

AGENDA ITEM IV. CURRENT WORK

b. Evaluation Capacity Development

Towards a Strategic Approach for Evaluation Capacity Development
Draft consultation paper

This draft note has been prepared by the DFID and the Secretariat to inform discussion and decisions on a more strategic, collaborative Network approach to strengthening evaluation capacities in partner countries, at the 11th Meeting under Agenda Item IV. Current Work.



11th Meeting

16-17 November 2010

Summary

Discussion Questions

1. What should be the priorities for Network action? Which of these specific ideas are you willing to contribute to?
2. How can members work together on capacity development? Are there elements on which donors are willing to pool resources or pursue joint strategies? Are there elements that members want to take on alone?
3. What funding and human resources would be available in support of these activities?

Suggested of proposed actions based on lessons (summarised below) – *for discussion*

Activities	Who?
WITHIN CURRENT WORK	
Create a focal point on capacity and strengthen the network task team	Interested members to volunteer (with Secretariat support)
Share the inventory of members' evaluation plans with partner country evaluation stakeholders.	DAC Secretariat (with agreement of members)
FUND COUNTRY-LED EVALUATION INITIATIVES	
Enter into a multi-dimensional strategic partnership with two or three countries to support country-led capacity development by providing targeted training, institutional support and engaging in joint work over several years.	Role for DAC secretariat, member evaluation units and potentially country/ programme teams (would need funding from members)
ENHANCE NETWORKING	
Targeted collaboration with partner country networks.	Network focal point with support from others
TECHNICAL SUPPORT AND NORMATIVE WORK	
Pooling resources for training and conferences.	Task team with support from all interested members
Strengthening normative frameworks for evaluation	Network members with secretariat in collaboration with other networks
Help desk function for technical support	Led by one or more network members (with funds from a group of members)
Assistance with assessment of ECD needs and capacities in a country	TBD

Summary of key lessons informing joint approach

- Evaluation capacity development (ECD) is understood as the long-term change process of unleashing, strengthening and maintaining evaluation capacities. It takes place in the context of ongoing efforts to strengthen related systems of management, governance, accountability and learning.
- Strengthening evaluation capacities involves more than just building individual technical skills; capacities also involve the enabling environment and institutional capacities.
- A “one-size-fits-all” approach does not suit evaluation capacity development; change is a political, as well as technical, process.
- Capacity development initiatives should be led by relevant partner stakeholders.
- Useful evaluation systems are not supply driven, but balance supply and demand for quality evaluation outputs.
- Capacity strengthening should begin by taking stock of the current situation and setting realistic targets and expectations.
- A high level of commitment to and understanding of the benefits of evaluation – especially among top levels in a government – helps ensure sustainability of the evaluation function and use of evaluation findings.
- Hands-on learning by doing is often an effective learning technique.
- Regional and national evaluation associations can play a critical role in strengthening and sustaining M&E capacity.
- There are growing opportunities for “south to south” learning.
- Evaluation needs, capacity gaps and resources should be identified and addressed early on when planning and implementing development activities.
- Many ECD activities and networks already exist. The Network should focus on creating synergies and leveraging its unique resources and position to strengthen or add value to (not duplicate) existing work.

Towards a Shared Strategic Approach for Evaluation Capacity Development

Draft consultation note

Introduction

Development partners agree that strong evaluation capacities in partner countries are needed to support effective public policy making and achieve development results. This agreement is reflected in the fact that a number of member evaluation units have capacity support as a core function in their mandate. The DAC Evaluation Network is also mandated to support the development of evaluation capacities. Strengthening evaluation systems has become an area of increasing interest for domestic stakeholders and international partners alike. Donor engagement on this issue has intensified in the context of commitments to improve mutual accountability and support country systems (see Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and Accra Agenda for Action).

Stronger evaluation systems would benefit domestic and international stakeholders alike, buttress domestic and mutual accountabilities, support stronger partner ownership and provide needed evidence to improve development policies and programmes. Network members, both individually and collectively, have actively contributed to supporting partner efforts to strengthen evaluation systems and skills in a variety of ways over the past twenty years.¹

Still, work on capacity development is often fragmented and lacking in focus. A stock take was shared at the 10th Network meeting, several members expressed interest in working together then and a number of members are working together to support the CLEAR initiative (see Annex 1). However, wider progress on concrete actions has been mixed. Network members and partner countries alike have expressed the need for a more strategic and collaborative approach to strengthening evaluation capacities. Further work is needed. As described by the UNDP, “well-intentioned efforts to develop these systems face obstacles associated with institutional design, political dynamics, poor managerial and/or technical capacity and resistance to change. At the same time, innovative practices developed within particular contexts in developing nations may yield important lessons worth sharing.” (UNDP, 2009)

The goal of this note is to stimulate discussion about the role of the members of the DAC Evaluation Network in supporting partner country evaluation capacities.

This paper begins by laying out some core definitions to set the stage for an overview of current thinking on capacity development and lessons emerging from the literature to inform a joint strategic approach to supporting capacity development. A number of avenues for possible collective action are described in the final section, together with a short set of discussion questions. The annexes provide an extensive (though not exhaustive) list of evaluation associations and capacity development players (Annexes 1 and 2), as well as an overview of the current work of network members (Annex 3), and a rough draft matrix showing the strengths and gaps of current initiatives (Annex 4).

I. Core definitions

Evaluation capacities are the ability of people and organisations to define and achieve their evaluation objectives (OECD, 2006). Capacity involves three interdependent levels: individual, organisational and the enabling environment. These interrelated capacities function together to demand, supply and use evaluation. Evaluation capacities include the power to set the evaluation agenda and to determine what is evaluated and what questions are asked. Further, capacities include the ability not just to produce evaluations but also to manage evaluation processes and effectively use evaluation results to influence policy and programme decisions. It is useful to

¹ Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan for the OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation, “Fact-finding survey on evaluation capacity development (ECD) in partner countries.” (2006)

distinguish between the capacity to manage evaluations and the capacity to conduct them, as both are necessary. (Feinstein, 2009)

Evaluation capacity development (ECD) is understood as the process of unleashing, strengthening and maintaining evaluation capacities. Capacity development is a long-term, endogenous change process that takes place in the context of ongoing partner and donor efforts to strengthen related systems of management, governance, accountability and learning, to improve development effectiveness. The best capacity development approaches are flexible, adapted and sustainable (African Development Bank).

Strengthening evaluation capacities is not an end goal in itself, but, should be seen, rather, as a means to support more effective development activities. Evaluation implicates actors across the entire range of stakeholders involved in and affected by public policy: governments, intended beneficiaries, civil society, and the general public.

Development evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed development project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results (OECD, 2002). This definition covers not only the evaluation of official development assistance (ODA) and development co-operation activities of external partners, but also evaluations of the development policies and programmes of developing countries themselves.

II. Key principles of evaluation capacity development from literature

This section will not repeat the more thorough analysis already undertaken elsewhere (see OECD DAC 2009) nor summarize the literature, but, rather, highlight a few key points – around which consensus has emerged – with an eye to informing the network’s future strategy.

Literature abounds on this topic, covering a range of issues including: evaluation in the public sector, institutionalisation of evaluation processes, evaluation in developing country contexts, norms and standards for evaluating development co-operation, lessons from the poverty reduction strategy (PRS) initiatives, country studies, and general literature on capacity development in the public sector. A number of sources for further reading are listed in the Reference section at the end of this report.

In addition to the DAC Evaluation Network’s own work on capacity development, contributions of note have been made in this field through: the World Bank’s Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) Evaluation Capacity Development Series and *How to Build M&E Systems to Support Better Government* (2007); various UNDP works on national evaluation capacities; Kusek and Rist (2004 and 2008), and the UNICEF et al Evaluation Working Papers, to name just a few. This section builds on these authors/groups, presentations and room documents from various evaluation events, evaluations of capacity support programmes and case studies from individual countries including Egypt, South Africa, Chile, Sri Lanka, Uganda, and Ireland.

Lesson: A one “size-fits-all” approach does not suit evaluation capacity development. While core, agreed evaluation norms, standards and methods can be employed in various contexts, specific institutional and political contexts determine the shape and functioning of an evaluation system and the “rules of the game” for capacity development processes. ECD approaches must be tailored to fit the institutional, organisational and individual capacities and goals of country partners (which vary widely). Capacity development is both technical and political. Change processes require some measure of political support and momentum, and therefore the “how” side of capacity development will vary depending on the country context, even where goals are shared.

- *Implications for the network:* While identifying and sharing good practice and practical lessons can contribute to our collective understanding, we should avoid creating “straight-jackets” or blindly applying lessons from one country to another.

Lesson: Efforts to strengthen capacities should begin by taking stock of the current situation: A shared understanding of existing capacities, strengths, opportunities, needs, goals and challenges should be developed among partners. Future, ongoing and past evaluations and related capacity development initiatives should be taken into consideration, particularly as these may affect the receptiveness of stakeholders. Tools for assessing and mapping capacities exist and can be adapted to support this process. See for example the UNDP's Capacity Assessment Practice Note (UNDP 2008, Website: www.capacity.undp.org). Evaluation skills and resources may exist, but be hidden due to a lack of support systems; it can therefore be useful to examine not only actual supply and demand, but also "potential" supply or demand for evaluation.

- *Implications for the network:* Planning and design stages should actively engage partner countries to develop a shared understanding of the current situation and future goals.

Lesson: A high level of commitment to and understanding of the benefits of evaluation – especially among top levels in a government helps ensure sustainability and guarantee that capacities, once developed, are employed. Individual or organisational "champions" with a high level of commitment and political clout can be critical in generating momentum towards change. Evaluation champions should be identified, targeted, and supported over the long run as change facilitators. (Mackay, 2006) One useful approach to strengthening country systems is to focus efforts on the evaluation function within a particular part of the government that has political weight (such as the Ministry of Planning or the Coordinating Office for Development Co-operation – this will vary from country to country). That hub can serve as a functioning example to other parts of government and be leveraged to create wider change by demonstrating credibility (Segone et al, 2008). For instance, a case study of Chile's evaluation system found that leadership by the powerful Finance Ministry strengthened the quality of the government's monitoring and evaluation system and helped make it more sustainable (Mackay, 2006).

- *Implications for the network:* The network should work to think in terms of country evaluation systems (beyond development co-operation) and engage in a concentrated and focused manner with strong potential evaluation champions in (and beyond) government.

Lesson: Ownership: Capacity development initiatives should be led by relevant partner stakeholders from the outset. Capacity development is necessarily an endogenous process of change.² This means partners must identify priorities and goals, and drive the planning, implementation, monitoring and assessment of capacity initiatives. Donors can support, facilitate, and provide resources, but not "import" capacity. The need for the evaluation function itself to maintain independence and credibility does not change the fact that strengthening capacities must be an internally-driven process. At a recent conference on national evaluation capacities hosted by the UNDP, while many participants "acknowledged that the demand for evaluation often originated from international partners, all recognized the national political process as the ultimate factor that shaped the national systems."(UNDP, 2009) This is perhaps the biggest challenge for external partners trying to support capacity change processes.

- *Implications for the network:* The network should continue to take a supportive or conduit role and look to other areas of capacity development to learn how best to nurture ownership and effectively support country leadership.

Lesson: Many field experiences confirm that one of the most effective learning techniques is through hands-on learning by doing. Directly involving staff and officials in evaluation work can help to improve both individual capacities and the management capacities within relevant institutions, while also convincing them of the value and usefulness of evaluation.

- *Implications for the network:* Continue to strengthen the capacity dimension of joint evaluation work. Look for opportunities within established donor work programmes

² OECD DAC, "The Challenge of Capacity Development: Working Towards Good Practice."(OECD, 2006)

to involve interested partners, even as observers or silent partners. A number of challenges remain in managing and implementing joint evaluations – the network should continue learning from these experiences and deepen our collective understanding of the capacity implications of joint approaches.

Lesson: Dimensions of the evaluation system beyond individual skill building require further attention.³ In particular, more focus is needed on stimulating demand for evaluation and supporting effective use of evaluation results. Capacity building efforts have too often worked solely on technical training or skill building of individuals. The important roles of incentives and the overall accountability environment have been neglected. Capacity development should move beyond individual production skills to address the wider enabling environment for accountability, skills for commissioning, managing and using evaluations, and the institutional framework supporting accountability (Feinstein, 2009).

Furthermore, in the context of development co-operation, training individual evaluators can have unintended negative effects on country systems. Building individual skills without strengthening the wider institutions needed to support evaluation may lead to the best trained evaluators leaving government for the private sector or being hired by donor agencies who can pay more and provide benefits.

- *Implications for the network:* Support for individual training should be linked strategically with wider support for the country system and active donor engagement in joint or country-led evaluation work over a longer time period. We need to get past thinking that “evaluation capacity development = IPDET scholarships” and start thinking more in terms of country systems and evaluation use at the country level.

Lesson: Useful evaluation systems are not supply driven, but balance supply and demand for quality evaluation outputs. Many ECD efforts have focused on the supply side of the question: training evaluators, producing reports, etc. with not enough attention paid to stimulating public interest in development results, management responses, beneficiary empowerment, and other factors that stimulate demand and build an active accountability environment. Evaluation is inextricably linked to the wider accountability system in a society. Transparency and accountability in the public sector play a core role in determining if and for what purposes evaluations can and will be carried out. As described by African Community of Practice (CoP) member Dr. Rosa Muraguri-Mwololo, “principles that guide results based management (learning, participation/inclusiveness, accountability and transparency) cannot embed where democratic practices are not respected” (AfCOP MfDR, 2010).

- *Implications for the network:* Members should prop up capacities by helping to create demand, including through funding of country-led evaluations and pursuit of joint evaluation on topics of mutual interest. We should also learn more about how donors can support evaluation demand.

Lesson: Evaluation needs, capacity gaps and resources should be identified and addressed early in the design and planning of development activities. Budgets and plans for development programmes should build-in basic good practice for quality monitoring and evaluation and include strategies for strengthening these capacities, where needed, as part of the development intervention. Evaluability and fundamental principles of planning and monitoring are rarely taken into account at the design and implementation stages, which makes evaluation more difficult later down the line.

³ For example, a 2004 evaluation of the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET) found that many participants met strong resistance from within their own agencies and institutions when they attempted to put into practice the evaluation training they had received out of country. The political and “cultural” dimensions of institutions were unaffected by trainings targeted at individuals, resulting in frustration and failure to use capacity that had been created. Jua, Management consulting Services: “Evaluation of the International Program for Development Evaluation Training.”(2004)

- *Implications for the network:* Look into how country offices, programme units, and other parts of our development agencies (beyond evaluation) might be engaged in evaluation capacity support. In what ways can evaluation units support evaluability and the integration of plans for capacity support to carry out evaluation into development policies and programmes from the outset?

Lesson: There are growing opportunities for “south to south” learning and triangular co-operation. Learning and sharing experiences among peers can be particularly fruitful for capacity building. Participants at a recent UNDP-Morocco conference identified a number of possibilities for south-south learning or triangular co-operation and shared the opinion that these are particularly useful ways to support capacity development processes.

- *Implications for the network:* Consider how platforms for south-south learning could best be encouraged and supported. Explore the possibility of supporting ECD via triangular co-operation schemes, where donors provide financial or technical resources in collaboration with experienced countries to support a third country.

Lesson: Regional and national evaluation associations play a critical role in strengthening and sustaining monitoring and evaluation capacities. Such networks provide opportunities for useful dialogue, interaction and learning.⁴ National evaluation organisations can serve as learning hubs, offer training and access to resources, and encourage support in communities of individuals committed to evaluation and accountable governance. Evaluation organisations can help donor agencies identify potential evaluation “champions” and evaluators to participate in joint work. Professional associations also contribute to building an enabling environment for the growth of evaluation culture.⁵

- *Implications for the network:* Existing evaluation networks may be useful entry points for capacity support. We should explore strategic partnerships with partner networks where these could be mutually beneficial.

III. Evaluation capacities in developing countries – current status and challenges

The network needs a basic understanding of the terrain in developing countries in terms of evaluation capacities in the public sector. While it is often said that recipient countries “lack evaluation capacity” the situation is in fact quite varied today and by no means can this statement be applied across the board. In fact, a number of countries have institutionalised and are operating robust public policy evaluation functions. Some of these were driven initially, at least in part, through the development and implementation of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), which involved capacity support for monitoring and evaluation.⁶

Today, information about evaluation processes in developing countries is scattered. Capacity analyses and readiness assessments have been carried out in a number of countries, but these often look at a range of public administration capacities (including and beyond evaluation) and specifics on evaluation capacities at the country level are not (to our knowledge) available from a single source. There is a wealth of information available from various sources, including a number of evaluation networks and organizations (see Annex 2). Two primary sources of more in-depth analysis are the UNDP work on national evaluation capacities, and studies carried out in the World Bank IEG Evaluation Capacity Development series case studies.

⁴ See for instance, presentation “Evaluation Networks contributions to the Impact Evaluation Initiatives,” by Oumou Bah Tall, President International Organisation for Co-operation in Evaluation (IOCE) at the MES-IDEAS Workshop. Kuala Lumpur, 4 April 2008.

⁵ For more on the role of evaluation organisations see the 2006 IOCE publication *Creating and Developing Evaluation Organisations – Lessons learned from Africa, Americas, Asia, Australasia and Europe*.

⁶ A number of studies have looked at the role of PRSPs in strengthening evaluation capacities at the national level, see for example World Bank IEG and IMF IEO (2005), Prensushi Rubio, and Subbarao (2002) and World Bank (2001).

What is missing from the relatively rich information about donor evaluation policies and the emerging evaluation capacities in the public sector in recipient countries, is a clearer understanding of the links between these two. Information about donor use of country systems to evaluate development programmes is not readily available. Through the DAC Evaluation Network we are aware of the increasing involvement of governments in joint evaluation work, but there has been no stock taking of which parts of government are being involved and which country capacities exist to operate these collaborations on the partner country side.

A number of country-led initiatives on public administration and policy evaluation are underway, including work in India to create an independent evaluation body and a joint effort of the OECD and the Government of Morocco (see Annex 1) to set up a regional centre to strengthen public sector evaluation capacities. A useful starting point would be to find out more about these initiatives, in order to identify in-roads for support and possible opportunities for learning across countries. Further exploration is also needed to better understand connections to capacities outside of the public sector, in universities, national and regional research institutions and the private sector.

The following section draws on the outcome of discussions at the UNDP National Evaluation Capacity event held in Morocco in December 2009 (UNDP, 2009). This event was particularly useful in bringing forth country-level capacities and current challenges for further strengthening these capacities. This builds on earlier efforts to take stock, see for instance the series of regional workshops hosted by the African Development Bank, World Bank and OECD DAC in the late 1990's (AfDB and World Bank, 1999). The discussions in Morocco involved participants from a range of developing countries. Their findings are useful for contributing to our understanding of current issues around capacity development in partner countries. These findings largely back up the lessons from literature outlined above.

- There are increasing expectations for countries to develop national evaluation systems. Institutionalisation is increasing rapidly and there are legal mandates, including constitutional mandates in some cases, to carry out evaluation in the public sector in many countries.
- Some countries moved from sub-national and sectoral approaches to developing national systems while others, after having established national systems, are now devoting attention on sub-national capacities in evaluation. Countries are evaluating a combination of outputs, outcomes, effects and impacts. Processes and approaches vary.
- While there is a close relationship between planning, monitoring and evaluation, generally speaking, planning and monitoring have received more resources and have been strengthened more. Some countries are not making explicit linkages between evaluation results and planning or monitoring of programme output and outcome indicators to inform decision making.⁷
- In some countries independent evaluations of public policies are submitted to parliament, while in others they remain within the executive branch, either in offices of the prime minister or president or the ministries of finance or planning. In some countries, auditor general offices are performing evaluation functions.
- The technical soundness of evaluation is a cornerstone for credibility but does not guarantee use. Institutionalization of evaluation systems also depends on decision-makers understanding and using information produced by evaluation. Evaluation of public policies can only happen if political will and commitment exist.
- The evaluation of public policies and programmes is embedded in political processes. Therefore both technical and political dimensions need to be considered for evaluation to take place. The role of government as the responsible entity for establishing the policies and the normative framework is critical to the process. Nevertheless parliaments and civil society were recognized as important players for establishing checks and balances. The role of the private sector is less clear, including the

⁷ A similar crowding out of evaluation by growing emphasis on monitoring and results based management has been reported by donor agencies as well (OECD DAC, 2000)

- involvement of the business sector, and its relation to demand and supply of evaluation, and partnerships with evaluation associations.
- Governments express a strong desire for ownership of evaluation processes and need to build their own evaluation standards rooted in the national context.

IV. Current initiatives and avenues for future work on evaluation capacity development

We collectively know quite a lot about what makes for success in an individual capacity development activity: ownership, focus on supply and demand, support for champions, strengthening management and use of findings as well as evaluating skills, taking a partnership approach, learning by doing, and drawing on experiences from others, especially through south-south sharing. What seems to be lacking is the macro-picture: an overarching strategic understanding of how these various efforts add up. A rough first attempt to compile various efforts (and proposals) has been made and could be developed further as we take this work forward (see Annex 4). Further thinking is also needed on prioritisation and sequencing.

Introducing complicated new institutions or coordination mechanisms will likely complicate an already cluttered terrain and hence this approach is not favoured. The most fruitful approach may be on building shared knowledge and understanding of “best-fit practices”, collaborating where doing so would add benefit, and working towards a more rational division of labour among the many international actors engaged in capacity development. How this can be achieved in practical terms, and how to get incentives right to support such collaborative approaches, needs to be further discussed, based on the present proposals.

Demand for evaluation capacity strengthening activities, including training, remains high. In particular, partners express the need for locally-based trainings offered in relevant national languages. Demand for demonstrating results and value-for-money are rising as well, however this is not always well articulated as a desire for rigorous evaluation or a need for capacities in evaluation. Members’ broad support for the CLEAR initiative and strong interest from many partners to host CLEAR centres, demonstrate these demands for ECD in-country. Some targeted mapping and assessment may be of use if these could be linked to a concrete action plans or strategies led by partner countries – though this may be beyond the Network’s remit at present. There are a lot of activities supporting individual skills building and professional evaluation networks (see Annexes 1-2). There is larger need in the areas of evaluation management and use capacities (UNDP 2010).

It is clear that strategies should focus on engaging at all three levels (individual training, management and institutional support and nurturing an enabling environment for accountability more broadly). Literature also emphasises the importance of ownership and strategic leadership from a dedicated core in-country. This means that funding of isolated, individual evaluation training is likely not going to create a critical mass needed to spur country systems in a useful way.

V. Potential routes for DAC Evaluation Network support for evaluation capacity development

The following is an initial list of ideas of steps we might take to move forward the capacity agenda, starting with creating a stronger task team to carry forward these ideas. This list would benefit from honing and further insight from others working on capacity development and evaluation, and especially from partner country perspectives. The list is by no means exhaustive, but should be viewed as a menu of possible options to further develop depending on interest and resources. The list focuses on evaluation, though work on evaluation capacity must be grounded in an understanding of the related systems of monitoring, results management, planning, audit and communication.

We also recognise the different levels at which members work and the fact that engagement on this agenda may vary, involving all or some of the following:

- Evaluation department work
- Country-led ventures
- Joint donor ventures
- Donor country offices' and programme units
- DAC secretariat

First steps

1. Strengthen task team and identify a network focal point on capacity: The DAC Evaluation Network should identify a volunteer member to serve as a capacity development focal point to help move this work forward and manage relations with other communities. The small Network task team on ECD identified at the previous network meeting could be strengthened to drive forward this work, with support from the Secretariat. As a first step, this group should further develop the ideas presented here and come up with a concrete action plan that addresses feasibility, potential resource implications (financial and human), timelines and expected benefits.

2. Share evaluation plans with partner country stakeholders: The member evaluation plans inventory (currently managed by the Secretariat and hosted on the members-only website) could be opened up to public access and/or shared with selected evaluation networks of partner country evaluation stakeholders. This would facilitate internal planning processes in-country and also open up the scope for partners to suggest/identify topics of mutual interest for collaboration.

3. Targeted collaboration to support country-led evaluation capacity development in two or three partner countries: DAC EVALNET could invite two or three interested recipient countries to submit a proposal for a partnership with us, based on their evaluation needs and a description of their own capacity goals. The Network could then work with the country to develop a multidimensional partnership with that country to support evaluation capacity development over several years.

Network members would support this multi-year joint plan for capacity development, both by providing direct training to key stakeholders and by engaging in country-led and joint evaluation work (and refraining from carrying out parallel individual evaluations). Members could provide funding for training in-country of a large group (twenty or more?) of core staff and other stakeholders in a core ministry to strengthen skills in evaluation production, management and use. Ideally this would be linked to planned joint evaluation work. It could also build on ties to CLEAR support and the regional centre at the University of Witwatersrand in South Africa (in conjunction with GIMPA (Ghana) and KIA (Kenya)).

Funding could be provided for country-led and joint evaluations within a multi-year plan and would be backed by active donor efforts to align with the country-led process. Donors providing development co-operation in the area under evaluation might join the country-led initiative, for example, as part of a steering group. Support could also be provided through technical assistance in design and implementation, by supporting dissemination and use of findings, and by support the institutional capacity and demand.

To maximise policy relevance and long term support for evaluation, timing of such an initiative would have to be determined carefully. Preferably the initiative would correspond with a revision of development strategies / policies in-country (new sector strategies or poverty reduction plans, for instance). The focus of this collaboration would be on the partner country evaluation systems, moving "beyond aid" to look at evaluations of development strategies, policies and programmes, including – but not exclusively – those supported by external partners.

Possibilities for future work (in no particular order)

4. Pooling resources for training and conferences: Network members could create a mechanism for pooling resources for evaluation training scholarships and participation in evaluation events. This could compliment the joint country-specific collaboration (described in 3) but go beyond to provide a channel for capacity support to participants from many countries. Creating some sort of standing fund would allow for a more targeted, strategic approach to providing scholarships.

For instance, by concentrating on supporting learning opportunities for a critical mass of people from a particular country, Ministry or agency over a short time period. It could also help reduce the burden on partners by improving clarity around selection criteria and creating a “one stop shop” for scholarship assistance. Currently, pooling is done on an ad hoc basis before specific evaluation events, or individual donors are approached by partner country stakeholders seeking financial assistance to attend trainings or events. Creating some sort of standing fund would help create a clearer division of labour between donors and allow for a more targeted, strategic approach to providing scholarships.

5. Targeted collaboration with partner country networks: On behalf of the DAC Evaluation Network, the focal point/task team could approach one or two regional/international evaluation groups (Afrea, for example, with which the Network has collaborated in the past) to explore areas of mutual interest and find out from them what needs and interests they have. Together they could identify one or two concrete areas for collaboration. Such collaboration would focus on areas of mutual benefit, where the DAC Evaluation Network would have an identifiable comparative advantage in terms of providing specific expertise, knowledge, experience or resources or opportunities for mutual learning.

6. Technical support: Help desk function for technical support: Donors could work together to create a “help desk” type function to provide online or telephone based support to partner country staff working on evaluation (and donor staff). Such a concept needs further development and should link up with other initiatives, including CLEAR, but seems like a useful compliment to existing services and programmes.

7. Encourage country offices and programme units in our development agencies to support capacity development for evaluation. As part of the joint initiative (described in step 3) evaluation units would also work with in-country embassies/country offices to incorporate evaluability and good design into development programmes from the outset, and to apply a capacity lens to the design and implementation stages to engage partner capacities where possible.

8. Strengthening normative frameworks for evaluation: A potential area for collaboration with existing evaluation groups and partner networks would be around strengthening evaluation norms and standards. The network could work, in collaboration with the intended users, to adapt existing evaluation tools and norms (including the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards and other existing standards) to fit different. The outcomes of the UNDP-Morocco conference on national evaluation capacities demonstrate strong interest from partner countries in strengthening evaluation norms and standards. The network could reflect on how existing norms, standards, and evaluation guidance (including DAC quality standards and other existing work from UNEG, Afrea, etc.) can be used by countries in their own evaluation systems. Would these evaluation tools and norms need to be adapted to fit different country contexts? If so, how could the collective experience of network members inform such adaptation? Could they be applied “as is” or perhaps accompanied by a simple introduction putting them into context for partner countries? The network could use existing resources (like the Summary of Key Norms and Standards) to develop a tool for work in partner countries – ideally in collaboration with the intended users.

9. Assessment of ECD needs and capacities in a country. The network could provide assistance based on members' own experiences, to assessing evaluation systems in-country. This could draw on the, "Evaluation Systems and Use, a working tool for Peer Reviews and Assessments," (DAC, 2006) and other network's standards, to assess capacity strengths and challenges and mapping these at the country level. Such work would be useful as an input to other initiatives and for individual work of donors and countries working on capacity development. Such a mapping across a number of countries would become a shared resource that would be useful for partner countries own processes and would also help donors identify partners for collaboration and joint work. The mapping could include local evaluation resources, such as training opportunities, evaluation consultants, etc. This could begin with a selected group of interested partner countries and then work towards expanding coverage.

VII. Questions for discussion

1. Which of these specific ideas are most appealing to you? What should the priorities be?
2. How can members work together on capacity development? Are there elements on which donors are willing to pool resources or pursue joint strategies? Are there elements that members want to take on alone?
3. What funding and human resources would be available in support of these activities?

References

- African Development Bank & World Bank Operations Evaluation Departments, "Evaluation Capacity Development in Africa: Selected Proceedings from a Seminar in Abidjan" (November, 1998)
- Bah Tall, Oumou, "Étude sur le développement des capacités en évaluation (ECD) en Afrique de l'Ouest, Rapport préliminaire" for the OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation (2008)
- Bah Tall, Oumou, presentation "Evaluation Networks contributions to the Impact Evaluation Initiatives," at the MES-IDEAS Workshop. (Kuala Lumpur, 4 April 2008)
- Bamberger, Michael and Howard White, "Using Strong Evaluation Designs in Developing Countries: Experience and Challenges" in *Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Evaluation*, Volume 4, Number 8 (October 2007) <http://www.jmde.com/Articles>
- Boyle, Richard, "ECD in the Republic of Ireland" IEG World Bank ECD working paper series no. 14. (June 2005)
- Breier, Horst for the OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation, "Joint Evaluations: Recent experiences, lessons learned and options for the future." (Paris, 2005)
- Cuong, Cao Manh and John Fargher, "Evaluation Capacity Development In Vietnam," room document for the OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation, 6th meeting. (Paris, 27 – 28 June 2007)
- Danida, "Evaluation study on experiences with conducting evaluation jointly with partner countries." (forthcoming)
- Feinstein, O. "National Evaluation Capacity: Lessons Learned and a Conceptual Scheme" (2009)
- Hauge, Arild O. "The Development of Monitoring and Evaluation Capacities to Improve Government Performance in Uganda," Evaluation Capacity Development Working Paper Series, no. 10. (OED World Bank, October 2003)
- Hradsky, Jim, OECD DAC Capacity Development Secretariat meeting document, "Capacity Development in Broad Strokes: Accra and Beyond." (July 2008)
- IADB and OECD DAC: "Regional Seminar on Monitoring and Evaluation in Latin America and the Caribbean: strengthening evaluation capabilities for sustainable development." (Quito, 1993)
- IOCE Creating and Developing Evaluation Organisations – Lessons learned from Africa, Americas, Asia, Australasia and Europe. (2006)
- Jayasekera, T. M. "Monitoring and evaluation for Development Effectiveness – Lessons, Experiences and the Way Forward with special emphasis to the Water Sector of Sri Lanka – Executive Summary." UNDP – TA and Ministry of Plan Implementation, Sri Lanka. (undated)
- Jua, Management consulting Services: "Evaluation of the International Program for Development Evaluation Training." (2004)
- Khan, Khadija, "Strengthening of Monitoring and Evaluation System" Pakistan Poverty Alleviation Fund. Islamabad – June 2003.

- Kusek, Jody Zall, "Ten step to a results based monitoring and evaluation system," in UNICEF, 2008.
- Mackay, Keith, "Institutionalization of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems to Improve Public Sector Management," by Independent Evaluation Group & the Thematic Group for Poverty Analysis, Monitoring and Impact Evaluation, The World Bank. ECD Working Paper Series - No. 15: January 2006
- Malaysia Evaluation Society (MES) Website: "Core Work: Evaluation Advocacy"
http://mes.org.my/home/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=79&Itemid=88 (Consulted online October 2010)
- Newsletter of the African Community of Practice on Managing for Development Results (October, 2010) http://africacop.org/news/oct10/AfCoP_News-10-10-en.html#TOP
- OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation – Meeting room document 5, "Partners in Development Evaluation – Learning and Accountability." (15-16 January 2004)
- OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation, "Evaluation Systems and Use, a working tool for Peer Reviews and Assessments,"(OECD , 2006a)
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/57/12/35857765.pdf>
- OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, "Fact-finding survey on evaluation capacity development (ECD) in partner countries." (Tokyo, 2006b)
- OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation, "Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management." (Paris, 2002)
- OECD DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation (now Network on Development Evaluation), "Results based Management in the Development Co-operation Agencies: A Review of Experience, background report." (2000)
- OECD DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation, "Donor Support for Institutional Capacity Development in Environment: Lessons Learned." (Paris, 2000)
- OECD DAC WP-EV Workshop report, "Development partners in evaluation learning and accountability," Paris, 25-26 March, 2003. (2003)
- OECD DAC, "The Challenge of Capacity Development: Working Towards Good Practice."(Paris, 2006)
- OECD Network on Development Evaluation, "A strategic approach to Evaluation Capacity Development for the DAC Network on Development Evaluation: What is known and suggestions for moving forward" prepared by the Secretariat for the 9th Meeting of the DAC Network on Development Evaluation, June 2009. (Paris, 2009)
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/19/13/42974509.pdf>
- Prennushi, G., G. Rubio, and K. Subbarao, "Chapter 3: Monitoring and Evaluation" in *Sourcebook for Poverty Reduction Strategies (Vol. 1 of 2) Core techniques and cross-cutting Issues* edited by Jeni Klugman. (World Bank, 2002). <http://go.worldbank.org/94XIE2QA20>

- Scanteam, "Inception Report - Synthesis Study on Best Practices and innovative Approaches to Capacity Development in Low Income African Countries." (Oslo, 2007)
- Schaumburg-Müller, Henrik for the OECD DAC Expert Group on Aid Evaluation: "Evaluation Capacity Building – Donor support and experiences." (Paris, 1996)
- Segone, Marco, Mahesh Patel, Jean-Charles Rouge and Craig Russon, "National and Regional Evaluation Organizations as a Sustainable Strategy for Evaluation Capacity Development" by Marco Segone in *Creating and Developing Evaluation Organizations- Lesson learned from Africa, Americas, Asia, Australasia and Europe*. (217-238) International Organization for Co-operation in Evaluation, 2007.
- UNDP Event on National Evaluation Capacity:
<http://stone.undp.org/undpweb/eo/evalnet/workshop/nec/index.cfm> (Consulted online October 2010)
- UNDP, "Evaluation Capacity Development in Asia: Selected Proceedings from the International Conference Beijing, October 1999" Evaluation Office, United Nations Development Programme (2000)
- UNDP, "Supporting Capacity Development – the UNDP Approach." (New York, June 2007)
- UNICEF et al Bridging the gap – the role of monitoring and evaluation in evidence-based policy making. (Geneva, 2008)
- UNICEF et al Country-led monitoring and evaluation systems, Better evidence, better policies, better development results. (Geneva, 2009)
- United Nations Development Program (UNDP) & the Observatoire National du Développement Humain: Brief note on conference outcome of the International Conference on 'National Evaluation Capacities' 15-17 December 2009, Casablanca, Kingdom of Morocco.
http://stone.undp.org/undpweb/eo/evalnet/workshop/nec/documents/report/NEC_conference_brief_note.pdf
- Vietnam Australia Monitoring and Evaluation Strengthening Project (Phase II): "Case study of M&E capacity building in Vietnam." (December 2006)
- World Bank and Carleton University, "IPDET Worldwide website." <http://www.ipdet.org> (Accessed July 2008) and *Evaluation of the International Program for Development Evaluation Training* presented to the OE Division of the World Bank and Carleton University. (March 22, 2004)
- World Bank IEG and IMF IEO, "The Poverty Reduction Strategy Initiative – Findings from 10 Country Case Studies of World Bank and IMF Support" (2005)
- World Bank Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) Evaluation capacity development (ECD) Working Paper Series: No.17: A Diagnosis of Colombia's National M&E System, SINERGIA (February 2007)
- World Bank Operations Evaluation Department, *Annual Report on Evaluation Capacity Development*. (Washington D.C., 2002)
- World Bank, "Building Evaluation Capacity for Poverty Reduction Strategies: Highlights of the Hague Workshop" Room Document for the DAC Working Party on Aid Effectiveness 34th meeting (Paris, 2001)

World Bank, "Evaluation Capacity Development: OED Self-Evaluation." (Washington D.C., June 2004)

World Bank, *How to Build M&E Systems to Support Better Government*. (Washington D.C., 2007)

Zhaoying, Chen, "Donor Support for Evaluation Capacity Development: from the Perspective of Recipient-country" for DAC/WP-EV Workshop, 2003.

Annex 1.

Existing players in evaluation capacity development

A longer list of evaluation organisations, training opportunities and international networks can be found in Annex 2.

Specific training and ECD programmes

- **The International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET)** is an executive training program that aims to provide managers and practitioners the generic tools required to evaluate development policies, programs, and projects at the local, national, regional, and global levels. The program features a two-week Core Course, followed by two weeks of more than 25 in-depth workshops, all taught by a dynamic group of leading-edge international faculty drawn from Southern and Northern organizations.
<http://www.ipdet.org/page.aspx?pageId=whatIs>
- **The Regional Centres for Learning on Evaluation and Results (Clear) Initiative:** CLEAR is a new global initiative to help developing countries strengthen their capacities in monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and performance management (PM). The initiative is being supported by the African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency, United Kingdom's Department for International Development and the World Bank. CLEAR responds to increasing government demands for applied M&E and PM capacity-building support and to the current limited availability of relevant services in Latin America, Africa, East Asia, and South Asia. Good quality programs and the pool of local experts are scarce on a wide range of relevant issues. These factors limit countries to depend on international supply, which is expensive, untimely, and not necessarily customized to their specific needs.

The CLEAR initiative responds to these needs with two key components: (1) *regional centres* to provide applied in-region training, technical assistance, and evaluation work, and (2) *global learning* to strengthen practical knowledge-sharing on M&E and PM across regions, on what works, what does not work, and why. The centres will provide demand-driven and cost-effective services specific to each region through training, advisory services, evaluation and innovation. Over 50 institutions have expressed interest in hosting a CLEAR centre in Africa and 5 institutions have been invited to put in a full proposal for this. Expressions of interest are currently being sought for CLEAR in South Asia. The level of interest in Africa was beyond expectations and would seem to demonstrate high demand for ECD in Africa – as well as highlighting a number of institutions who are already available to provide training in M&E on the continent. <http://www.worldbank.org/ieg/clear/>

- **The OECD- MENA Initiative on Governance and Investment for Development** is a regional effort, initiated and led by countries in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA). It promotes broad reforms to enhance the investment climate, modernise governance structures and operations, strengthen regional and international partnerships, and promote sustainable economic growth throughout the MENA region, including by strengthening public policy evaluation capacities. A conference was held in Rabat in early 2010 to explore the possibility of creating a regional public policy evaluation capacity development centre (to be based in Morocco). This work is led by the Government of Morocco, with support from the OECD Secretariat in the Governance Directorate. The Morocco ECD centre would be complimented by training centres on financial management and other public administration hosted by other MENA countries. The Secretariat of the Evaluation Network has also contributed to this work and there seems to be scope for further collaboration.
www.oecd.org/mena
- **The International Development Research Centre (IDRC)** is a Crown corporation created by the Parliament of Canada in 1970 to help developing countries use science and technology to find practical, long-term solutions to the social, economic, and environmental problems they face. Support is directed toward creating a local research community whose work will build healthier, more equitable, and more prosperous societies. In South Asia this has involved considerable work to help foster networks linking researchers, citizens and civil

society organisations. Support has also been provided for "Institutionalizing Evaluation Training in Universities in South Asia" which supports Universities in Bangladesh, India and Pakistan in their efforts to implement a graduate-level evaluation curriculum. The curriculum will be applied and problem-oriented, and will draw on global best practices designed to meet national and regional evaluation priorities. The long-term objectives are to strengthen evaluation skills in the context of the development challenges in South Asia, and to support a culture of innovation, experimentation and research in academic institutions. The overall goal is to contribute to more accountable and effective development research, policy and interventions.

- **Bursary programmes:** A number of donors provide direct assistance to developing country evaluation experts and emerging talent from the public sector. For instance, DFID funded ten developing country partners to attend the European Evaluation Society annual conference and workshops, where they will attend capacity strengthening workshops and also have the opportunity to network with other evaluation professionals.
- **Online capacity development resources:** A number of webportals and online communities provide opportunities for networking, skill building and sharing of experiences. MyMandE is one. Others are listed in Annex 2.

Communities of practice and professional networks

Evaluation organisations, networks and associations work to improve methods and practice, enhance the standards and quality of evaluation work, develop skills, promote ethical behaviour and standards, strengthen professional independence and provide a forum for exchange, debate and learning (see International Organization for Co-operation in Evaluation (IOCE) website). These networks can play a role as entry points for identifying demand and existing capacities. At the country level, such organisations also help create supportive communities for learning, networking and building skills. They can play an important role in professionalization of the evaluation field. (Segone et al, 2007).

The number of organisations of this kind has grown rapidly in the past fifteen years, with particularly strong growth of organisations in developing countries, outside Western Europe and North America. In Africa, the expansion of groups of evaluators has been "rapid and dramatic" (ibid) and the same could be said for Asia, where a number of national research and evaluation organisations have taken a strong regional role in supporting capacities in neighbouring countries. See for instance, the work on evaluation advocacy by the Malaysian Evaluation Society, which encourages developing countries to adopt and implement evaluation particularly within the public sector (MES, 2010)

- **The International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS)** was inaugurated in September 2002 to help fill a gap in the international evaluation architecture. IDEAS' mission is 'to advance and extend the practice of development evaluation by refining methods, strengthening capacity and expanding ownership', with a particular focus on developing and transitional economies. IDEAS' strategy aims to promote and advance evaluation as a key tool for development effectiveness, transparency and accountability in policy-making, social and organisational learning. IDEAS focuses on three major themes: Enhancing Conceptual Thinking in Development Evaluation, Governance and Accountability for Development, Strengthening Development Evaluation Practice. <http://www.ideas-int.org>
- **International Organization for Co-operation in Evaluation (IOCE)** is a loose alliance of regional and national evaluation organisations (associations, societies and networks) from around the world that collaborate to: build evaluation leadership and capacity in developing countries; foster the cross-fertilisation of evaluation theory and practice around the world; address international challenges in evaluation; and assist the evaluation profession to take a more global approach to contributing to the identification and solution of world problems. The IOCE has been set up to add value to the many national and regional efforts – to encourage co-operation and to strengthen evaluation internationally. IOCE is part of this contemporary movement that looks to evaluation as a profession and practice that can

contribute to improve societal, policy and institutional problem solving and development.
<http://www.ioce.net>

- **Managing for Development Results (MfDR) Communities of Practice (COPs)** in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Members of the **African MfDR CoP** “strive to make our organizations more effective and accountable to ensure that they improve the lives of our fellow citizens.” It is a bilingual virtual community of over 1,550. The website receives on average 4 250 visits per month. Thirty-seven percent of the members are working for African governments, with about a quarter of them directly for the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development or equivalent. Members from development agencies, mostly field office staff, count for 19% of the total membership.

AfCoP representatives participate in international fora, including joint-CoP activities with the Asian and Latin American Cops. Members work for African governments, civil society, and as independent results experts in the field. Their mission is to build African capacity to manage for development results through sharing experiences, networking and building strong learning relationships between practitioners in Africa and around the world.

- **Regional evaluation networks, i.e. African Evaluation Association (AFREA):** *AfrEA* was founded in 1999 in response to a growing demand for information sharing, advocacy and advanced capacity building in evaluation in Africa. It is an umbrella organisation for more than 20 national M&E associations and networks in Africa, and a resource for individuals in countries where national bodies do not exist. *AfrEA* works with the national networks and interested partners on the continent and worldwide to develop a strong African evaluation community. Among others it has held five continent-wide conferences; the fifth and most recent one took place in Egypt in March/April 2009, and has facilitated the development of African Evaluation Guidelines to enhance the quality and utility of evaluation on the continent.
- **Community of Evaluators (CoE)** a group of evaluators from South Asia, working together to strengthen the field of evaluation. Community of Evaluators (COE) in South Asia has been constituted in October 2008 as part of a Project titled "Advancing Evaluation Theory and Practices in South Asia – “Building a Community of Experts”. The Community presently has 36 members from South Asian Countries namely Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. The Goal of the CoE is – “to promote and enhance the quality of the theory and practice of evaluation in South Asia and to contribute to the same, particularly from a South Asian perspective, globally.”
- **National evaluation associations/network** (numerous) work to build professional communities and strengthen accountability environment, as well as supporting individual skill building.
- Major evaluation **conferences and events** (often hosted by regional associations such as the European Evaluation Society, IOCE or others) are also important platforms for learning, networking, sharing experiences and building skills. For example, the **Evaluation Conclave in South Asia** to be held in 2010 will bring together hundreds of evaluation experts and development staff from the region and beyond. The conclave is an initiative of Community of Evaluators (CoE) a group of evaluators from South Asia. In 2009, the UNDP hosted a major event on National Evaluation Capacity in Morocco to: share experiences from countries with different levels of development of national M&E systems; to identify lessons and constraints in implementing national M&E systems; and, to identify supply and demand for technical assistance in strengthening institutional capacity for national M&E systems under the umbrella of South-South co-operation. (UNDP, 2009)

Major institutional players

UNDP is a core player in the field of evaluation capacity development. A task team of the **United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG)** is currently focusing on ECD at the country level. The UNDP benefits from broad membership and a country-level presence and could therefore be a potentially be a complimentary partner for the DAC network.

UNICEF has recently published a conceptual framework on developing national capacities for country-led evaluation systems, “Evidence for Children” (UNICEF, 2010) and has led in the publication of series of works on country systems, the “Evaluation Working Papers” in collaboration with IOCE and IDEAS and others. UNICEF is mandated by the UN General Assembly to support country systems.

http://www.unicef.org/evaluation/files/DevelopingCapacities_CountryEvaluationSystems_final.pdf

World Bank Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) has produced extensive research on ECD experiences and processes, including a major publication on developing M&E systems to support governance (World Bank, 2007). The Bank also provides some capacity support, including through IPDET and in-country trainings on M&E.

African Development Bank: The Operation Evaluation Department is a strong proponent of evaluation capacity development. Since the end of the 1980s, it has often partnered with others to help strengthen—through a variety of advocacy and knowledge-sharing activities—the capacities of regional member countries to develop and implement evaluation systems and processes. Such capacity development is increasingly important as countries and donors seek to align external aid support with nationally owned strategies and programs.

Asian Development Bank (ADB): According to their website, the Independent Evaluation Department has backed evaluation capacity development since 1990 to raise awareness of its role in promoting the transparency, accountability, results orientation, and effectiveness of management systems. The changing development context of the Asia and Pacific region and the advent of learning organizations and knowledge-based economies have fed stocktaking exercises in IED that warrant placing a stronger accent on evaluation capacity development. The ADB provides technical assistance and other forms of support to its developing country members.

<http://www.adb.org/evaluation/technical-assistance>

Other DAC Evaluation Network members. A number of bilateral donor evaluation departments are charged with supporting capacity development for evaluation in recipient countries. Some departments, while not explicitly charged with this function, never the less find themselves facing capacity constraints in their daily work. Annex 2 contains a summary for network members, based on responses to a 2009 member survey.

Related evaluation or capacity development work:

3iE: The International Initiative for Impact Evaluation, funds the design and implementation of impact evaluations in development. A new funding window (started in 2010) provides funding and technical support for promising impact evaluation proposals, with an eye towards supporting emerging capacities and demand for evaluation at the country level.

Spanish Impact Evaluation Trust Fund: The intent is to provide global knowledge about what works, build capacity, disseminate knowledge and improve effectiveness of social policy. The Spanish Government trust fund from the Spanish Directorate General of Policy Planning and Evaluation for Development of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Development, and the Ministry of Economy and Finance. Eleven million Euros supporting impact evaluations from July 2007-- July 2010.

PARIS 21: The *Partnership in Statistics for Development in the 21st Century (PARIS21)* was founded in November 1999 by the United Nations, the European Commission, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank, in response to the UN Economic and Social Council resolution on the goals of the UN Conference on Development. PARIS21's goal is to develop a culture of evidence-based policy making and implementation which serves to improve governance and government effectiveness in reducing poverty and achieving the Millennium Development Goals. PARIS21 pursues this goal by encouraging and assisting low-income countries to design, implement, and monitor a National

Strategy for the Development of Statistics (NSDS). An NSDS is expected to provide a country with a strategy for strengthening statistical capacity across the entire national statistical system (NSS). As it focuses very much on the national statistics offices, PARIS 21 has not engaged in any great way on evaluation; however there may be lessons to learn from work they have done on advocacy around national statistics. The approach here has been to set out strategies for statistics behind which Government and supportive donors can align funding and other support.

Annex 2. Other evaluation organisations and websites

Other major Networks	
United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG)	http://www.uneval.org/
Evaluation Co-operation Group	http://www.ecgnet.org/
The Active Learning Network on Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Assistance (ALNAP)	http://www.alnap.org/
Training Opportunities	
CLEAR Initiative	www.worldbank.org/ieg/clear
International Program Development Evaluation Training (IPDET)	http://www.ipdet.org/ Designed to meet the professional development needs of senior- and mid-level evaluation and audit professionals working in developed and developing country governments, as well as the needs of professional evaluators working in bilateral and multilateral development agencies and banks.
IMA International	http://www.imainternational.com IMA International is an international development business specialising in capacity building worldwide, including institutional capacity building. Offers courses, training and coaching in monitoring and evaluation.
International Initiatives and Networks	
International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS)	International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS)
International Organisation for Co-operation in Evaluation	International Organisation for Co-operation in Evaluation
International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie)	International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie)
Network of Networks on Impact Evaluation (NONIE)	Network of Networks on Impact Evaluation (NONIE)
UN Agencies	
Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS)	http://www.unaids.org/en/AboutUNAIDS/IndependentEvaluation
UN Office of Internal Oversight	http://www.un.org/Depts/oios/

Services	
United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF)	http://www.unCDF.org/english/evaluations/
Food and Agricultural Organisation	http://www.fao.org/pbe/pbee/en/index.html
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)	http://www.unesco.org/ios/
International Labour Organisation	http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/program/eval
United Nations Population Fund	http://www.unfpa.org/monitoring/
International Fund for Agricultural Development	http://www.ifad.org/evaluation
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)	http://www.unhcr.org
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)	http://www.unicef.org/evaluation/
United Nations Boards of Auditor	http://www.unsystem.org/auditors/external.htm
National and Regional Evaluation Associations and Societies [more to be added]	
Europe	Africa
European Evaluation Society http://www.europeanevaluation.org/	African Evaluation Association http://www.afrea.org/
French Evaluation Society (Société Française de l'Évaluation)	Nigerien Network of Monitoring and Evaluation
German Evaluation Society	South African Monitoring and Evaluation Association
Associazione Italiana di Valutazione	
The UK Evaluation Society	
Asia	Americas
Australasian Evaluation Society	American Evaluation Association
Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit	Canadian Evaluation Society
Malaysian Evaluation Society (Persatuan Penilaian Malaysia)	Brazilian Evaluation Society
Non-Governmental Organisations	
Bond	A network of more than 280 UK based voluntary organisations working in international development and development education.

Euforic	Europe's Forum on International Co-operation
F3e	Composée d'organisations françaises de solidarité internationale. Il aide ses membres à améliorer la qualité des actions dont ils sont porteurs en les dotant d'outils d'étude et d'évaluation.
Interaction Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group	The InterAction Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group (IA M&E WG) is an autonomous working group established to stimulate enthusiasm and creativity for developing effective evaluation systems.
Resources	
Australian Development Gateway	
The Australian Development Gateway is a knowledge-sharing website, supporting people working in Asia Pacific countries to reduce poverty and promote sustainability. It is a mechanism for Australians and others in the Asia Pacific region to contribute knowledge and to engage in vigorous discussion. By accessing the ADG, people working in the field of development will be able to collaborate more effectively by sharing practical knowledge faster.	
Centre for Aid and Public Expenditure	
The Centre for Aid and Public Expenditure's mission is to improve the quality of international development assistance and to enhance the effectiveness of developing countries' public resource management.	
Directory of development organizations	
A directory of development organizations designed to facilitate international co-operation and knowledge sharing in development work.	
Eldis	
Eldis is a gateway to information on development issues, providing free and easy access to wide range of high quality online resources.	
Evaluation Center	
Hosted by Western Michigan University, this site provides evaluation specialists and users with refereed checklists for designing, budgeting, contracting, staffing, managing, and assessing evaluations of programs, personnel, students, and other evaluands; collecting, analyzing, and reporting evaluation information; and determining merit, worth, and significance.	
evaluation.francophonie.org	
Programme Développement des capacités en évaluation: Ce programme couvre le biennium 2004-2005. Sa perspective générale est d'amorcer une dynamique francophone dans le domaine de l'évaluation de politiques publiques, et de capitaliser les connaissances et les pratiques dans ce domaine. This site provides information to evaluators around the world about evaluation, its events and methods. It intends to facilitate stakeholders' networking and joint work.	
Evaluation portal	
Independent evaluation portal with evaluation information about: books, links, congresses, societies, organisations, networks, journals, projects etc. (German language)	

source)
Independent Evaluators' Webring
The Webring hosts a public database of evaluators, which can be consulted for free. The database clusters the expertise of the members of the Webring in order to increase their targeted visibility. The Webring helps organisations, businesses, public authorities and any other institution to find professional evaluation specialists from within a pool of qualified experts.
The International Development Research Centre
The Evaluation Unit promotes the use of state-of-the-art evaluation and management methodologies and practices throughout IDRC and with its Southern initiatives.
MandE
A news service focusing on developments in monitoring and evaluation methods relevant to development projects and programmes with social development objectives.
One World Trust
Promotes education and research into the changes required within global organisations in order to achieve the eradication of poverty, injustice and war.
Online Evaluation Resource Library (OERL)
Developed for professionals seeking to design, conduct, document, or review project evaluations, OERL's mission is to support the continuous improvement of project evaluations.
Quality Compas
The Quality Compas is the result of an applied research project: the Quality Project, which was conducted by Groupe URD, in conjunction with NGO partners. It is a quality assurance method that has been designed for humanitarian interventions and is therefore fully adapted to the humanitarian context. Project management and evaluation are the two mainstrays of the Quality Compas.
Managing for Development Results Principles in Action
This web site provides information about how countries and agencies are working together in a global partnership on managing for development results.
Performance Assessment Resource Centre
The parc supports international efforts to improve performance assessment in international development practice. The parc has been set up to support the evaluation work of development partners in both the South and the North.
Poverty Action Lab
The Poverty Action Lab serves as a focal point for development and poverty research based on randomized trials. The objective is to improve the effectiveness of poverty programs by providing policy makers with clear scientific results that help shape successful policies to combat poverty.
PREVAL
Programme for strengthening the regional capacity for monitoring and evaluation of IFAD's rural poverty-alleviation projects in Latin America and the Caribbean - Phase III
Resources for Methods in Evaluation and Social Research

This page lists free resources for methods in evaluation and social research. The focus is on "how-to" do evaluation research and the methods used: surveys, focus groups, sampling, interviews, and other methods. Most of these links are to resources that can be read over the web.

[Three-Cs.net](#)

This website offers you access to the six final reports from the 3Cs evaluation initiative and is a key electronic resource on coordination, complementarities and coherence for development.

[WWW Virtual Library: Evaluation](#)

An online database of high quality Internet resources related to social policy evaluation. The database points to hundreds of websites, and each has been selected and described. The catalogue is browsable or searchable by subject area.

Annex 3. Summary of Network members engagement on evaluation capacity development

MEMBER -->	Does your unit have a strategy for supporting evaluation capacity development (ECD) in partner countries?		COMMENTS:
Australia	Australia, AusAID	Yes	VAMESP II & VAMESP I in Vietnam. For the past several years, ODE has funded Mini-IPDETs, in several countries in the region. Partner government personnel with a role in evaluation have been invited to attend these.
Austria	Austria - Directorate for Eval, Devet Policy and Strategy	No	
Belgium	<i>Belgium totals</i>		
	Belgium -Special Eval Office	No	
	Belgium Internal Evaluation Unit	No	
Canada	Canada, Evaluation Division, CIDA	Yes	However our resources to do so are very limited. Support to IPDET, Afrea, IDEAS and other capacity development initiatives Also, we encourage, Program Branches to use their resources to improve the “performance management systems” (Audit and Evaluation, Offices of the Auditor General) in different partners countries. A major initiative was launched in the Sahel Sub-Saharan Africa between 2003 to 2008 in collaboration with IDRC to strengthen the Monitoring and Evaluation Units of the Poverty Reduction Strategies in Mali, Niger, Burkina, Senegal, Benin.
Denmark	Denmark, Evaluation Dept, DANIDA	No	
EC	EC	No	
Finland	Finland Unit for Evaluation and Internal Audit	No	

France	<i>France totals</i>		
	France -AFD	No	
	France MINISTRY OF FOREIGN, EURO AFFAIRS /DGMDP	Yes	Included in evaluation policy. Le pôle de l'évaluation a organisé et financé plusieurs sessions de formation pour des praticiens de l'évaluation (consultants privés) en Guinée, au Togo et au Kenya.
	France - DGTPE, MIN. ECONOMY, FINANCE AND INDUSTRY	No	
Germany	<i>Germany totals</i>		
	Germany GTZ		
	Germany BMZ	Yes	Draft policy includes ECD. Actually not yet- the strategy is in the making) We have struggled on and off with this topic, commissioned several papers ...like others, I assume. A programme worth the name is now in the making There is some ongoing "M&E" TC support but usually this means only "M".
	Germany KFW	No	
Greece			
Ireland	Evaluation and Audit Section, Irish Aid	No	
Italy	Italy- Inspection, Monitoring and Initiatives Assessment Unit	Yes	"The new Guidelines being developed take this aspect into account." (NB: I think this refers more to internal capacity)
Japan	<i>Japan totals</i>		

	Japan JICA	Yes	Not in policy. Evaluation department, in collaboration with Ministry of Planning (or equivalent organization) of the partner countries, jointly plans and supervises the ECD process. Up to date JICA (former JBIC) agreed to support ECD in Viet Nam, Philippines, and Indonesia by signing The memorandum of understanding (MOU) for co-operation in evaluation. Through these supports, JICA aims to help partner countries to establish management methods of a project cycle in which the lessons learned and recommendations from the evaluations would be utilized in future development projects. The following activities are recent ECD examples in Viet Nam: Joint Ex-post Evaluations, assistance in enhancing evaluation system and capacity; Assist with establishment of the Viet-nam Evaluation Association; Conduct ODA Evaluation training for stakeholders in the Vietnamese government; Participate in the 9th National Meeting of the Japan Evaluation Society, and promote exchanges with Evaluation Associations of other countries. Furthermore, Evaluation Department annually conducts ODA Loan evaluation seminar since 2001. The seminar targets government officers (in charge of development projects in planning agencies in partner country), and provides capacity development training in evaluation system and techniques.
	Japan MoFA	Yes	ECD included in policy. "MOFA , aiming to raise understanding of ODA evaluation methodologies and challenges to evaluations, and for the capacity building for evaluation, has been holding an "ODA Evaluation Workshop" every year since 2001, inviting relevant authorities of Asian countries and international organizations to participate. ODA evaluations bring about benefit not only by raising aid effectiveness in the donor country, but also by improving governance and ownership in the recipient country."
Korea	KOICA	No	The Evaluation Office is focusing on strengthening the internal evaluation system at the moment. Thus, supporting evaluation capacity development in partner countries would be considered later.
Luxembourg			
Netherlands	IOB	No	
New Zealand	New Zealand NZAID	No	
Norway	Norway NORAD	No	
Portugal	PORTUGAL	No	

Spain	Spain, Evaluation Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Co-operation	No	
Sweden	<i>Sweden Totals</i>		
	SWEDEN UTV, Sida	Yes	"SIDA has a clear policy of promoting local involvement and local capacity building, for which, UTV has a specific budget of SK 10 million (About € 1 million). UTV is supporting the World Bank's initiative to promote regional ECD centres.
	Sweden, SADEV	Yes	"It's in our policy but much remains to be done" Has specific mandate in SADEV policy.
Switzerland	<i>Switzerland Totals</i>		
	SWITZERLAND SECO	No	
	SWITZERLAND SDC	Yes	Although evaluation capacity development is not explicitly mentioned in our evaluation policy, we actively support such capacity development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o We support International and national evaluation networks (such as AfrEA) o We try to integrate consultants/evaluators from the South among the team members of our evaluations o Since 2004 we provide scholarships to people from the South for the IPDET course in Canada (University of Ottawa and IEG, World Bank). o We support scholarships for people coming from the South for international events on evaluation (such as the Conference of the European Evaluation Society in Lisbon)
United Kingdom	U.K. DFID Evaluation Department	Yes	We have set up a new Capacity & Quality team in EvD who are sourcing training providers who will strengthen our evaluation skills in EvD and roll out training to staff overseas. This will ultimately include helping stakeholders in country to carry out evaluations on DFID's interventions.
United States	<i>US total</i>		
	U.S.A. MCC		
	U.S.A. USAID	No	
	U.S.A. ODFA	Yes	(no details provided)
AfDB	AFDB OPEV	No	

AsDB	ASDB	Yes	See various activities listed here: http://www.adb.org/Evaluation/technical-assistance/default.asp
EBRD	EBRD EvD	No	"Not applicable. EBRD's focus on the private sector makes ECD irrelevant. "
IADB	IADB OEO	Yes	Part of OVE's mandate includes Evaluation Capacity Development, which OVE does through cooperative evaluation agreements with sub-regional financial institutions, seminars and other training activities. The key evaluation capacity problem in borrowing member governments is the absence of an institutional location in the budget decision-making structure for evaluation. This has led OVE to provide limited direct evaluation capacity building assistance to Borrowers and to urge Management to address this problem in its modernization of the state projects. For its part, OVE also has included Borrower participation in ex-post project evaluations as a way of increasing their institutional capacity to conduct evaluations and use them for better resource allocation. OVE has cooperative agreements with the Caribbean Development Bank, the Central American Bank for Economic Integration and the University of the West Indies to carry out joint evaluation capacity development activities. OVE also has worked with the Brazilian Institute for Research in Applied Economics (IPEA) to develop evaluation networks in Latin America and to increase awareness of the utility of evaluation for public administration. Finally, in conjunction with IPEA, the Bank supported the development of the website of Inter-American Roundtable on Evaluation and Performance Measurement, which contains relevant resources in Spanish and English.
IMF	IMF IEO	No	-
World Bank	World Bank IEG	Yes	http://www.worldbank.org/ieg/ecd/
UNDP	UNDP		No response

Annex 4. Rough draft matrix assessing current and proposed initiatives (to be developed further)

Activity	Criteria (based on lessons)								
	Builds individual capacity	Partner led	Builds on current situation	Works on demand side	Seeks political buy in	Facilitates learning by doing	Supports evaluation associations	Other strengths/ weaknesses	Resources needed
Funding training at IPDET	yes	Partners often like		Not key focus	No	No	No		IPDET £/ place Other....
Funding training in country linked to joint evaluation	yes	?	Yes?	May?	?	yes	May do		Lower than IPDET as save on subsistence
Funding conference bursaries	yes	Partners often like		Not key focus	No	No	No		Relatively cheap (under \$5000/ person)
More strategic work on evaluation training at national level	yes	Could be	Could do	Might also	? perhaps if work at uni level?	May indirectly eg dissertations	Could do		Could be quite resource intensive
CLEAR	yes	joint	Attempts to	In part	Attempts to	Could do	?	Attempting regional reach and sustainability. Can't replicate in lots of places	£x million over 3 years in Africa

Helpdesk resource	A bit	Use partner led	?	Not key focus	No?	Not really	Not really		Could be quite a lot
Provide resources like standards/ guidance	Not directly	Should not do if not	?	Perhaps a bit	No?	no	May do	Should be collaborative.	Could be quite small
Help assess capacity needs	No	Should be/ joint?	yes	may	may	Not really	Probably does	Who has appropriate skills?	Could be relatively high (may reduce over time)
Encouraging partner governments to jointly evaluate	yes	joint	Yes?	yes	yes	yes	?		Quite high if fund whole evaluations
Encouraging partners to identify capacity needs and supporting	May do	yes	yes	May do	May do	May do	May do		varied