strengthen ASEAN economic integration by assisting ASEAN in its efforts at integrating into one market for goods, services and investment, including the development of appropriate labour market and HRD policies; and
- to enhance ASEAN competitiveness by supporting the establishment of a regional ASEAN environment for the development of a competitive private and SME sector with a particular focus on the quality and safety of food and agricultural products.

Five of Program Stream's projects aim to contribute to economic integration and seven to enhancing competitiveness.

Regional Partnerships Scheme

The Regional Partnerships Scheme (RPS) commenced in August 2002 and is due to finish in June 2008. It has a current budget of \$15 million, and aims to support the

implementation of a range of smaller scale regional development activities developed by ASEAN and Australian entities.

The overarching goal of the RPS is to promote sustainable economic and social development within the ASEAN region in line with the objectives and priorities of Vision 2020, the Hanoi Plan of Action and subsequent summit meetings. Its purpose is to: strengthen the capacity of ASEAN to address regional development challenges, in particular, greater/deeper economic integration so as to better participate in the global economy, through supporting project partnerships between appropriately skilled institutions in Australia and ASEAN institutions. Twenty nine projects have been implemented under the RPS.

Regional Economic Policy Support Facility (REPSF)

The Regional Economic Policy Support Facility (REPSF) ran from January 2002 to January 2007 and had a budget of \$9 million. It supported a range of priority regional policy research activities undertaken by ASEAN and Australian research entities. Research priorities were determined by a joint ASEAN-Australia panel, chaired by the Secretary General of ASEAN. Under REPSF a total of fifty research papers were produced.

Mid Term Review of AADCP

A 2005 Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the AADCP found that the program had helped strengthen regional cooperation and economic integration and positively contributed to ASEAN Australian relations. However, the Review also noted that the program lacked an integrated monitoring and evaluation framework. As such there has been little reporting against program level indicators, and this in turn has led to difficulties in monitoring the program as a whole. The Mid Term Review highlighted a number of issues and lessons learned.

The Regional Partnerships Scheme and Program Stream are scheduled to finish by June and August 2008 respectively, with REPSF having already finished in January 2007. An independent completion report for the AADCP and its three components must now be prepared.

2. Objectives

To prepare an Independent Completion Report (ICR) for the ASEAN Australia Development Cooperation Program (AADCP) to assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of both the program as a whole and each of the three components.

3. Scope of Services

The ICR team will be required to:

- a) Undertake consultations with key AusAID staff, AADCP managing contractors and subcontractors;

- b) Conduct a desk based analysis of key program documentation that includes, but is not limited to:

Key Documents

- “Preparing Completion Reports for AusAID”- Interim Guidelines
- Program Design Documents for Program Stream, Regional Partnerships Scheme and Regional Economic Policy Support Facility;
- The Mid-Term Review of the AADCP;
- Gender Research Report on AADCP;
- AADCP Monitoring and Evaluation Performance Assessment Report;
- Key AADCP Reports (most recent Six Monthly Progress Reports, April 2008 Quality at Implementation Reports, Annual Plans and Draft Completion Reports [when available]);
- REPSF 1 Monitoring and Evaluation Report (Phase 1);
- The Regional Partnerships Scheme Project Effectiveness Review;
- Paper by StanCert on Standards; and
- “Lessons Learned” documents gathered throughout the life of the AADCP program.

Background Documents

- The ASEAN Charter;
 - The ASEAN Economic Blueprint;
 - The Vientiane Action Programme;
 - The ASEAN Baseline Reports; and
 - AusAID’s Asia Regional Strategies for periods 2002-2008.
- c) Participate in a mission to Jakarta to meet with key stakeholders at the ASEAN Secretariat;
- d) Deliver briefings in both Jakarta (for ASEC staff) and Canberra (for AusAID staff) on conclusion of the mission;
- e) Conduct an analysis of the information yielded from consultations, Jakarta mission and survey responses;

4. Outputs

The ICR team will be required to produce the following outputs (all reports should be submitted in electronic format):

a) Stakeholder Survey

From the Desk Review, the ICR team will develop a mechanism/ strategy for consultation to determine key stakeholders’ views on the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of both the AADCP as a whole and each of the three components. The tool will be used to seek the views of key AADCP stakeholders including Australia’s Country Coordinator Thailand; the other nine ASEAN member countries; AusAID Posts in the ASEAN region; Project Implementing Partners and Associates; Australian

Coordinating Partners and research organisations. The strategy should be received by the AusAID representative 20 days before the Jakarta mission.

b) Report on Key Issues

A report identifying the key issues and findings from the Desk Review will be submitted to AusAID on 13 June 2008. The report should be no more than 20 pages and should include:

- A summary of the information collected to date, identifying any information gaps;
- Key issues requiring discussion with stakeholders during the Jakarta mission;
- A brief Terms of Reference for each of the ICR team members (ie one page on the responsibilities and duties of the Team Leader/ Economist and the Monitoring and Evaluation Expert);
- Draft itinerary for the Jakarta mission (ie. an indication of people the ICR team would like to meet with); and
- An annotated outline of the Independent Completion Report.

c) Aid Memoire

On the completion of the mission, an Aid Memoire on key findings will be presented to the Principal Director of the Bureau of External Relations and Coordination of the ASEAN Secretariat.

d) Draft Independent Completion Report

A Draft Independent Completion Report will be submitted by the ICR team to the AusAID representative within 10 days of completion of the mission to Jakarta. The draft report will be distributed to stakeholders for comment.

e) Final Independent Completion Report

The ICR team will consider all stakeholder comments in preparing the Final Report, which will be submitted within 1 week of receiving final comments from stakeholders. The report will be published at AusAID's discretion.

5. Duration and Phasing

The consultancy is expected to commence in May 2008, and be completed no later than October 2008.

The expected phasing of the project is as follows:

- a) Literature review, in-Australia consultations and development of Key Issues Report and Survey -13 days;
- b) Jakarta Mission -6 Days;
- c) Preparation of Draft Independent Completion Report– 8 days;

- d) Completion, refinement and finalisation of final Independent Completion Report – 4 days.

6. Personnel

The ICR team will consist of the following members:

a) Economist and Team Leader

The economist/ team leader will have a strong background in development economics, will possess highly developed evaluation skills and will have had experience in leading regional missions. An understanding of ASEAN would be beneficial.

b) Economist/ Monitoring and Evaluation Expert

The Economist/ Monitoring and Evaluation Expert will have extensive development experience in the region. They will possess highly developed skills in monitoring and evaluation, particularly in relation to measuring program performance and effectiveness. They will also have a strong understanding of both international thinking in performance assessment and AusAID's requirements for performance measurement of programs. An understanding of ASEAN's approach to performance measurement including the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the Vientiane Action Programme (VAP) would be useful.

The ICR team will be accompanied by:

a) AusAID Representative

The AusAID representative will have a strong understanding of the regional development context and the ASEAN Australia Development Cooperation Program (AADCP). The AusAID representative will be able to draw on lessons learned from the current AADCP and the design of the AADCP II to support the ICR team. Specifically, the AusAID representative will:

- Manage the development of the Independent Completion Report by providing advice relating to the ICR team on AusAID policies and design guidelines;
- Manage the program for the in-Australia consultations and the regional mission;
- Participate in consultations with key stakeholders in Jakarta, representing AusAID/ Australian Government perspectives;
- Distribute the draft and revised draft Independent Completion reports to stakeholders for comment, collate responses and forward these to the ICR team for consideration.

b) ASEAN Representative

The team will include an ASEAN representative. They will have a strong understanding of ASEAN and the ASEAN Australia Development Cooperation Program.

The ASEAN representative will:

- Provide advice on whom the ICR team should meet with during the Jakarta mission;
- Coordinate and impart the views of ASEAN and the ASEAN Secretariat on the impact and lessons learned of the AADCP; and
- Coordinate and submit to AusAID ASEAN's comments on the Revised Draft Independent Completion Report.

ANNEX 2

KEY AADCP PROGRAM DOCUMENTS

Program Name	Document/Report	Date Submitted
ASEAN Australia Development Cooperation Program (AADCP)	AADCP Mid Term Review	2005
	AADCP Performance Assessment Report	2007
	An Approach to Equality Between Women and Men Within AADCP (produced under the Regional Partnerships Scheme)	February 2008
	Draft Independent Completion Report	7 th October 2008
Program Stream	Mobilisation Plan	16 July 2003
	Security Plan	16 July 2003
	Imprest Account Manual	16 July 2003
	Final First Annual 2003/2004	11 September 2003
	Program Management/ Quality Assurance Handbook	17 September 2003
	Final Six Monthly Report 2nd Quarter	29 March 2004
	Final Second Annual Plan 2004/2005	3 June 2004
	Final Six Monthly Report 6th Quarter	27 August 2004
	1st PCC Agreed Record	1 October 2004
	2nd PCC Agreed Record	1 March 2005
	Final Third Annual Plan 2005/2006	5 May 2005
	3rd PCC Agreed Record	1 September 2005
	Final Six Monthly Report 10th Quarter	14 November 2005
	4th PCC Agreed Record	1 March 2006
	5th PCC Agreed Record	1 September 2006
	Final Fourth Annual Plan 2006/2007	5 October 2006

	Final Six Monthly Report 14th Quarter	25 October 2006
	6th PCC Agreed Record	1 March 2007
	Final Fifth Annual Plan 2007/2008	18 May 2007
	M&E and Performance Assessment Input Report	1 August 2007
	7th PCC Agreed Record	1 September 2007
	Performance Assessment Report	1 October 2007
	Final Six Monthly Report 18th Quarter	5 December 2007
	Draft Project Completion Report	
	8th PCC Agreed Record	
	Final Project Completion Report	
Regional Economic Policy Support Facility (REPSF) Phases 1 and 2	Feasibility Design Study	2001
	Annual Plans	2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006
	Progress Reports	2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006
	REPSF Review	2004
	Mid Term Review	2005
	Facility Completion Report (Phase 1)	2007
	Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for Phase 2	2007
	Monitoring and Evaluation Six monthly Reports	2007 and 2008
	Draft Final Facility Completion Report (Phase 2)	2008
	Final Facility Completion Report (Phase 2)	2008
Regional Partnerships Scheme	Database Management Handbook	February 2003
	Website Management Handbook	February 2003
	Progress Report August 2002- December 2002	February 2003
	Progress Report January-	May 2003

	April 2003	
	Four Monthly Newsletter Edition 1	May 2003
	Progress Report April – July 2003	July 2003
	Annual Plan 2003-2004	August 2003
	Four Monthly Newsletter Edition 2	October 2003
	Progress Report August – November 2003	November 2003
	Four Monthly Newsletter Edition 3	January 2004
	Progress Report December 2003- March 2004	April 2004
	Four Monthly Newsletter Edition 4	May 2004
	Annual Plan 2004-2005	August 2004
	Four Monthly Newsletter Edition 5	September 2004
	Six Monthly Progress Report April- September 2004	October 2004
	Four Monthly Newsletter Edition 6	January 2005
	Six Monthly Progress Report October 2004- January 2005	February 2005
	Project Implementation Handbook	May 2005
	Four Monthly Newsletter Edition 7	May 2005
	Annual Plan 2005-2006	August 2005
	Four Monthly Newsletter Edition 8	September 2005
	Six Monthly Progress Report February 2005-July 2005	November 2005
	Four Monthly Newsletter Edition 9	January 2006
	Four Monthly Newsletter Edition 10	May 2006
	Six Monthly Progress Report August 2005- January 2006	July 2006
	Annual Plan 2006-2007	August 2006
	RPS Handover and Sustainability Strategy- Milestone 14	September 2006
	Four Monthly Newsletter	September 2006

	Edition 11	
	Four Monthly Newsletter Edition 12	January 2007
	Six Monthly Progress Report February- July 2006	March 2007
	Four Monthly Newsletter Edition 13	May 2007
	AADCP Performance Assessment Report	August 2007
	Annual Plan 2007-2008	August 2007
	Six Monthly Progress Report August 2006- January 2007	September 2007
	Four Monthly Newsletter Edition 14	September 2007
	Six Monthly Progress Report February – July 2007	January 2008
	RPS Project Effectiveness Review	January 2008
	Four Monthly Newsletter Edition 15	January 2008
	Six Monthly Progress Report August 2007- January 2008	April 2008
	Draft Project Completion Report	April 2008
	Four Monthly Newsletter Edition 16	May 2008
	Final Project Completion Report	June 2008

ANNEX 3**AADCP ACTIVITIES IMPLEMENTED AND ACTIVITY COST****Program Stream**

Project Code	Title of Project	Actual Cost (A\$)
INT-1	Strengthening ASEAN Standards and Conformity Assessment Systems	2,035,986
INT-2	Enhanced Customs Capacity Building in ASEAN	1,708,864
INT-3	Legal Infrastructure for E-Commerce in ASEAN	2,250,931
INT-5	Enhanced Skills Recognition Systems in ASEAN	1,141,614
INT-6	Enabling ASEAN Project	1,254,263
COMP-1	Small and Medium Enterprise Automotive Activity	531,247
COMP-2	Quality Assurance Systems for ASEAN Fruit and Vegetables	1,960,167
COMP-3	Quality Assurance and Safety of ASEAN Fish and Fishery Products Handling, Processing and Packaging	952,740
COMP-4	Strengthening ASEAN Plant Health Capacity	1,286,687
COMP-5	Strengthening Animal Health Management and Biosecurity in ASEAN	1,212,419
COMP-6	Strengthening ASEAN Risk Assessment Capability to Support Food Safety Measures	1,218,324
COMP-7	Free Trade Area Facility	810,000
NA	Monitoring and Evaluations Adviser to ASEC	92,147
NA	Automotive Adviser to ASEC	445,042

Regional Economic Policy Support Facility Phase I

No	Project Code	Title of Study	Actual Cost (A\$)
1	02/001	Developing Indicators of ASEAN Integration - A Preliminary Survey for a Roadmap	139,500
2	02/002	Options for Managing the Revenue Losses and Other Adjustment Costs of CLMV Participation in AFTA	108,854
3	02/003	Reforming Trade in Services Negotiations under AFAS	39,000
4	02/004	Liberalizing and Facilitating the Movement of Individual Service Providers under AFAS: Implications for Labour and Immigration Policies and Procedures in ASEAN	48,382
5	02/005	A Proposed ASEAN Policy Blueprint for SME Development 2004-2014	37,500
6	02/006	Liberalization of Financial Services in the ASEAN Region	160,550
7	02/007	Liberalizing Capital Movements in the ASEAN Region	195,000
8	02/008	Preparing ASEAN for Open Sky	191,610
9	02/009	Liberalization and Harmonization of ASEAN Telecommunications	194,800
	03/001	Issues and Options for the Work Programme to Eliminate	

No	Project Code	Title of Study	Actual Cost (A\$)
		Non-tariff Barriers in AFTA	
10	03/002	Preparing for Electricity Trading in ASEAN	199,655
11	03/003	Harmonization and Integration of Customs Valuation Policies and Practices in the ASEAN Region	197,600
12	03/004	A Background Paper for the Strategic Plan of Action on ASEAN Cooperation in Food and Agriculture (2005 – 2010)	95,142
13	03/005	Maximizing the Contribution of IP Rights (IPRs) to SME Growth and Competitiveness	84,878
	03/006	A Background Paper for the Next ASEAN Plan of Action to Enhance Economic Integration (2005 – 2010):	
14	03/006a	Global Economic Challenges to ASEAN Integration and Competitiveness: A Prospective Look	70,000
15	03/006b	An Assessment Study on the Progress of ASEAN Regional Integration: The Ha Noi Plan of Action toward ASEAN Vision 2020	60,000
16	03/006c	Resource Mobilisation for the Implementation of the Vientiane Action Programme: A Background Paper	72,697
17	03/006d	Monitoring and Impact Assessment Mechanisms for the VAP: A Background Paper	70,000
18	03/006e	The Pattern of Intra-ASEAN Trade in the Priority Goods Sectors	40,000
19	04/001	Promoting Efficient and Competitive Intra-ASEAN Shipping Services	254,995
20	04/002	Harmonization and Integration of Customs Cargo Processing Policies and Practices in the ASEAN Region	198,875
21	04/003	SME access to finance: Addressing supply-side prerequisites	199,966
22	04/004	Options for establishing regional research network to support ASEAN's priorities	93,677
23	04/005	ASEAN Telecommunications and IT Sectors – Towards Closer ASEAN Integration	70,000
24	04/006a	Regulatory Models for ASEAN Telecoms	33,000
	04/006b	Regulatory Models for ASEAN Telecoms	42,000
25	04/007	Movement of Workers in ASEAN: Healthcare & IT Sectors	122,656
	04/008	Strategic Directions for ASEAN Airlines in a Globalizing World	44,000
26	04/008a	Strategic Directions for ASEAN Airlines in a Globalizing World: Overview	20,000
27	04/008b	Competition and Consumer Protection Policy	20,000
28	04/008c	The Emergence of Low Cost Carriers in South East Asia	20,000
29	04/008d	Ownership Rules and Investment Issues	20,000
30	04/008e	Development of Principles for the Implementation of Subsidies and State Aid	8,000
	04/008f	Development of Principles for the Implementation of Subsidies and State Aid	8,000
31	04/009a	Developing the ASEAN Minerals Sector: A Preliminary Study	38,000
32	04/009b	Enhancing ASEAN Minerals Trade & Investment	248,000

No	Project Code	Title of Study	Actual Cost (A\$)
33	04/010	AIA-Plus: Building on Free Trade Agreements	235,578
34	04/011	An Investigation Into the Measures Affecting the Integration of ASEAN's Priority Sectors (Phase 1)	43,000
35	05/001	ASEAN Tourism Investment Study	230,000
36	05/002	Relationship between the AJCEP Agreement and Japan's Bilateral EPAs with ASEAN countries	30,000
37	05/003	Australia and New Zealand bilateral CEPs/FTAs with ASEAN countries and their implication on the AANZFTA	50,000
38	05/004	Ten years of AFAS: An Assessment	59,471
39	05/005	ASEAN Tax Regimes and the Integration of the Priority Sectors	45,000
40	05/006	Expanding the Market for Business Services in ASEAN	197,500
41	05/007	Desirability, Feasibility and Options for Establishing ESM within the AFAS	40,000
42	06/001a	An Investigation Into the Measures Affecting the Integration of ASEAN's Priority Sectors (Phase 2): Overview	70,000
43	06/001b	The Case of Electronics	100,000
44	06/001c	The Case of Textiles and Apparel	107,634
45	06/001d	The Case of Logistics	100,000
46	06/001e	Region-wide Business Survey	180,000
47	06/001f	Overall Findings & Recommendations	30,000
48	06/002	An Impact Assessment of the Visit ASEAN Campaign	99,955
49	06/003	A Background Paper on Energy Issues for the 2nd East Asia Summit	60,000
50	06/004	ASEAN fiscal and monetary policy responses to the rising oil prices	50,300

Regional Economic Policy Support Facility Phase II

No	Project Code	Title of Study	Actual Cost (A\$)
51	07/001	Options for EAS Finance Cooperation: A Scoping Study	249,304
52	07/002	The EAS: Towards a New Architecture for East Asia Cooperation	219,300
53	07/003	Developing ASEAN's SAM and regional air services arrangements with dialogue partners	248,000
54	07/004	East Asian Free Trade Agreements in Services: Facilitating Free flow of Services in ASEAN?	149,870
55	07/005	Energy Market Integration in the East Asia Summit Region	249,500
56	07/006	Harnessing educational cooperation in the EAS for regional competitiveness and community building	244,870
57	07/007	Poverty Reduction and Social Development in ASEAN: Towards an ASEAN Roadmap for the Implementation of the Millennium Development Goals Plus	217,500
58	07/008	Best Practices in the Introduction and Implementation of	265,000

No	Project Code	Title of Study	Actual Cost (A\$)
		Competition Policy and Law in East Asian Summit Countries: Insights, Issues and Perspectives for a Regional Work Program on Competition Policy and Law in ASEAN	

Regional Partnerships Scheme

Project Code	Title of Project	Actual Cost (A\$)
1	Energy Policy and Systems Analysis Project (EPSAP) for CLM Countries	647,411
2	Ecolabels & Certification in Forestry -Issues Relevant to the Use of Ecolabels in ASEAN and Towards Global Standards	278,172
3	Project Design Support Program: Support Program for Intensifying the Implementation of the ASEAN Plan of Action in Key Economic Related Sectors	430,102
4	Development of the ASEAN Strategic Plan of Action on Water Resources Management	372,556
5	Capacity Building for the Implementation of the ASEAN Marine Water Quality Criteria	485,084
6	Market Analysis: Managing and Commercializing Science and Technology in ASEAN	49,960
7	Training Course for Senior Officials in the Theory of Counter Terrorism Recognition and Multilateral Collaboration for Combating Terrorism	480,260
8	ASEAN Member Countries' International Tax Regimes - The Promotion of Economic Growth and Regional Investment	269,834
9	Strengthening Risk Management and Governance in ASEAN's Banking System	405,485
10	ASEAN Emerging and Resurging Infections: Surveillance and Response Program	510,700
11	Workshop for Public Prosecutors and the Judiciary on Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights	30,533
12	Computer Security Incident Response Team (CSIRT) Capacity Building	75,000
13	Development of Regional Competency Standards for Training in Renewable Energy	269,927
14	Establishment of a Reference Laboratory for the Southeast Asian Foot and Mouth Disease Control Program	241,143
15	Developing ASEAN Common Competency Standards for Tourism Professionals	455,365
16	Development of Evaluation Framework and Impact Assessment Tools for ASEAN COST Programmes and Projects	251,326
17	Advanced Training in Intellectual Property Search and Examination Procedures for IP Offices in the ASEAN Region	178,560

Project Code	Title of Project	Actual Cost (A\$)
18	Operationalise Guidelines on Responsible Movement of Live Food Finfish Project	266,298
19	Statistical Capacity Building for Harmonisation of ASEAN International Trade in Goods and Services	322,852
20	Regional Training Programme for Capital Market Development	184,805
21	Strengthening Aquatic Animal Health Capacity and Biosecurity in ASEAN	303,946
22	Developing Common ASEAN Tourism Curriculum Project	900,875
23	Capacity Building for an ASEAN Mutual Recognition Arrangement in Tourism Project	581,900
24	Strengthening of Food Inspection and Certification for Shrimp and Bivalve Molluscs in ASEAN Member Countries Project	404,248
25	Harmonisation and Implementation of ASEAN GAP Project	428,605
26	Development of Regional Competency Standards for Training in Renewable Energy Project Phase II: Establishing Institute for Sustainable Power Licensee in ASEAN Region	89,537
27	Capacity Building for Implementation of the ASEAN Marine Water Quality Criteria Project - Phase II	427,023
28	ASEAN Closer Economic Relations Training Program on Pre-Arrival Processing Procedures for ASEAN Customs Administrations	Withdrawn
29	Development of an ASEAN Community Progress Monitoring System Project	520,689
30	Capacity Building to Improve Land Management and Reduce Land and Forest Fires and Associated Transboundary HAZE pollution in the ASEAN Region	369,734
31	Cambodia, Laos PDR and Myanmar Energy Policy Systems Analysis Project Phase 2	Withdrawn
NA	An Approach to Equality Between Women and Men Within AADCP	70,000

ANNEX 4

AADCP PROGRAM COST SUMMARIES

PROGRAM STREAM

Statement of Expenditure Life to August 2008

26 May 2003 to 30 April 2008
AusAID CONTRACT NO: 11680

Cardno Acil PROJECT NO: 377

	Original contract limit	Amendment 1	Amendment 2	Amendment 3	Amendment 4	Actual Expenditure
Milestones	\$ 1,283,211.00	\$ 1,283,211.00	\$ 1,389,662.00	\$ 1,407,727.00	\$ 1,431,748.00	\$ 1,431,748.00
Billings	\$ 1,924,825.00	\$ 1,924,825.00	\$ 2,084,494.00	\$ 2,111,590.00	\$ 2,147,622.00	\$ 2,017,089.30
PMF (APTF)		\$ 169,049.00	\$ 169,049.00	\$ 169,049.00	\$ 169,049.00	\$ 165,855.50
PMF (M & E Adviser input)			\$ 14,733.00	\$ 14,733.00	\$ 14,733.00	\$ 14,733.00
Backbilling (Amendment 2)						\$ 117,092.80
Total Reimbursables	\$ 1,273,650.00	\$ 1,273,650.00	\$ 1,283,650.00	\$ 1,283,650.00	\$ 1,223,597.70	\$ 786,241.31
Procurement Categories			\$ 41,000.00	\$ 41,000.00	\$ 41,000.00	\$ 24,016.19
Desktop Computer Modem & Software			\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 18,668.02
Printer Scanner Phone & Fax			\$ 8,000.00	\$ 8,000.00	\$ 8,000.00	\$ 4,340.79
Office Furniture			\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 1,007.38
Other Reimbursable Costs			\$ 1,242,650.00	\$ 1,242,650.00	\$ 1,182,597.70	\$ 762,225.22
Travel - short Term Advisers			\$ 172,100.00	\$ 172,100.00	\$ 172,100.00	\$ 126,925.65
Fees Unallocated Short Term Advisers			\$ 264,000.00	\$ 264,000.00	\$ 264,000.00	\$ 208,366.87
ASEC Counterpart Contribution Cost			\$ 300,000.00	\$ 300,000.00	\$ 300,000.00	\$ 213,664.38
ASEAN Coordination Costs			\$ 423,940.00	\$ 423,940.00	\$ 363,887.70	\$ 178,652.85
Workshops			\$ 22,860.00	\$ 22,860.00	\$ 22,860.00	\$ 8,909.17
New Project Costs and Translation			\$ 49,750.00	\$ 49,750.00	\$ 49,750.00	\$ 18,328.86
Monitoring EAP and FTA Facility			\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 7,377.44
Imprest Account (plus Bank Charges)	\$ 14,529,800.00	\$ 14,529,800.00	\$ 16,539,800.00	\$ 16,539,800.00	\$ 16,539,800.00	\$ 15,406,739.00
Total Expenses	\$ 19,011,486.00	\$ 19,180,535.00	\$ 21,481,388.00	\$ 21,526,549.00	\$ 21,526,549.70	\$ 19,939,498.91

REPSF Final Cost Summary
Jan 2002-July 2008
(AUD)

Budget Line Ref.	Description	TOTAL Phase I Budget	Total Expenditure Phase I	Unspent funds from Phase I (A)	Phase II Budget (B)	Total revised budget (07/08) (A+B)	TOTAL Exp 07/08	Balance remaining
Reimbursable expenditure								
3.3.a	SubContracted Research	\$5,249,776.00	\$4,255,569.00	\$932,475.33	\$3,390,400.00	\$4,322,875.33	\$2,947,502.32	\$1,375,373.01
3.3.b	Review, editing & dissemination	\$317,887.00	\$245,212.00	\$133,004.39	\$115,609.50	\$248,613.89	\$35,566.76	\$213,047.13
3.3.c	Advertising	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$0.00	\$10,000.00
3.3.d	Tech Advisory Panels	\$48,201.00	\$48,201.00	\$0.00	\$15,000.00	\$15,000.00	\$0.00	\$15,000.00
3.3.e	Registration Advertising	\$31,854.00	\$31,854.00	\$0.00	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$0.00	\$10,000.00
3.3.f	RPC Meeting Costs	\$15,000.00	\$1,604.00	\$13,395.71	\$15,000.00	\$28,395.71	\$8,335.07	\$20,060.64
3.3.g	Procurement	\$57,000.00	\$56,968.00	\$32.00	\$10,550.00	\$10,582.00	\$7,511.32	\$3,070.68
3.3.h	APD Travel	\$117,900.00	\$115,464.00	\$2,436.39	\$50,755.00	\$53,191.39	\$30,783.04	\$22,408.35
3.3i	REPSF website update costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$15,000.00	\$15,000.00	\$2,796.97	\$12,203.03
3.3j	Report production costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$100,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$7,202.69	\$92,797.31
3.3k	Monitoring ASEAN research	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$23,695.00	\$23,695.00	\$3,510.92	\$20,184.08
3.3l	Monitoring and evaluation	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$65,609.50	\$65,609.50	\$41,248.99	\$24,360.51
3.5	Research Advisor costs	\$546,588.00	\$546,588.00	\$1,402.55	\$0.00	\$1,402.55	\$1,402.55	\$0.00
	LTP contract amendment - rounding difference between Phase I & Phase II					\$439.00	\$0.00	\$439.00
Sub-total Reimbursable payments		\$6,384,206.00	\$5,301,460.00	\$1,082,746.37	\$3,821,619.00	\$4,904,804.37	\$3,085,860.63	\$1,818,943.74
Milestone payments								
M1	Research Org Database	\$15,000	\$15,000			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M2	ASEC Website	\$15,000	\$15,000			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M3	Research Project Database	\$10,000	\$10,000			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M4	RPC Record	\$64,000	\$64,000			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M5	RPC TOR	\$15,000	\$15,000			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M6	Res Selection Criteria	\$23,000	\$23,000			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M7	Research Management Guidelines	\$23,000	\$23,000			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M8	Draft Annual Plan	\$64,000	\$64,000			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M9	QPR 1	\$64,000	\$64,000			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M10	QPR 2	\$64,000	\$64,000			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M11	RPC Record #2	\$64,000	\$64,000			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M12	QPR 3	\$64,000	\$64,000			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M13	QPR 4	\$64,000	\$64,000			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M14	Draft Annual Plan	\$80,000	\$80,000			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Management Fee	\$54,090	\$54,090			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M15	RPC Record #3	\$64,000	\$64,000			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M16	6 monthly Progress Report	\$128,000	\$128,000			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M17	Draft Annual Plan	\$341,700	\$341,700			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M18	6 monthly Progress Report	\$187,700	\$187,700			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M19	6mPR	\$187,700	\$187,700			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M20	ASEC Long Term Plan	\$149,250	\$0	\$149,250.00		\$149,250.00	\$149,250.00	\$0.00
M21	Annual Plan	\$341,700	\$341,700			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M22	6mPR	\$187,700	\$187,700			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M23	6mPR	\$187,700	\$187,700			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M24	Annual Plan	\$341,700	\$341,700			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M25	6mPR	\$187,700	\$187,700			\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
M26	Completion Report	\$142,201	\$0	\$142,201.00		\$142,201.00	\$142,201.00	\$0.00
M27	Phase II M&E Plan				\$214,975.00	\$214,975.00	\$214,975.00	\$0.00
M28	Phase I Aggregate M&E Report				\$214,975.00	\$214,975.00	\$214,975.00	\$0.00
M30	M&E Report				\$193,217.00	\$193,217.00	\$193,217.00	\$0.00
M31	M&E Report				\$193,217.00	\$193,217.00	\$193,217.00	\$0.00
M32	Draft Facility Completion Report				\$130,998.50	\$130,998.50	\$130,998.50	\$0.00
M33	Final Facility Completion Report				\$130,998.50	\$130,998.50	\$130,998.50	\$0.00
Sub-total Milestone payments		\$3,130,141.00	\$2,838,689.81	\$291,451.00	\$1,078,381.00	\$1,369,832.00	\$1,369,832.00	\$0.00
TOTAL		\$9,514,347.00	\$8,140,149.81	\$1,374,197.37	\$4,900,000.00	\$6,274,636.37	\$4,455,692.63	\$1,818,943.74
Plus Phase I expenditure:						\$8,140,149.81		
TOTAL REPSF Contract Value						\$14,414,786.18		

Regional Partnerships Scheme

ASEAN Australia Development Cooperation Program: Regional Partnerships Scheme																	
Cumulative cost summary: 14 August 2002 to 30 June 2008																	
	Original Contract	Year 1 (Aug 02 to Jul 03)		Contract Amend. No.1	Year 2 (Aug 02 to Jul 04)		Year 3 (Aug 02 to Jul 05)		Contract Amend. No.2	Year 4 (Aug 02 to Jul 06)		Contract Amend. No.3	Year 5 (Aug 02 to Jul 07)		Contract Amend No. 4 & 5*	Year 6 (Aug 02 to Jun 08)	
		Cost	% spend of Original Contract		Cost	% spend of Contract Amend. No.1	Cost	% spend of Contract Amend. No.1		Cost	% spend of Contract Amend. No.2		Cost	% spend of Contract Amend. No.3		Cost**	% spend of Contract Amend. No.5
Quarterly billing	\$1,617,302	\$242,595	15%	\$1,609,391	\$564,572	35%	\$886,055	55%	\$1,609,391	\$1,245,079	77%	\$1,709,499	\$1,618,150	95%	\$2,087,595	\$2,085,725	100%
Milestones	\$693,130	\$256,457	37%	\$689,739	\$346,123	50%	\$346,123	50%	\$689,739	\$537,455	78%	\$732,643	\$611,099	83%	\$894,684	\$894,683	100%
ASEC Based Personnel	\$1,305,300	\$136,291	10%	\$1,305,300	\$291,110	22%	\$467,068	36%	\$1,305,300	\$650,959	50%	\$1,329,330	\$853,363	64%	\$1,109,330	\$1,097,903	99%
Short-Term Personnel	\$82,191	\$34,558	42%	\$82,191	\$59,507	72%	\$66,235	81%	\$82,191	\$68,157	83%	\$82,191	\$73,843	90%	\$213,647	\$185,916	87%
Project Effectiveness Review Personnel	\$0	\$0	0%	\$0	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	\$0	0%	\$0	\$0	-	\$46,907	\$46,907	100%
Total Personnel	\$3,697,923	\$669,901	18%	\$3,686,621	\$1,261,313	34%	\$1,765,480	48%	\$3,686,621	\$2,501,649	68%	\$3,853,663	\$3,156,455	82%	\$4,352,162	\$4,311,134	99%
Reimbursable Costs	\$1,218,200	\$46,402	4%	\$1,218,200	\$136,305	11%	\$267,920	22%	\$1,218,200	\$394,284	32%	\$1,218,200	\$523,469	43%	\$641,372	\$622,285	97%
Reimbursable Procurement	\$70,900	\$39,980	56%	\$70,900	\$61,357	87%	\$62,204	88%	\$70,900	\$63,683	90%	\$70,900	\$69,395	98%	\$78,900	\$69,715	88%
Procurement fee (7%)	\$4,963	\$2,799	56%	\$4,963	\$4,373	88%	\$4,641	94%	\$4,963	\$4,710	95%	\$4,963	\$5,109	103%	\$5,523	\$5,132	93%
Project Effectiveness Review reimb.	\$0	\$0	0%	\$0	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	\$0	0%	\$0	\$0	-	\$69,769	\$44,854	64%
Total Reimbursables	\$1,294,063	\$89,180	7%	\$1,294,063	\$202,035	16%	\$334,765	26%	\$1,294,063	\$462,676	36%	\$1,294,063	\$597,972	46%	\$795,564	\$741,986	93%
Trust Fund	\$10,400,000	\$430,112	4%	\$10,400,000	\$4,237,241	41%	\$5,807,737	56%	\$10,400,000	\$7,236,181	70%	\$10,400,000	\$8,103,404	78%	\$10,700,000	\$10,079,525	94%
Trust Fund Management Fee	\$208,000	\$8,602	4%	\$208,000	\$84,745	41%	\$116,155	56%	\$208,000	\$146,046	70%	\$208,000	\$163,390	79%	\$208,000	\$200,984	97%
TOTAL COST	\$15,599,986	#####	8%	\$15,588,684	\$5,785,334	37%	\$8,024,137	51%	\$15,588,684	\$10,346,551	66%	\$15,755,726	\$12,021,221	76%	\$16,055,726	\$15,333,629	96%

Notes

*The value of the Trust Fund noted under Contract Amend No. 4&5 includes interest of around \$300,000 earned on the Trust Fund Account. This is also reflected in the total value of the contract.

**Year 6 Costs are estimates as at 30 June 2008

ANNEX 5

AADCP INDEPENDENT COMPLETION REPORT METHODOLOGY

AusAID requires that an Independent Completion Report (ICR) be prepared for all projects with expenditure in excess of \$3 million. It is not intended that the ICR duplicate preparation of the contractor Completion Reports (CR) – rather the ICR should independently seek to check and verify the assessment provided in the CR and identify and address any information gaps.

Separate contractor Completion Reports have been prepared for each AADCP component stream. The ICR will provide an overview of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact of the AADCP in a single report and identify lessons that can be applied to the design and implementation of similar programs in the future.

While the ICR will draw much of its analysis from secondary sources, particularly contractor reports, it will be important to reinforce and validate this information in consultation with the key AADCP stakeholders. The Australian Managing Contractors (MCs) have undertaken considerable consultation with ASEAN stakeholders in the preparation of their Completion Reports (CRs). The RPS undertook further more detailed consultations in the preparation of the RPS Effectiveness Review. Nevertheless, there have been some gaps and inadequacies in their analyses, and little in the way of an overall evaluation of the AADCP as a whole.

There are a large number of stakeholders in the AADCP. These include:

- ASEC management and desk officers, working groups/committees, regional focal points, national agencies;
- Activity participants involved in seminars, training, research, etc and national agencies able to utilise program outputs;
- AusAID management and desk officers; Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade;
- The managing contractors Cardno ACIL (PS, RPS) and GRM (REPSF) responsible for the management of the three AADCP component streams;
- Sub contractors and partners, both Australian and ASEAN, and government and private, responsible for the implementation of project and research activities.

ASEAN/ASEC encourages broad based stakeholder consultations. The preparation of the contractor Completion Reports has involved extensive stakeholder consultation with all stakeholder groups. It is not cost, resource or time effective for the ICR team to duplicate this process or conduct face-to-face consultations in all ten member countries or with all stakeholders. The ICR proposes the following stakeholder consultation process:

- A one-week field mission to Jakarta to meet with ASEC representatives, ASEC desk officers, Working Group participants, the AusAID Post in Jakarta, other donors supporting ASEC, RPS ASEAN partners based in Jakarta, and Indonesian Government agencies involved in AADCP activities

- One week equivalent over the period June–August of face-to-face consultations in Canberra (with a selection of REPSF researchers, RPS partners, AusAID managers and members of the JPC, and key Australian government agencies such as Customs, AQIS and DFAT);
- Relevant AusAID managers involved in the AADCP;
- Meetings and/or telephone interviews with key Australian stakeholders resident outside of the ACT, including Australian Managing Contractors;
- Survey of ASEAN stakeholders who have been involved AADCP activities, including women, using questionnaires (sent by email), or possibly telephone or video conferences (methods to be discussed with ASEC)
- Telephone conference/interviews (or email questionnaire) with representatives from AusAID Posts in ASEAN member countries.

Support will be requested from ASEC to facilitate meetings and the stakeholder consultation process, particularly approaches to consultation with non Jakarta based activity participants and regional focal points (through survey questionnaire, telephone conferences, etc), will be discussed with ASEC during the field mission and refined as appropriate.

Table 1 lists the key AADCP stakeholders, the means of consultation and examples of the major issues of importance to the ICR that will be discussed with each group.

Table 1: AADCP stakeholders, consultation methods and key issues for evaluation

Stakeholder	Consultation method	Key issues
ASEC representatives	Direct discussions in Jakarta	Relevance/appropriateness of AADCP objectives, the 3 component streams and delivery model. Other development assistance to ASEC - coordination/overlap and harmonisation. Effectiveness in terms of Vision 2020, HAP, VAP objectives etc. Effectiveness for ASEAN members. Technical capacity to absorb. National take-up. Focus on CLMV. Approaches/limitations of M&E. Efficiency of AADCP including its management/implementation and cost sharing arrangements. Management burden on ASEC. Use of outputs and sustainability. Maintenance of regional networks after program completion. Most important outcomes/impacts from

		<p>ASEC perspectives.</p> <p>Intended/unintended benefits.</p> <p>Progress in achieving ASEAN regional objectives.</p> <p>Recommendations/lessons for the future.</p>
Managing Contractors	<p>Phone interviews/discussions.</p> <p>Discussions in Jakarta with former contractor staff.</p>	<p>Quality and appropriateness of PS, RPS and REPSF designs.</p> <p>Any implementation issues.</p> <p>Capacity of sub contractors.</p> <p>Effectiveness and focus of AADCP (and PS, RPS and REPSF).</p> <p>Effectiveness of short regional-level activities versus deeper engagement with ASEAN members. Capacity to absorb versus networking.</p> <p>Focus on CLMV</p> <p>Maintenance of regional networks after program completion.</p> <p>Quality assurance procedures for activities and outputs.</p> <p>Efficiency of AADCP including its management/implementation and cost sharing arrangements (project size, number, duration, connectedness, progressive engagement, flexibility?).</p> <p>M&E procedures during implementation and for evaluation at completion.</p> <p>Most important outcomes/impacts for ASEAN members. Sustainability.</p> <p>Use of outputs by ASEC and ASEAN.</p> <p>Recommendations/lessons for the future.</p>
AusAID (Canberra & Posts)	<p>Direct discussions in Canberra, Jakarta and possibly Laos.</p> <p>Simple email questionnaires for other Posts (if required).</p>	<p>Effectiveness of short regional-level activities versus deeper engagement with ASEAN members.</p> <p>Efficiency of AADCP including its management/implementation arrangements (project size, number, duration, connectedness, progressive engagement?).</p> <p>Management burden on AusAID Canberra and Posts (particularly Posts in Jakarta and Bangkok).</p> <p>Coordination with other AusAID activities (regional and country</p>

		<p>programs) – linkages/overlaps. Coordination with other development assistance activities supporting ASEC and/or ASEAN member countries. Focus on CLMV. Outcomes and benefits for AusAID. Recommendations/lessons for the future.</p>
<p>Sub-contractors (AIPs, APOs, research agency)</p>	<p>Meetings in Canberra and possibly in Jakarta (if they are represented). Additional phone interview/discussions (if required)</p>	<p>Effectiveness of the particular project and delivery approach (level of engagement with ASEC & ASEAN members, appropriate membership of working groups or English speakers, etc?). Capacity to absorb. Sub contractor experience of ASEAN/ASEC. Effectiveness of PS, RPS and REPSF (as relevant). Effectiveness of short regional-level activities versus deeper engagement with ASEAN members. Maintenance of regional networks after program completion. Quality of inputs, activities and outputs. Efficiency of management/ implementation arrangements (project size, number, duration, connectedness to related AADCP and ASEAN activities, progressive engagement?). Most important outcomes/impacts for ASEAN members. Use of outputs by ASEC and ASEAN. Sustainability of outcomes and benefits. Recommendations/lessons for the future.</p>
<p>ASEAN participants</p>	<p>Direct discussions in Jakarta and Laos (key agency representatives). Simple email survey (or phone/video conference – yet to be determined)</p>	<p>Relevance appropriateness of the AADCP project in which they were involved to: the participant’s routine work; the member country’s priorities/programs. Effectiveness of the activity (in terms of ASEAN regional and member country priorities). Effectiveness of short, regional-level activities (workshops etc) versus deeper</p>

		<p>engagement with ASEAN members.</p> <p>Level of technical understanding and skill development.</p> <p>Quality of inputs, activities and outputs.</p> <p>Personal benefits from involvement with the AADCP project. (Were personal experiences/skills able to be applied/used?)</p> <p>Most important outcomes/impacts for the specific agency/country.</p> <p>Use of outputs by the specific agency/country.</p> <p>Sustainability of outcomes and benefits.</p> <p>Recommendations/lessons for the future.</p>
ASEAN member country senior officials	Direct discussions in Jakarta and possible Laos (key agency representatives).	<p>Awareness of AADCP and REPSF, PS and RPS activities and outputs (policy and research papers, guidelines etc).</p> <p>Relevance appropriateness of the AADCP activities/outputs to the member country's priorities/programs.</p> <p>How participants chosen for AADCP activities.</p> <p>How experiences/skills of participants used subsequently.</p> <p>Effectiveness of the activity (in terms of ASEAN regional and member country priorities).</p> <p>Effectiveness of short, regional-level activities (workshops etc) versus deeper engagement with ASEAN members.</p> <p>Extent of ASEAN progress on regional agendas.</p> <p>Most important outcomes/impacts for the specific agency/country.</p> <p>Use of outputs by the specific agency/country.</p> <p>Sustainability of outcomes and benefits.</p> <p>Recommendations/lessons for the future.</p>
Women and men from all stakeholder groups	Direct discussions as well as through the proposed email surveys	<p>How participants for AADCP activities selected?</p> <p>Representation of women in home agencies (at the various levels)?</p> <p>Gender analysis in AADCP projects (eg gender and social impact of economic</p>

		<p>policies, gender analysis in economic research).</p> <p>Gender analysis in home agency (relevance /importance /skills etc).</p> <p>Gender outcomes and impacts of AADCP.</p> <p>Awareness of AADCP gender review (and perspectives on the findings/recommendations).</p> <p>Recommendations/lessons for strengthening outcomes for women.</p>
Other development partners supporting ASEC	Direct discussions in Jakarta	<p>Relevance/appropriateness of AADCP and the 3 streams and comparisons with other development assistance.</p> <p>Coordination/overlap of development assistance to ASEC.</p> <p>Perspectives on AADCP effectiveness in terms of Vision 2020, HAP, VAP objectives etc.</p> <p>Effectiveness for ASEAN members.</p> <p>Efficiency of AADCP including its management/implementation arrangements (compared with other forms of assistance).</p> <p>Perspectives on outcomes/impacts of AADCP for ASEC and ASEAN members.</p> <p>Recommendations to strengthen AADCP effectiveness/outcomes and use/sustainability of outputs.</p> <p>Recommendations for harmonization.</p>

Checklists of questions will be developed to guide discussions and informal interviews with each stakeholder group. A simple questionnaire will be drafted and discussed with ASEC to collect information from AADCP participants in ASEAN member countries. Another simple questionnaire will also be developed for collecting perspectives from AusAID Posts in ASEAN member countries.

In addition the team will:

- Develop a list of sub-contractors and researchers from which to commence consultations in Canberra
- Review a selection of project completion reports relevant to consultations in Canberra, Jakarta and Laos

- Develop checklists of questions to guide consultations with each stakeholder group
- Develop initial drafts of the questionnaire to survey ASEAN member country participants (to be discussed with ASEC)
- Develop a simple questionnaire for collecting perspectives from AusAID Posts in ASEAN member countries.

In addition to consultations and simple survey approaches outlined above, the ICR will seek to assess the quality of selected AADCP outputs. A sample of guidelines, research papers and policy and strategy discussion papers and other key documents produced as AADCP project outputs will be reviewed. Other stakeholders will also be consulted for their opinions on the quality and appropriateness of key AADCP outputs.

ATTACHMENT 1: FIELD MISSION (AUGUST 10-15) - PROPOSED MEETINGS

1. AusAID Post
2. REPSF – GRM field staff
3. RPS – ACIL CARDNO field staff
4. PS – ACIL CARDNO field staff
5. Enabling ASEAN Project
6. AADCP ASEAN RPS partners based in Jakarta
7. Indonesian Ministries/staff participating in AADCP projects
 - Customs
 - Tourism
 - Food and agriculture
8. ASEC management
 - Bureau for Economic Integration and Finance
 - Bureau for External Relations and Coordination
9. ASEC desk officers
 - Customs
 - Tourism
 - Food and Agriculture
10. Available key working groups and regional focal points
11. Other donors
 - EU
 - US
12. Indonesian Ministries responsible for ASEAN integration
 - Ministry of Trade
 - Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Based on field mission meetings and discussions with ASEC the requirement for further stakeholder consultation meetings will be determined. These could include:

- Email questionnaire
- Telephone/Video conference

ATTACHMENT 2: KEY ISSUES

Relevance

- Was there an adequate preparation process for AADCP as a whole and for the PS, RPS and REPSF streams individually?
- Was the program rationale and sectors selected sound?
- Was the design consistent (and updated) in accord with AusAID policies (White Paper, Paris Aid Effectiveness Agenda) and the Asia Regional Strategy and ASEAN strategies and priorities (2020 Vision, HAP, VAP, etc)?
- Was the design based on lessons learned from past programs?
- Did the design take account of other regional programs/donor experience?
- Did the design consider linkages/synergies with development assistance programs in ASEAN member countries to facilitate national level sustainability? (eg AusAID's country programs and trade-related sector-wide approaches)
- Were objectives results-focussed and measurable? Did the design consider and assign responsibility for overall AADCP planning, M&E and management?
- Did the design consider and assign responsibility for policy dialogue and donor and agency harmonisation of systems?
- Was the strategy adequately resourced and focussed?
- Was there adequate procedures for coordination and integration between the three program streams?
- Was there an appropriate balance between small, short-term, responsive and flexible modalities with more strategic, longer terms support to ASEAN in key sectors?
- Was there adequate support to meet the specific needs of ASEAN member countries especially to address the limited capacity of CLMV?

Efficiency

- Was the delivery model and management arrangements involving separate component streams and contractors cost efficient? Was coordination and synergies between streams adequately considered?
- Was there a management burden on ASEC with three streams each with their own management and administration systems and structures?
- Where the arrangements for cost sharing appropriate?
- Was the skill mix of contractor and counterpart staff appropriate, were they fully engaged?
- Was the ratio of administrative costs to activity spending reasonable?
- Does the delivery model enable cost efficient performance assessment?
- Is it more cost-effective to provide support at a regional level (through workshops and training etc)³³ or to support national implementation and capacity building?

³³ Were all member countries equally motivated and prepared? Were all participants appropriately selected and with similar responsibilities, backgrounds and education?

Effectiveness

- Generally it would seem there is adequate evidence to support the view that quality outputs have been delivered at the project level.³⁴
- It is less clear that project success has had a strong impact further up the logic chain (in part the logic chain is not clear or realistic)
 - in the absence of an agreed M&E framework the PS, RPS and REPSF contractors conducted surveys and/or developed other approaches in an attempt to assess effectiveness
 - benefits unrelated to specific program objectives tend to dominate eg strengthened relationships, networks, etc
 - information will be sought on progress in the achievement of ASEAN objectives, notably VAP
- Given that achievement of objectives will be difficult to quantify, intermediate outcomes will be important in the evaluation.
- Measures of effectiveness should not be confined to consideration of outputs, but should also assess the extent to which these outputs are used, adopted, progressed or provide benefits to the ASEAN member countries.

Sustainability and Impact

- Impact and sustainability of higher level objectives and goals are difficult to assess and attribute, but can be considered qualitatively in terms of focus, scope for reinforcement of successes, national level support, etc
- Intermediate outcomes vary with the individual projects in each component. Qualitative assessment of overall impact requires a summation of these.
- Downstream impacts must be assessed at the national level. Similarly, sustainability required the member country take-up/adoption of regionally agreed initiatives. Was there adequate national support, particularly to the CLMV?

Lessons Learned

In addition to AADCP contractor assessments, lessons learned from other donor experiences (eg World Bank, DFID) of regional programs will be reviewed to determine relevance to the AADCP.

³⁴ The ICR will review a selection of activity completion reports and seek stakeholder views on the quality and effectiveness of workshops, training, research papers, etc.

ANNEX 6

**AADCP INDEPENDENT COMPLETION REPORT
PERSONS INTERVIEWED AND KEY PROJECT DOCUMENTS REVIEWED³⁵**

IN- AUSTRALIA CONSULTATIONS (MAY- AUGUST 2008)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Meeting/ Organisation</i>	<i>Key Project Documents Reviewed</i>
Monday 19 May	AADCP PS and RPS	Bruce Coyne, Sue Majid, Ruth Morgan, Melissa Wells, Anna Saxby and Jasmine Cadd, Cardno Acil	PS and RPS Six Monthly Reports, Annual Plans, Program Completion Reports, RPS Project Effectiveness Review, AADCP Mid Term Review
Thursday 22 May	AADCP PS and RPS	Bruce Coyne and Sue Majid, Cardno Acil	As above
Monday 16 June	REPSF 1	Ms Rosemary McKay, Manager ASEAN, AusAID	Six Monthly Progress Reports and Program Completion Reports for REPSF 1 and 2, AADCP Mid Term Review, and Project Completion Reports for the 8 FTA Capacity Building Workshops
Wednesday 18 June	REPSF 1 AND 2	Ms Gail Tregear, Coordinator, AADCP REPSF 1 and 2	Six Monthly Progress Reports and Program Completion Reports for REPSF 1 and 2, AADCP Mid Term Review
	REPSF 1	Professor Andrew MacIntyre, Director, Crawford School, author, research paper 04/04, “The Economic Research Network for ASEAN Partnership”	REPSF research paper 04/04, “The Economic Research Network for ASEAN Partnership”
Thursday 19 June	REPSF 1	Professor Chris Manning, author research paper, 02/04, “Liberalising and Facilitating the Movement of Individual Service Providers under AFAs”	REPSF research paper, 02/04, “Liberalising and Facilitating the Movement of Individual Service Providers under AFAs”
	PS	Chris Connelly, Director, and Peter van Djik, Executive	Project Progress Reports and Completion Report

³⁵ Efforts were made to contact all of the subcontractors involved in the implementation of the AADCP. Those that were available were contacted.

		Director, Galexia, PS project, “Legal Infrastructure for E-Commerce in ASEAN”	
	PS	Mr John Larkin, Mr Paul Gibbons, and Mr Tim Ward, DFAT, PS FTA Workshop/ Seminar Facility	Project Completion Reports for the 8 FTA Capacity Building Workshops
	PS and REPSF 1	Professor Tim Turpin, Deputy Director, Australian Expert Group in Industry Studies, author research paper 03/005, “Maximising the contribution of IP Rights to SME Growth and Competitiveness.” Implemented PS project “Enhancing Skills recognition Systems in ASEAN”	REPSF research paper 03/005, “Maximising the contribution of IP Rights to SME Growth and Competitiveness.” Progress report and Completion report for “Enhancing Skills recognition Systems in ASEAN”
Friday 20 June	PS	Mr Hian Yap consultant and author of PS project report “Consolidated report on the integration of the ASEAN automotive sector”	PS research paper, “Consolidated report on the integration of the ASEAN automotive sector”
	PS	Mr Deon Mahoney, Principal Microbiologist Food Standards Australia New Zealand, PS project “Strengthening ASEAN Risk Assessment Capability to Support Food Safety Measures”	Project Progress Report and Completion Report
	REPSF 1, PS and RPS	Mr John Martin, author research paper 03/006 (d) “Monitoring and Impact Assessment Mechanisms for the VAP: A background paper”; consultant on the VAP for PS, and technical consultant for PS and RPS	REPSF research paper 03/006 (d) “Monitoring and Impact Assessment Mechanisms for the VAP: A background paper”, AADCP PS, RPS and REPSF monitoring and evaluation information from Program Six Monthly Reports and Program Completion Reports, and the AADCP Mid Term Review
	RPS	Ms Kate Norris, and Ms Joanne Rush, Assistant Director, IP Australia, RPS projects “Workshop for Public Prosecutors and the Judiciary	Project Progress Reports and Completion Reports

		on Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights” and “Advanced Training in Intellectual Property Search and Examination Procedures for IP Offices in the ASEAN Region”	
	RPS	Dr Mahomed Patel , ANU, RPS project, “The ASEAN Emerging and Resurging Infections Surveillance and Response Program”	Project Progress Report and Completion Report
Monday 28 July	REPSF 1 AND 2	Dr Ramonette Serafica , REPSF 1 and 2, GRM	Six Monthly Progress Reports and Program Completion Reports for REPSF 1 and 2
	RPS	Dr Beth Webster , RPS project “Development of an ASEAN Community Progress Monitoring System” project, Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research, The University of Melbourne	Volumes 1-3 of the reports for the “Development of an ASEAN Community Progress Monitoring System” project
Tuesday 29 July	REPSF 1	Dr Bob Warner , REPSF, Centre for International Economics (CIE) AADCP design expert and consultant on several REPSF reports; author of REPSF report, “Resource Mobilisation for the Implementation of the Vientiane Action Programme: A Background Paper”; technical expert for design of Program Stream	Program Design Document for Program Stream, REPSF research paper “Resource Mobilisation for the Implementation of the Vientiane Action Programme: A Background Paper.”
Wednesday 30 July	RPS	Dr David Kennedy , Director AusVet, RPS projects, “Strengthening Aquatic Animal Health Capacity and Biosecurity in ASEAN”; and “Operationalise Guidelines on Responsible Movement of Live Food Finfish.”	Project Progress Reports and Completion Reports
	RPS	Dr Lorraine Corner author AADCP report “An approach	AADCP report “An approach to equality between women

		to equality between women and men within AADCP”	and men within AADCP”
	RPS and PS	Mr Mike Crooke , M and E expert used by Cardno Acil for Program Stream and RPS	Monitoring and Evaluation information submitted under PS and RPS, and Project Effectiveness Review fro RPS
	PS	Dr Angus Cameron , Director AusVet PS project “Strengthening Animal Health management and Biosecurity”	Project Progress Report and Completion Report
Thursday 31 July	DFAT	Ms Catherine Dobbin and Ms Naomi Viccars , ASEAN Team, DFAT	
	AusAID	Dr Peter van Diermen , Senior Economic Adviser, AusAID	
Wednesday 6 August	RPS and PS	Jim Travers, General Manager, AMSAT , PS projects ”SME Automotive Activity”, “Strengthening ASEAN Capability in Risk Assessment in Support of Food Safety”, and RPS projects ” Capacity Building for the Implementation of the ASEAN Marine Water Quality Criteria (Phases 1); “Market Analysis: Managing and Commercialising Science and Technology (S & T) in ASEAN; “Strengthening of Food Inspection and Certification for Shrimp and Bivalve Molluscs” ; and “Capacity Building for the Implementation of the ASEAN Marine Water Quality Criteria (Phases 2)	Project Progress Reports and Completion Reports

JAKARTA CONSULTATIONS (11-15 AUGUST 2008)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Meeting/ Organisation</i>	<i>Key Project Documents Reviewed</i>
Monday 11 August	<i>GRM International</i>	Six Monthly Progress Reports and Program

	<p>Mr Joost Verwilghen, Country Manager Indonesia</p> <p>Mr Felix Yeboah, Senior Project Manager, REPSF 2</p> <p>Ms Mihaela Balan, Monitoring and Evaluation Expert</p> <p>Ms Sarah Black, Program Manager, REPSF 1 and 2</p>	<p>Completion Reports for REPSF 1 and 2, AADCP Mid Term Review</p>
	<p><i>Independent Consultant</i></p> <p>Ms Eileen Wahab Independent Reviewer of Enabling ASEAN Project</p>	<p>Progress Reports for the Enabling ASEAN Project</p>
	<p><i>The Treasury Australian Embassy Jakarta</i></p> <p>Mr Vince Ashcroft Senior Representative South East Asia Minister Counsellor (Financial)</p>	<p>REPSF 2 research papers</p>
Tuesday 12 August	<p><i>Nathan and Associates</i></p> <p>Mr Tim Buehrer Chief of Party/ USAID Contractor ASEAN- US Technical Assistance and Training Facility</p> <p>Mr Noordin Azhari Deputy Chief of Party/ USAID Contractor ASEAN- US Technical Assistance and Training Facility (Former Principal Director Bureau for Economic Integration and Finance, ASEAN Secretariat)</p>	<p>Newsletters for the ASEAN- US Technical Assistance and Training Facility</p>
	<p><i>ASEAN Secretariat</i></p>	<p>Six Monthly Progress Reports and Program</p>

	Dr Anish Kumar Roy Director Bureau for Resources Development Unit Former Director External Relations and Coordination	Completion Reports for RPS and PS, and the AADCP Mid Term Review
	<i>Uniquist</i> Mr Gary Ellem Operations Adviser Enabling ASEAN Project	Progress Reports for the Enabling ASEAN Project
	<i>Kadin Indonesia</i> <i>Indonesian Chamber of Commerce and Industry</i> Mr David Parsons Executive Director Committee on Investment and International Trade Development and author of research paper 06/001 (b) “An Investigation Into the Measures Affecting the Integration of ASEAN’s Priority Sectors (Phase 2) – The Case For Electronics”	REPSF research paper 06/001 (b) “An Investigation Into the Measures Affecting the Integration of ASEAN’s Priority Sectors (Phase 2) – The Case For Electronics”
Wednesday 13 August	<i>ASEAN Secretariat</i> Mr Rony Soerakoesoemah Assistant Director Bureau of Economic Integration and Finance	Six Monthly Progress Reports and Program Completion Reports for REPSF 1 and 2, and the AADCP Mid Term Review
	<i>ASEAN Secretariat</i> Mr Ky Anh Nguyen Senior Officer ICT Unit	Progress Reports and Project Completion Report for the “Legal Infrastructure for E-Commerce in ASEAN” Project
	<i>Cardno Acil</i> Ms Maria Balamiento Former Project Manager Regional Partnerships Scheme	Six Monthly Progress Reports and Program Completion Report for RPS and the AADCP Mid Term Review
	<i>ASEAN Secretariat</i> Mr Htain Lin	

	<p>Senior Officer, Natural Resources Unit Bureau of Economic Integration and Finance</p> <p>Mr Suriyan Vichitlekarn Senior Officer, Natural Resources Unit Bureau of Economic Integration and Finance</p>	
	<p><i>Cardno Acil</i></p> <p>Dr Iwan Gunawan Former Project Manager Program Stream</p>	<p>Six Monthly Progress Reports and Program Completion Report for PS and the AADCP Mid Term Review</p>
Thursday 14 August	<p><i>ASEAN Business Advisory Council, ASEAN Secretariat</i></p> <p>Mr Nararya Soeprapto Executive Secretary</p>	
	<p><i>ASEAN Secretariat</i></p> <p>Dr Alex Lim Head of Coordination Unit Ms Gayatri Probosasi Special Officer, Bureau External Relations and Coordination</p>	<p>Six Monthly Progress Reports and Program Completion Reports for RPS and PS and the AADCP Mid Term Review</p>
	<p><i>ASEAN Secretariat</i></p> <p>Mr Agus Sutanto Senior Officer for Statistics Bureau of Economic Integration and Finance</p> <p>Mr John de Guia Senior Officer for Statistics Bureau of Economic Integration and Finance</p>	<p>Volumes 1-3 of the reports for the “Development of an ASEAN Community Progress Monitoring System” project, Six Monthly Progress Reports and Program Completion Reports for RPS , PS and REPSF and the AADCP Mid Term Review</p>
	<p><i>ASEAN-EU Programme for Regional Integration Support- Phase II</i></p> <p>Mr David Martin Team Leader, European Technical Assistance Team</p>	<p>ASEAN-EU Programme for Regional Integration Support- Phase II Newsletters</p>

Friday 15 August	<i>AusAID</i> <i>Australian Embassy Jakarta</i>	
	Ms Jessica Hoverman Regional Coordinator, AusAID	
	<i>ASEAN Secretariat</i>	Six Monthly Progress Reports and Program Completion Reports for REPSF 1 and 2, and the AADCP Mid Term Review
	Mr Sundram Pushpanathan Principal Director Bureau of Economic Integration and Finance	

ANNEX 7

AADCP PARTICIPANT SURVEY

Date.....

Background information

1. Name of your agency:

.....

2. Your position:

.....

3. Your country:

.....

4. Name of the ASEAN/AADCP activity you were involved with:

(Note that the names of activities are provided in the covering email message)

5. Nature of your involvement:

(Tick as appropriate)

Working Group Member

Workshop Participant

Training Participant

National Focal Point

Regional Focal Point

Resource Person

Other (describe):

.....

6. Duration of involvement in this activity:

How many separate visits/trips did you make under this activity?(visits)

Total duration of your involvement in the training/workshops/meetings: ...(days)

Outcomes and results

7. What do you think was the planned objective(s) of this ASEAN/AADCP activity?

(Tick as appropriate)

Training or capacity building

Guideline development

Standards development

Policy dialogue/formulation

Research

- Planning (work plan, regional plan etc)
- Other
(describe).....

8. Can you describe these in more detail: (eg “Developing operational guidelines for movement of finfish” or, “Training in risk analysis for)

9. Please write down the single most important benefit from this activity:

To you personally:

For your agency:

10. If you have developed any new skills, have you been able to use them at your workplace? (circle as appropriate) YES / NO / NO SKILLS

If YES, describe which skills and how you have used them at work

If NO, describe why not

11. Did you share any skills or knowledge gained with colleagues in your agency or other agencies? (circle as appropriate) YES / NO / NOT APPLICABLE

If YES, describe what skills/knowledge, how they were shared and with whom

12. Has your agency used, adopted or further developed any of the outputs from this activity to this point in time? (eg guidelines, standards etc) YES / NO / NOT APPLICABLE

If YES, describe which outputs and how they have been used?

If NO, describe why not

13. Does your agency have plans to use any of the outputs from this activity in the future?
YES / NO / NOT APPLICABLE

If YES, describe which outputs and how they will be used/developed?

14. Overall what do you think were the major strengths and weaknesses of this activity?

Strengths:

Weaknesses (or areas for improvement):

15. Do you have any recommendations to make future AADCP activities more effective?

Recommendations:

ANNEX 8

AADCP MISSION DEBRIEFING NOTE/AIDE MEMOIRE

Background

An AusAID mission³⁶ visited Jakarta from 10-15 August for discussion with key stakeholders³⁷ as input to the preparation of the ASEAN Australia Development Cooperation Program (AADCP) Independent Completion Report (ICR). In Jakarta discussions were conducted with the Australian Embassy, relevant officers of ASEC, other donors, GRM (REPSF managing contractor) and business representatives. A list of persons interviewed is attached (as Annex 6).

AusAID requires that an Independent Completion Report be prepared for all major projects. The purpose of the ICR is to assess the performance of an activity and in particular determine what worked well and what might be done differently and more effectively in the future.

The ICR will provide an assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability and lessons learned of the AADCP, based on a review of available program documents, including contractor Completion Reports and discussions with key stakeholders.

Key findings

- The AADCP is well regarded by ASEC and regional members
 - The program was inclusive covering all 10 member countries;
 - the program was flexible and responsive;
 - the program approach provided a sound structure to the provision of assistance;
 - the activity selection and appraisal approach was transparent and disciplined;
 - the quality of outputs has been good;
 - contractor and sub contractor performance has been good; and
 - The AADCP contributed to some capacity building within ASEC, including an enhanced research culture.

- The AADCP was well regarded by other donors
 - REPSF outputs in particular have been useful in supporting other donor programs; and
 - there has been good coordination at a working level in an effort to avoid duplication and to leverage similar donor sector/project activities.

- ASEC has a large work program to manage with limited resources

³⁶ The mission comprised David Barber (consultant), George Collett (consultant), Joanne Ronalds (AusAID) Dr Alexander Lim (ASEC) and Ms Gayatri Probosasi (ASEC).

³⁷ To date stakeholder discussions have been conducted in Australia with contractors and a range of sub contractors and Australian government departments.

- desk officers service more than 90 working groups and between 800-1000 meetings each year;
 - ASEC capacity and systems for delivery of programs is limited. The delivery model for AADCP was labour intensive and contractor support was essential;
 - donor programs are large (around double ASEC's budget) and involve different approval and implementation processes; and
 - there is little time available for analytical work by desk officers.
- The key factors affecting successful AADCP project delivery include
 - sound contractor management practices;
 - desk officer commitment;
 - working group participation; and
 - good design.
 - The AADCP design had a number of limitations, including
 - at a higher level, the goal and objectives were unrealistic;
 - the monitoring framework and responsibility for monitoring was not clearly specified and there was a lack of clarity concerning measurement indicators;
 - AADCP reporting requirements were onerous and not results focussed; and
 - there was a lack of clarity concerning engagement with the private sector.
 - It is difficult to attribute the contribution of AADCP activities to progress in the regional ASEAN agenda
 - best results have been achieved in assisting the development of broad principles that are acceptable at a regional level and in the dissemination of research.
 - The potential for maximising linkages between REPSF and RS/RPS components was not fully realised
 - the program design did not assign responsibility, either for ASEC or contractors, for coordination or for enhancing opportunities to leverage between AADCP components.
 - The main constraint of regional programs is the ability to support national implementation
 - ASEC has a regional mandate only and AADCP was designed to provide regional assistance;
 - national implementation requires a clear understanding of national implications of regional agreements;
 - the flexibility and wide scope of AADCP is a trade-off against greater strategic focus and more in-depth support of fewer activities – the success of regional activities requires buy-in from all member countries;
 - regional training and workshops are effective in building networks and awareness but less so in building capacity;
 - member countries have different capacities and often different priorities which affect the scope to adapt and apply frameworks at the national level; and

- limited knowledge of national capacities/constraints and a regional focus limited the extent to which AADCP activities could be designed to meet national needs.
- o To complete stakeholder consultations a limited survey of training/workshop participants has been agreed with ASEC that a simple questionnaire should be used to collect information from ASEAN member country participants who had been involved in AADCP activities. A random sample of 16 AADCP projects was selected (6 from the Program Stream and 10 from the Regional Partnerships Stream). A simple questionnaire was reviewed and revised. The questionnaire will be sent by email to all participants in the sample of 16 projects. The emphasis of the survey is on the usefulness and application of training skills, and other outputs such as guidelines and standards, in each participant's agency. It is hoped that at least 200 responses will be received. The analysis of this simple survey will form a small section in the ICR and will help validate information provided by the other stakeholders consulted and provided in the contractors' Program Completion Reports.

Jakarta
15 Aug. 08