DAC Network on Development Evaluation

Summary Record of the 18th Meeting of the DAC Network on Development Evaluation

15-16 June 2015
I. OPENING SESSION

1. The Chair, Penny Hawkins (United Kingdom), opened the meeting by welcoming members and guests and invited new participants to introduce themselves. The draft agenda was adopted [DCD/DAC/EV/A(2015)1] and members approved the summary record of the Network’s 17th meeting [English DCD/DAC/EV/M(2014)2 / French DCD/DAC/EV/M(2014)2].

II. NEW APPROACHES TO WORKING JOINTLY - WITH FOCUS PRESENTATIONS ON GOVERNANCE AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

Governance

2. The Swiss Agency for Development Co-operation (SDC) and the Policy and Operations Evaluation Department of the Netherlands’ Ministry of Foreign Affairs (IOB) presented two evaluations demonstrating how governance interventions can be evaluated using a “jointness-light” approach. Anne Bichsel, SDC, explained the “joint-light” approach in which a joint workshop was conducted at the onset to develop a joint analytical framework, after which the teams completed separate evaluations in parallel, with exchanges throughout the process. At the completion of the evaluation a synthesis workshop will be held to distil a joint publication which will later be disseminated. Some of the advantages of the approach include: low transaction costs, reinforced learning, development of a more comprehensive analytical framework and relative independence as there were two separate teams working in parallel. The evaluation also seemed to carry more political weight as a result of the joint approach. Some of the challenges have included: the fact that the evaluations progressed at different paces and that the creation of a joint fund required some additional administrative work.

3. Ted Jackson (Evaluation Team Leader) presented the methodology and main findings of the SDC evaluation ‘Governance Programming and Mainstreaming’ which included a document and literature review, key person interviews, country case studies (in Bolivia, Bosnia and Mozambique), learning groups to facilitate exchanges with staff, and review of other SDC evaluations between 2006 and 2014 and of OECD peer reviews. A particular success is SDC’s Global Programme Water Initiatives which has shown that it is possible to link local, national, regional and global governance programming, and that credible global policy dialogue can be based on on-the-ground experience of what works and what does not work. Overall, the evaluators
found that SDC is a strong performer on reporting on inputs and outputs, but has some room to improve in better recognising outcome-level achievements. In addition, they found that the ability of country programmes to be flexible and be able to adjust programming to local conditions is crucial to good governance work.

4. Geske Dijkstra (IOB) presented the scope, methodology and some preliminary results of the evaluation ‘Good Governance: Democratization, Rule of Law and the Combat of Corruption’. The IOB evaluation has a more limited scope than the SDC evaluation with a focus on activities aimed at achieving good governance outcomes and does not include governance mainstreaming or other sectors that could contribute to governance outcomes. The evaluation includes analysis of policies, a literature review, country case studies (Indonesia, Uganda and Rwanda) using citizen surveys, Qualitative Comparative Analysis, academic literature reviews and statistical analysis as well as a ‘Local Governance Score-Card Initiative’ (LGSCI) as part of the Uganda field study. One preliminary finding is that while there are various sets of conditions and ‘pathways’ which can lead to good governance, political will is a necessary condition for ensuring a successful governance outcome. Final conclusions will be forthcoming upon the completion of the evaluation process.

5. The discussion and comments from members and participants clarified some issues concerning the "joint-lightness" approach and focused on the added value of new forms of collaborative evaluation. While the two evaluations were asymmetrical in a time sense and had different mandates, there are expectations of ongoing exchanges as the findings come out. The joint analytical workshop had the added value of allowing the development of an overarching model and a common understanding of governance and the factors conducive to successful governance programming.

Capacity development

6. Denmark, Norway and Sweden presented their innovative joint approach on a two year evaluation of capacity development.

7. Lennart Peck (SIDA) presented the approach and advantages of the Scandinavian joint evaluation of capacity development which included a joint Terms of Reference (ToR), with the possibility to add agency specific questions. Three evaluation teams were hired to work separately on the evaluations with a joint synthesis and joint dissemination planned at the end of the process. A straightforward Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was signed and a joint management group was formed; however, each agency maintained responsibility for their own part of the evaluation. Furthermore, no funds were mixed in the process. Representatives from the three agencies met together at crucial points in the process (inception, ToR, following field visits). The model presents an alternative to an evaluation conducted by a single agency and an alternative to the traditional joint approach. The advantages to the Scandinavian joint light approach include: a stronger evidence base, more data, gains in efficiency, additional perspectives, increased attention given to the evaluation, and strengthened collaboration between evaluation units. There were also benefits compared to the traditional joint evaluation approach, as there were a minimum of formalities, a more equal division of workload among participating agencies, and a reduced risk of tensions as
separate but coordinated evaluations took place. The model, however, requires compromise and it may potentially be challenging to synthesise results going forward.

8. Øyvind Eggen (Norad) presented the methodology used in the “joint-light” approach which consisted of a literature review (SIDA), a methodology study (Norad), and a conceptual framework (Danida), organised around a theory of change hypothesis. The evaluation included portfolio screening, desk reviews and country visits. There were, however, some challenges encountered, particularly problems with data collection as there was a lack of robust data in creating the score cards. Lessons include: the conceptual and analytical framework was elaborate and it was a challenge with multiple evaluation teams (with people from different domains and areas of experience). These challenges highlighted the pertinence of synthesising experiences in capacity development across institutions.

9. Following the presentation, the issue of how to get policy makers to pay attention to evaluation findings was raised. The joint evaluation conducted in South Sudan, as one of the largest recent joint evaluations, was cited as an example. Despite the inclusion of a large number of agencies the information and lessons from the evaluation were perhaps not optimally used by decision makers as it appears that the conflict analysis was ignored in subsequent programming. On the issue of encouraging decision makers to make better use of evaluation findings, participants shared their experiences on working with senior management to reinforce evaluation demand and evaluators’ responsibility to ensure that findings are actionable, realistic, and easily digestible for policy makers. One participant asked if the focus on joint evaluation is not shifting the emphasis away from working with partners. While there was general consensus on the advantages of exploring new forms of collaboration, some members mentioned challenges to working jointly based on past experiences.

Follow-up: The Chair noted the interest in continuing discussion on the advantages, disadvantages and practicalities of using “joint-light” approaches and the need to discuss how context impacts joint work which could be a topic for discussion in a future meeting. Clearly stating the objectives of using collaborative approaches from the onset and better communicating the benefits should remain a priority going forward.

III. FUTURE EVALUATION PRIORITIES AND EVIDENCE NEEDS

10. Karen Jorgensen (OECD Secretariat) presented some of the changing motivations for development co-operation, which has increasingly become integral to foreign policy (as reflected in the integration of development agencies into ministries of foreign affairs). Karen also mentioned the growing pressure to represent the national interest dimension in development co-operation and summarised some of the changing needs of developing countries as expressed in the OECD Development Co-operation Directorate’s recent ‘Fit for the future’ survey which found that developing countries increasingly want targeted policy advice and a new model of technical assistance. With the adoption of the SDGs expected in September, there will be a greater focus on global public goods as the SDGs are more than just a mandate for development co-operation, but rather a universal mandate for a whole of government agenda. The agenda is also moving from aid to A-I-T (aid, investment, tax), seen as a way to finance the SDGs. These changes will impact
development evaluation, which will have to address an increasingly large number of subjects and a more diverse range of partnerships, such as triangular co-operation. Evaluation practitioners can take advantage of the pressure to demonstrate results to make evaluation a core part of the organisation (which could challenge the traditional view of what independence means). Evaluators will be called upon to advance the results agenda, the learning agenda and the accountability agenda and may need to expand their toolboxes. The evaluation community will need to start thinking more about cross-government interventions and partnerships and how evaluation practitioners can evaluate them.

11. Emmanuel Jimenez (3ie) followed with an ignite style speech on impact evaluations. He noted a dramatic increase in the number of impact evaluations in the last 10 years, most of these evaluations have been in four sectors: health, education, social protection, and agriculture; and most have been in Africa. While some new topics have come up, there are some big evaluative gaps in terms of coverage and regions. Emmanuel stressed that we must ensure early engagement in the evaluation process and work towards evaluation ready projects and programmes with feedback embedded throughout the project cycle.

12. Caroline Heider (World Bank) stated that three major events in 2015: the Financing for Development Conference in Addis Ababa, the adoption of the SDGs, and the COP21 in Paris, will drive the way we think about development and evaluation in the future. Evaluators will have to adapt to the new financing for development landscape which will rely more on public domestic resources and non-ODA sources; this will mean that evaluators will need to be able to evaluate non-ODA financed programmes and projects. There is also a greater role for the private sector and Private Public Partnerships (PPP) including impact investing, institutional investors, and global funds which will require evaluators to evaluate a quadruple bottom line (including profitability, social and environmental effects of programmes) in addition to development results. The other main challenge is related to the SDGs as the number of objectives and their complexity has increased, forcing us to ask: are the SDGs evaluable, how is it going to happen with over 100 indicators, and how will we make sense of the data? The SDGs, and in particular the focus on climate change, tackle issues that are not simple linear problems. Since there are many unknowns and a complex relationship of cause and effect, evaluation needs to be built into programme design in a more rigorous way and new methodologies to address complexity are needed. As evaluation professionals, the challenge is to increase influence and engagement with policy makers. If evaluators want to be able to change the way institutions work and make an impact, they will have to make strategic choices about what and how they evaluate and then have to package the findings and do outreach in an effective way.

13. Marco Segone, UNEG, outlined the five aspects that make the SDGs game changers: 1) increased ownership, meaning more demand for use of national systems and development through participatory processes, 2) the universality of the SDGs which will also apply to OECD countries, 3) the need to be able to evaluate complexity, 4) the greater focus on inclusive growth, gender and social equality (both stand alone and cross-cutting objectives), and 5) the ambitious nature of the SDGs which requires greater partnership; hence the only way to address the challenges, including evaluating them, will be through partnership.
14. Comments from several members expanded upon the future challenges that evaluation practitioners will need to adapt to. At the same time, members noted continuity and the need to reinforce ongoing efforts to expand and consolidate new approaches and methodologies, while also increasing the synthesis of evidence and the timely communication of findings to policy makers. Future challenges include dealing with issues of big data and its organisation (as opposed to data scarcity), the growing use of new technology in enhancing participation and verifying results, and the increased importance of evaluating sustainability, which has traditionally been considered one of the more challenging OECD DAC evaluation criteria. The Chair summed up the discussion noting that some changes are already underway, such as exploring the use of big data and addressing complexity in evaluation.

*Follow-up:* The Bureau will consider how to further facilitate discussions on the use of new technology, big data, and innovative tools for development evaluation in a future meeting. Members are invited to share their ideas, experiences with innovation, and proposals for advancing discussion on these topics with the Bureau.

**IV. EVALUATION CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT**

15. Stephen Porter (DFID) chair of the DAC EvalNet Evaluation Capacity Development (ECD) task team, presented a mapping of gaps in evaluation capacity development. It is possible to map ECD using a three level approach looking at 1) the individual level, 2) the institutional level and 3) the enabling environment, as evaluation capacity development ought to be taking place at multiple levels within an organisation. Similarly, there is a matrix perspective of ECD which identifies stakeholders that must be involved in both demand and supply of evaluation with the support of intermediation bodies. By putting these two models together we can better understand how ECD works and can map a national evaluation system to identify gaps, opportunities, and demand within the system; such a mapping can help develop institutional demand for evaluation as well as developing capacity. From the mapping of ECD we can see that the majority of ECD practice is still concentrated at the individual level and is primarily oriented towards training, while there are gaps at the institutional and enabling environment levels. There is relatively little ECD taking place in think tanks, within civil society or with disadvantaged youth. Audit offices, legislatures and parliamentarians also force evaluators to ask questions about how to build capacity in various institutions and how to make these efforts mutually reinforcing. With ECD practice there is now a greater reach across supply and demand, while some apparent gaps still appear. Hence evaluators need to ask: what actually works in ECD and what contribution should the EvalNet ECD task team make?

16. Marco Segone (UNEG) recalled that the 2015 International Year of Evaluation is a bottom up movement. Evaluation torch themes include: the global evaluation agenda 2016-2020, bridging the gap between supply and demand, mainstreaming evaluation in SDGs, and developing National Evaluation Plans. The Global Evaluation Week event will be in November 2015 in Nepal. The main topics will be: how to create an evaluation framework for SDGs and how to strengthen national capacities. The launch of four new initiatives is expected at the global evaluation week event in Nepal: 1) the launch of EvalSDG network, 2) the launch of the EvalGender+ network, 3) the launch of the Global Parliamentarian Forum for Evaluation, and 4) the launch of EvalYouth.
17. Claude Leroy-Themeze (former chair of the Collaborative Partner-Donor Evaluation [CPDE] management group) provided EvalNet members with an update. The synthesis workshop was held in Manila in December and was hosted by the National Economic and Development Authority of the Philippines (NEDA) and the Asian Development Bank (ADB). The workshop was attended by more than 40 participants. The synthesis workshop report is available on the EvalNet CPDE webpage as are 14 country studies and 4 thematic papers. Some emerging conclusions include: the main findings are mixed as most donors make no or limited use of partner countries’ evaluation systems, donors contribute to develop evaluation capacity but limit their contributions to the building of capacity in areas of interest to them, hence it is clear that one approach is insufficient for all partner countries. Going forward, an informal working group could be created to continue the work initiated with the CPDE study. The next step is to complete the CPDE study report and to follow up with a small online survey before the 2016 EvalNet meeting.

18. Keiichi Muraoka (Japan) briefly described Japan’s approach to Evaluation Capacity Development and JICA’s annual ODA evaluation workshop for partner countries in the Asia Pacific region.

19. Stephen Porter (DFID, ECD task team chair) introduced three questions for the ‘Bee-hive discussion’: 1) what are your ideas for taking forward the initiative on collaborative partner-donor relations? 2) What are the main gaps in supporting evaluation capacity? 3) What role should EvalNet take in filling these gaps? Each of the five groups then presented their views on the bee-hive discussion questions. The main points were:

- Ultimately for ECD to be successful there has to be political will and ownership.
- It would be good to be invited by partners to take part in evaluations (responding to increasing demand from the partner countries side). Reinforcing engagement with local evaluation associations and working with local evaluators should be encouraged. The group also noted that joint work requires a high level of trust from all parties.
- Need to recognise that developing countries with evaluation functions are often tasked with evaluating their own priority areas and it can be hard for them to divert their attention to donor activities.
- Some identified gaps include: knowing what really works in ECD in different contexts and being able to weigh the role of various stakeholders.
- There were several areas that EvalNet could work on to fill gaps: 1) country diagnostic tool, 2) undertake an evaluation development capacity mapping exercise, 3) look at the question of what is good practice on ECD in low capacity settings and 4) how to encourage joint and collaborative evaluations.

**Follow-up:** Stephen Porter, as chair of ECD task team will work on outlining the future role of EvalNet in filling gaps in supporting evaluation capacity, in line with the discussion and ideas presented by members. The task team for ECD will reach out to EvalNet members and partners as needed going forward; possible work could include good practices for ECD in low capacity settings and how context influences ECD, developing an ECD country diagnostic tool and undertaking an evaluation capacity development mapping
exercise that focuses on the efforts of evaluation and research departments. The Collaborative Partner-Donor Evaluation (CPDE) management group will work to ensure completion of the CPDE study report and will follow up with a small online survey.

TUESDAY 16 JUNE 2015

V. MULTILATERAL EVALUATION ISSUES

20. David Slattery (Australia) presented an evaluation of non-core funding to the ADB and World Bank. Australia has substantially scaled up non-core financing to the point where it has recently overtaken core funding in volume. The purpose of the evaluation was to assess whether this form of aid is effective and to look at ways that Australia, as a bilateral donor, could make its partnerships with multilateral banks more effective. The evaluation also looked at the advantages and motivations for this form of aid for Australia. These have consisted of a mix of strategic objectives, such as wanting to harmonise aid funds in the context of the Paris Declaration and a variety of pragmatic reasons, not strictly related to the objective of providing effective aid. Based on a staff survey and an analysis of a sample of projects, the evaluation found that staff support and engagement was variable across regions and projects, but essential to get the best results for non-core funding. The evaluation also found that there is a need to strengthen monitoring and evaluation of bank executed projects, which often had weak monitoring systems.

21. Anna Aghumian (World Bank Independent Evaluation Group [IEG]) gave a presentation on IEG’s approach to evaluation of global partnerships and regional partnership programmes (GRPPs). IEG is trying to promote better standards for partnership programme management as the bank currently participates in over 125 global partnership programmes and administers more than 1000 trust funds. IEG shared with members a learning note entitled, “Opportunities and Challenges from Working in Partnerships: Findings from the IEG’s Work on Partnership Programs and Trust Funds” which summarises learning from reviews of 24 GRPPs conducted between 2006 and 2014 and a note drafted by IEG for the EvalNet meeting offering seven guiding principle for evaluating partnership programmes. The quality of evaluations of partnership programmes has sometimes been uneven and the bank is transitioning to a new approach to evaluate these programmes, with an emphasis on mainstreaming. IEG is proposing to host a workshop with multilateral and bilateral partners to promote knowledge sharing and to find ways to advance this agenda.

22. Indran Naidoo (UNDP) presented a brief status report from UNEG-DAC collaboration on peer reviews of evaluation functions. Riitta Oksanen, co-chair, is responsible for coordinating from the EvalNet side. There are three confirmed peer reviews for 2015: 1) UNRWA, 2) International Trade Center (ITC), and 3) UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNDOC) – for which a representative from EvalNet is needed for the peer review to take place in the last quarter of 2015. A guidance document for the peer reviews is at a draft stage and is planned to be shared with members towards the end of the year.

23. Björn Gillsäter of the OECD Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) Secretariat provided an update and presented forthcoming plans for MOPAN. Currently the network consists of 19 member countries and represents most major contributors to multilateral
aid. MOPAN 3.0, soon to be launched, will involve assessments of 12 organisations per year conducted in parallel, with data from more countries (12 instead of 6) to be collected over a longer time period. Moreover, there is an objective of creating greater synergies between MOPAN and other multilateral assessments. MOPAN will continue to focus on development and humanitarian organisations, but will also broaden the focus to include more organisations; it will strive to pay more attention to country level performance and will include criteria from the EvalNet approach on multilateral development effectiveness going forward.

24. In the discussion, MOPAN’s absorption capacity, in regards to the intention of assessing more organisations each year, was mentioned as was the risk of ‘evaluation fatigue’ for organisations that are assessed multiple times (by different entities); a factor which can ultimately undermine evaluation culture. Finally, Karen Jorgensen (Secretariat) reminded members that political pressure is a main driver of evaluations of multilaterals and that many member countries are currently developing an official, written multilateral strategy. While questions of organisational effectiveness can and should be addressed jointly, each member will need to examine their own strategy towards multilaterals in terms of “best fit” with the member’s development co-operation objectives.

**Follow-up:** Australia, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the United Kingdom, the United States, the European Investment Bank, UNEG and the Secretariat all expressed interest in the IEG workshop. IEG to contact interested members on way forward and organisation of workshop.

**VI. UPDATES**

25. Hans Lundgren (Secretariat) drew attention to the important new review of evaluation systems being launched by EvalNet and provided an update on the latest developments. He thanked the members for their inputs and the seven members of the steering group for their support, in particular, Norway who is host to the pooling and contractual arrangement. Finally, he reminded members that their participation and engagement will be crucial going forward for a high quality product. The review intends to take stock of the various evaluation arrangements in place across development agencies with the aim of helping DAC members and development partners learn from their individual and collective experiences.

26. An overview of upcoming evaluation events was presented. Events include:

- Maximising the value of evaluations – using evidence to learn and adapt, DFID workshop, 18 June

- Making effective use of evaluations in an increasingly complex world, Unesco/OECD/SFE/EES joint conference, 30 September at Unesco HQ, Paris, presented by Kevin Williams, OECD

- National evaluation capacities (NEC) conference, UNDP, 26-30 October Bangkok, co-organised with the IDEAS conference on Evaluating Sustainable Development, presented by Indran Naidoo
DAC - China study group evaluation seminar, 28 October tbc, in Beijing, presented by Michael Laird

Evidence on a silver platter: evaluation results for policy making in development co-operation, 5-6 November, Berlin


27. DEReC and evaluation plans inventory: EvalNet’s joint database of evaluation reports (DEReC) has undergone a major re-vamp. Angèle N’zinga (Secretariat) presented the new DEReC website and gave a brief demonstration of the site’s improved search functions. Members are strongly encouraged to consult the new website, share the link with colleagues and contribute to keeping DEReC updated by sending completed evaluations, regularly, to the Secretariat. Susanna Morrison-Métois (Secretariat) thanked members for their contributions to the evaluation plans inventory and presented a few recent highlights and trends in members’ upcoming planned evaluations.

VII. EVALUATING PUBLIC GOODS

28. IOB, the Netherlands presented a concept paper prepared by Rob D. van den Berg for a discussion on the global public goods agenda and consequences for evaluation. Antonie de Kemp, in his presentation, first discussed the textbook definition of global public goods (as being non-rival and non-exclusive) and then challenged this definition as it applies to climate change. In related examples of market failure, global collection action will be needed. Different definitions of global public goods pose challenges for development evaluation (as long time horizons come into play and counterfactuals can be hard to identify). While evaluations of specific projects focusing on climate change are common, the new collective action problem requires practitioners to ask what it means for evaluation. For one, there will be more actors with different interests and priorities working together. As greater complexity comes in, evaluators will need a larger set of instruments and tools. Some questions posed are: to what extent is the international development agenda changing into a global public goods agenda? What does this mean for EvalNet and its role? The Netherlands recommended as a next step to look further into the literature on global public goods and to make an inventory of existing evaluations of global public goods, looking at methodological approaches and experiences.

29. Several members noted that evaluation practitioners already possess techniques and standard toolboxes for evaluating health, education, and investments in security and in fragile states, and in conducting evaluations of specific projects related to climate change. What is new about the global public goods agenda is the collective action dimension in which objectives, such as those outlined in the SDGs, will require coordinated global action. Members have experience evaluating their individual contributions to the achievement of MDGs, but there is a need for new tools for rigorous evaluation of global efforts to deliver on universal objectives. One member commented that this may require evaluators to look at approaches often used in research, such as general equilibrium and game theory models that are not generally part of an evaluator’s toolbox.
Follow-up: Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, the European Investment Bank, and the Secretariat expressed interest in collaborating on evaluation of global public goods. The Netherlands and Norway will work on an inventory of global public goods evaluations as expressed in the concept paper. They will contact other members who have expressed interest to move the work forward on the creation of this inventory. The Secretariat will conduct future scoping work on topics related to evaluation of climate change.

VIII. ANY OTHER BUSINESS AND CLOSING

30. There were no other business items.

31. Penny Hawkins (Chair of EvalNet) summarised the discussions and highlighted themes that stood out during the meeting. Penny noted that discussions on future evaluation priorities and ‘fit for the future’ landed on points critical to evaluation and the role evaluation will play in development co-operation going forward. With the adaptation of the SDGs, evaluators have an opportunity that they ought not miss- to use measurements and assessments- to tell the story that sits behind the numbers. Penny reminded members that they can commit to participate in task teams after the meeting as well by contacting the Secretariat. Finally, she commended members and invitees for the impressive, strong attendance from capitals (which included the participation of representatives from Kazakhstan, Mexico and UAE).

32. The next EvalNet meeting will take place on 26-27 April 2016.

IX. INFORMAL SESSION

EBRD, new evaluation performance rating system

33. Keith Leonard (EBRD) presented the bank’s new performance rating guidelines and recent changes to their evaluation rating system. The new system contains a larger number of possible ratings (with six possible categories rather than four) and a unified evaluator template which makes the evaluators’ discretion more transparent (when exercised). The new rating template contains an automatic calculation of ratings in each criteria area, specifically weighted, and allows evaluators to see the boundary between two overall performance rating categories. The new guidelines are more closely aligned with OECD-DAC evaluation criteria, which were adopted as the basic structure of the performance assessment system, with the aim of using evaluation terminology which is more internationally recognisable. Finally, the guidelines contain a revised set of sub-criteria and the application of a results framework; they also use a theory of change model for assessing performance in situations where results are not fully observable or measurable at the time of evaluation due to incomplete or missing data. In addition, more explicit attention is given to unanticipated results (both positive and negative) and the use of counterfactuals.

34. In discussion, members’ comments focused on how EBRD measures and defines additionality and sustainability and on the trade-offs between using a rating system to evaluate a specific number of projects (in this case using stratified random sampling and then aggregating the performance of the bank in an annual report) versus going into greater depth in evaluating fewer key topics or projects. The EBRD follows good practices and utilises statistical sampling methods as set out in their
guidelines. Keith also explained that the evaluations use a different set of indicators than the performance monitoring used by management, as the ratings are given ex post and hence they are able to use a broader set of data.

**Japan, new development co-operation charter and presentation of a review of Japan’s ODA evaluations**

35. Keiichi Muraoka, presented changes in Japan’s development co-operation charter, which extends the scope of Japan’s co-operation and takes into consideration the increasing flow and impact of funds other than ODA in developing countries. Japan also presented a third party evaluation entitled ‘Review of Japan’s ODA Evaluation from FY 2003 to 2013’ which included recommendations for Japan’s ODA evaluation methodology.

**Member updates**

36. The United States shared updates concerning the evaluation policy of the US State Department whose new [website](#) will be the main site for all foreign assistance evaluations of the US government. USAID recently launched a series of complexity trials to see in which environment these evaluation tools work best. In addition, USAID is working on an evaluation that looks at sustainable outcomes in locations where they have been engaged with programmes implemented over a five or ten year period. Moreover, USAID is working on a meta-evaluation looking at over 800 evaluations focusing on the evaluations’ use, practices, and enabling factors; the report will be shared with members once finalised.

37. DFID indicated that they are refreshing their evaluation guidance and would welcome feedback from EvalNet members. ICAI has had a change in their Board of Commissioners, as the terms of the Board members all came to an end recently. ICAI’s main priorities in the coming years will be on relevance and on impact. They will produce a report on how DFID delivers impact, looking at the results agenda. ICAI has also made efforts to produce short, accessible evaluation reports and would like to continue in this direction.

38. Ireland explained that their evaluation component is a function that covers both evaluation and audit for the entire Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, including development co-operation. Currently they conduct country programme evaluations completed on a five year cycle and are seeking to examine the utility of these exercises.

39. Spain commented on the implementation of their evaluation policy adopted in 2013. They have a website that makes all evaluations available in one location, including decentralised evaluations (and evaluations coming from NGOs). As a result, uneven quality of evaluations has been observed; hence Spain would like to work on evaluation capacity within their own system. Spain is seeking exchanges of experience with other members, who are managing evaluations in a decentralised way inside operation units.

40. IOB has been focusing more on how they disseminate results of evaluations to reach the right people, at the right level, at the right time.
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Email: catherine.PRAVIN@ec.europa.eu

Finland/Finlande

Ms. Riitta OKSANEN
Senior Advisor
Unit for Development Evaluation
Ministry for Foreign Affairs
P.O. Box 451
FI-00023 Helsinki
Finland

Tel: +358 295 351 432
Email: riitta.oksanen@formin.fi

France

Ms. Mauricette GADY-LAUMONIER
Chef de l'Unité d’Evaluation
Direction Générale du Trésor
Ministère des Finances et des Comptes Publics
Unité d’Evaluation des Activités de Développement
139 rue de Bercy Teledoc 552
75572 Paris cedex 12
France

Tel: +33 1 44 87 73 52
Email: mauricette.gady-laumonier@dg tresor.gouv.fr

Ms. Marie-Laure CUSTOS MAYALA
Adjointe à la responsable du Pôle Évaluation
Ministère des Affaires étrangères et du Développement international
27 rue de la Convention CS 91 533
75732 Paris cedex 15
France

Tel: +33 (1) 43 17 83 79
Email: marie-laure.custos@diplomatie.gouv.fr
Ms. Flora GIARRACCA
Chargée d’évaluation
Direction générale du Trésor
Ministère des Finances et des Comptes Publics
Unité d’évaluation des activités de développement
139 rue de Bercy
75572 Paris Cedex 12
France
Tel: +33 1 44 87 70 46
Email: flora.giarracca@dgtresor.gouv.fr

Mr. Jean-Philippe NADAL
Legal Advisor, Head of Public Procurement and PPP Department
ADETEF - Ministère des Finances télédoc 727
120, rue de Bercy, télédoc 727
75572 Paris Cedex 12
France
Tel: +33 6 26 79 76 02
Email: jean-philippe.nadal@adetef.finances.gouv.fr

Ms. Emilie ABERLEN
Chargée d’Étude et d’Évaluation
Division de l’Evaluation et de la Capitalisation - Département de la Recherche
French Agency for Development (AFD)
5, rue Roland Barthes
75598 Cedex 12 Paris
France
Tel: +33 1 53 44 31 65
Email: aberlene@afd.fr

Germany/Allemagne

Ms. Anette BRAUN
Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
Division 105 - Evaluation of development cooperation; German Institute for Development Evaluation (DEval)
Dahlmannstraße 41
53113 Bonn
Germany
Tel: +49 228 535 3857
Email: Anette.Braun@bmz.bund.de
Mr. Jörg FAUST
Director
DEval - German Institute for Development Evaluation
Fritz-Schäffer-Str. 26,
53113 Bonn
Germany
Tel: +49 228 336907 902
Email: Joerg.Faust@deval.org

Ms. Annette BACKHAUS
Section Leader M&E Systems
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH
Dag-Hammarskjöldweg 1 - 5
65760 Eschborn
Germany
Tel: +49 619 6791 373
Email: Annette.Backhaus@giz.de

Ms. Dorothea GROTH
Counsellor; Development Advisor
Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the OECD
9, rue Maspero
75116 Paris
Tel: +33 1 55 74 57 09
Email: wi-7-oecd@pari.auswaertiges-amt.de

Iceland/Islande

Mr. Gisli PALSSON
Head, Program Monitoring and Evaluation
Icelandic International Development Agency (ICEIDA)
Thverholt 14,
125 Reykjavik
Iceland
Tel: + 354 545 7984
Email: gisli@iceida.is

Ireland/Irlande

Mr. Tom HENNESSY
Director Evaluation and Audit
Department of Foreign Affairs
80 St. Stephens’s Green
Dublin 2
Ireland
Tel: 353 61 774137
Email: tom.hennessy@dfa.ie
Mr. Donal MURRAY
Senior Evaluation Specialist
Evaluation and Audit Unit
Department of Foreign Affairs
13/15 Lower Hatch Street
Dublin 2
Ireland
Tel: +353 14 082813
Email: Donal.Murray@dfa.ie

Ms. Edel CRIBBIN
Development Officer
Permanent Delegation of Ireland to the OECD
12, avenue Foch
75016 Paris
France
Tel: +33 1 44 17 67 00
Email: edel.cribbin@dfa.ie

Italy/Italie

Mr. Michele MORANA
Evaluation manager
Directorate General for Development Cooperation
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation
Uff. IX 1, Piazzale della Farnesina
00135 Rome
Italy
Tel: +39 06 36 91 43 26
Email: michele.morana@esteri.it

Japan/Japon

Mr. Keiichi MURAOKA
Director
ODA Evaluation Division
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Minister’s Secretariat
2-2-1, Kasumigaseki
Chiyoda-ku
100-8919 Tokyo
Japan
Tel: + 81 3 5501 8467
Email: keiichi.muraoka@mofa.go.jp
Ms. Yukiko MIZUNO
Representative
Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)
France Office
6 rue de Berri
75008 Paris
France
Tel: +33 1 40 20 04 21
Email: Mizuno.Yukiko@jica.go.jp

Korea/Corée

Mr. Hwang Wook KANG
Manager of Evaluation
Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA)
Evaluation Office
825 Daegangpangyo-ro, Sujeong-gu, Seongnam-si,
Gyeonggi-do, 461-833
Korea
Tel: +82 31 740 0313
Email: hkwang@koica.go.kr

Mr. Jongkuk PARK
Senior Loan Officer
Operations Services & Evaluation Department
Export-Import Bank of Korea, Planning & Coordination Team,
EDCF Department, The
16-1, Yeouido-Dong,
Yeongdeungpo-Gu,
Seoul 150-996
Tel: +82 2 3779 5360
Email: parkjk@koreaexim.go.kr

Ms. Jiesoo LEE
Assistant Manager
KOICA

Ms. Sunkyung CHUNG
Expert Adviser
ODA Bureau

Ms. Ju-Hyun OH
Senior Representative - KOICA
Permanent Delegation of Korea to the OECD
4 Place de la Porte de Passy
75016 Paris
France
Tel: +33 1 44 05 24 04
Email: ozoneoecd@gmail.com
Luxembourg

Mr. René LAUER
Coordinateur du service évaluation et contrôle de qualité
Direction de la Coopération au développement
Ministry of Foreign Affairs - Directorate for Development Cooperation
6, rue de la Congrégation
1352 Luxembourg
Luxembourg

Tel: +352 247 82438
Email: rene.lauer@mae.etat.lu

Mexico/Mexique

Ms. Sandra BUCIO-ESCOBEDO
Deputy Director General Planning and Evaluation
Mexican Agency for International Development Cooperation (AMEXCID)
Plaza Juarez 20 Piso 7
Centro 06010 Mexico
Mexico

Tel: +52 55 36865100
Email: sbucio@sre.gob.mx

Netherlands/Pays-Bas

Ms. Wendy ASBEEK BRUSSE
Director IOB
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Postbus 20061 Bezuidenhoutseweg
2500 EB The Hague
Netherlands

Tel: +31 0 70 348 5730
Email: wendy.asbeekbrusse@minbuza.nl

Mr. Antonie DE KEMP
Coordinating Evaluator
Policy and Operations Evaluation Department
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Postbus 20061 Bezuidenhoutseweg 67
2500 EB The Hague
Netherlands

Tel: +31 70 348 65 63
Email: antonie-de.kemp@minbuza.nl
Ms. Geske DIJKSTRA
Evaluator
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Bezuidenhoutseweg 67
Postbus 20061
2500 EB The Hague
Netherlands
Tel: +31 6 22 567 568
Email: Geske.Dijkstra@minbuza.nl

New Zealand/Nouvelle-Zélande
Ms. Ingrid VAN AALST
International Development Group
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT)
195, Lambton Quay
6060 Wellington
New Zealand
Tel: +64 4 439 7144
Email: ingrid.vanaalst@mfat.govt.nz

Norway/Norvège
Mr. Per Øyvind BASTØE
Director
Evaluation Department
Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD)
PO Box 8034
Ruseløkkeveien 26
0030 Oslo
Norway
Tel: +47 23 98 03 57
Email: peba@norad.no

Mr. Øyvind EGGEN
Policy Director
Evaluation Department
Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD)
Postboks 8034 Dep
Ruseløkkveien 26
0030 Oslo
Norway
Tel: +47 23 98 02 72
Email: Oyvind.Eggen@norad.no
Poland/Pologne

Ms. Barbara MRÓWKA
Independent Post for Evaluation of Polish Development Cooperation
Development Cooperation Department
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
J.Ch.Szuch Av. 21,
00-580 Warsaw
Poland

Tel: +48 22 523 8259
Email: barbara.mrowka@msz.gov.pl

Portugal

Ms. Manuela AFONSO
Head
Evaluation and Audit Unit
Camões, Instituto da Cooperação e da Língua (Camões, IP)
Av. da Liberdade, nº 270
1250-149 Lisbon
Portugal

Tel: +351 213109160
Email: manuela.afonso@camoes.mne.pt

Spain/Espagne

Mr. Jose Manuel ARGILÉS MARÍN
Head of the Evaluation and Knowledge Management Division
Secretary General for International Development Cooperation
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation
C Serrano Galvache N 26
28071 Madrid
Spain

Tel: +34 91 379 17 32
Email: josemanuel.argiles@maec.es

Sweden/Suède

Ms. Sonja DALTUNG
Director
Expert Group for Aid Studies
Government Offices
Garnisonen
SE-10333 Stockholm
Sweden

Tel: + 46 0 8 405 8373
Email: sonja.daltung@gov.se
Mr. Lennart PECK  
Senior Policy Specialist, Evaluation Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (PME)  
Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency (SIDA)  
Valhallavägen 199  
SE-105 25 Stockholm  
Sweden  
Tel: +46 8 698 55 65  
Email: lennart.peck@sida.se

Switzerland/Suisse  
Mr. Jean-Marc CLAVEL  
Head, Evaluation and Corporate Controlling Division  
Federal Department of Foreign Affairs - FDFA  
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation - SDC  
Freiburgstrasse 130  
3003 Berne  
Switzerland  
Tel: +41 58 465 17 19  
Email: jean-marc.clavel@eda.admin.ch

Ms. Anne BICHSEL  
Program Officer  
Evaluation and Corporate Controlling Division  
Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation - SDC  
Freiburgstrasse 130  
3003 Berne  
Switzerland  
Tel: + 41 31 325 92 57  
Email: anne.bichsel@eda.admin.ch

United Kingdom/Royaume-Uni  
Mr. Stephen PORTER  
Evaluation Advisor, Market Development  
Evaluation Department  
Department for International Development (DFID)  
22 Whitehall  
SW1A 2EG London  
United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 207 0231971  
Email: s-porter@dfid.gov.uk
Mr. Kevin ANDREWS
Senior Learning and Evaluation Advisor
Multilateral Effectiveness Department
Department for International Development (DFID)
22 Whitehall
SW1A 2EG London
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 0 207 023 0672
Email: K-Andrews@dfid.gov.uk

Ms. Alexandra CRAN-MCGREEHIN
Head of Secretariat
Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI)
Dover House
66 Whitehall
SW1A 2AU London
United Kingdom

Email: a-cran-mcgreehin@icai.independent.gov.uk

United States/États-Unis

Ms. Eileen A. CRONIN
Chief of Evaluation and Aid Effectiveness
U.S. Department of State
Office of the Direction of Foreign Assistance Reso
2201, C STREET NW
20520 Washington, DC
United States

Tel: + 1 202 647 2805
Email: croninea@state.gov

Ms. Negar AKHAVI
Acting Director, Policy, Planning and Learning
U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)
Office of Learning, Evaluation and Research
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
20523 Washington, DC
United States

Tel: + 1 202 712 0173
Email: nakhavi@usaid.gov
Lithuania/Lituanie

Ms. Lilija ŽINIENE
Head of Bilateral Cooperation Division
Development Cooperation Department
Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA)
J.Tumo-Vaizganto 2
Vilnius
Lithuania

Tel: +370 699 13623
Email: lilija.ziniene@urm.lt

United Arab Emirates/Émirats araby unis

Mr. Rashed AL HEMEIIRI
Director
Monitoring and evaluation department
UAE, Ministry of International Cooperation and Development (MICAD)

Tel: +971 2 6544 444
Email: rashed.hemeiri@micad.gov.ae

African Development Bank (AfDB)/Banque africaine de développement (BAfD)

Ms. Karen ROT-MUNSTERMANN
Division Manager, Knowledge Management, Outreach and Capacity Development
Independent Development Evaluation
Immeuble du Centre de Commerce International d’Abidjan (CCIA)
Avenue Jean-Paul II
01 BP 1387 Abidjan 01
Côte d’Ivoire

Tel: +225 2026 3457
Email: K.ROT@AFDB.ORG

European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)/Banque européenne de reconstruction et de développement (BERD)

Mr. Keith LEONARD
Deputy Chief Evaluator
Evaluation Department
One Exchange Square
EC2A 2JN London
United Kingdom

Email: Leonardke@ebrd.com
Ms. Victoria MILLIS
Principal Evaluation Manager
Evaluation Department
One Exchange Square
EC2A 2JN London
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 20 7338 6725
Email: MillisV@ebrd.com

Ms. Beatriz PEREZ TIMERMANS
Evaluator
Evaluation Department
One Exchange Square
EC2A 2JN London
United Kingdom
Email: PerezB@ebrd.com

European Investment Bank (EIB)/Banque europénne d'investissement (BEI)

Ms. Ivory YONG-PROTZEL
Head of Operations Evaluation Division
100, Bd Konrad Adenauer
Luxembourg
Luxembourg
Tel: +352 4379 88696
Email: i.Yong@eib.org

UN Development Programme (UNDP)/Programme des Nations Unies pour le développement (PNUD)

Mr. Indran NAIDOO
Director
United Nations Independent Evaluation Office
220 East 42nd Street (DNB-20th Floor)
New York, NY 10017
20th Floor, Room 2066
10017 New York
United States
Tel: +011 6467814200
Email: indran.naidoo@undp.org
UN Evaluation Group (UNEG)/Groupe d'Evaluation des Nations Unies (UNEG)

Mr. Marco SEGONE
Chair, United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG)
Director, Independent Evaluation Office, UN Women
Co-chair, EvalPartners
220 East 42nd street (between 2nd and 3rd Avenue), Room 2164 (21st floor)
New York
United States
Tel: +1 646 781 4825
Email: marco.segone@unwomen.org

World Bank/Banque mondiale

Ms. Caroline HEIDER
Senior Vice President and Director-General
Independent Evaluation Group
1818 H Street, NW
DC 20433 Washington
United States
Tel: +1 202 473 6300
Email: cheider@worldbank.org

Ms. Marie GAARDER
Manager, Public Sector Department
Independent Evaluation Group
1818 H Street, NW
DC 20433 Washington
United States
Tel: +1 202 473 5733
Email: mgaarder@worldbank.org

Ms. Anna AGHUMIAN
Evaluation Officer
Independent Evaluation Group
Country, Corporate and Global Evaluations, IEGCC
1818 H Street, NW
DC 20433 Washington
United States
Tel: +1 202 458 1803
Email: aaghumian@worldbank.org
International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie)

Mr. Emmanuel JIMENEZ
Executive Director
International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie)
1625 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Suite 450
20036 Washington DC
United States

Tel: +1 202 629 3939
Email: ejimenez@3ieimpact.org

Consultants and Invitees

Mr. Edward JACKSON
President
E.T. Jackson & Associates Ltd.
104-858 Bank Street
ON K1S 3W3 Ottawa
Canada

Tel: +1 613 230 5221
Email: edward_jackson@etjackson.com

Ms. Claude LEROY-THEMEZE*
Former lead of the Collaborative Partner-Donor Evaluation Initiative
Independent Evaluation Group
The World Bank Group
Country, Corporate, and Global Evaluations

Tel: +33 1 40 69 31 72
Email: cleroy@worldbank.org
*participated in the Evaluation Capacity Development session on 15 June

Mr. Olzhas ISSABEKO
Director
Foreign Economic Policy Department
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Kazakhstan

Email: o.issabekov@mfa.kz

Mr. Anuar ADILBEKO
Third Secretary
Foreign Economic Policy Department
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Kazakhstan

Email: a.adilbekov@mfa.kz
**Ms. Karen JORGENSEN**
Head of Division  
DCD/REED  
Annexe Delta 2076  
2 rue André-Pascal  
75016 Paris  
France  
Tel: +33 1 45 24 94 61  
Email: Karen.JORGENSEN@oecd.org

**Mr. Björn GILLSÄTER***
Head of Division  
DCD/MOPAN  
Annexe Delta 2176  
2 rue André-Pascal  
75016 Paris  
France  
Tel: +33 1 45 24 80 49  
Email: Bjorn.GILLSATER@oecd.org  
*participated in the Multilateral Evaluation Issues session on 16 June

**Mr. Michael LAIRD***
Senior Policy Analyst  
DCD/REED  
Annexe Delta 2084  
2 rue André-Pascal  
75016 Paris  
France  
Tel: +33 1 45 24 90 33  
Email: Michael.LAIRD@oecd.org  
*participated in the Updates session on 16 June

**Mr. Hans LUNDGREN**
Head, Evaluation  
DCD/REED  
Annexe Delta 2084  
2 rue André-Pascal  
75016 Paris  
France  
Tel: +33 1 45 24 90 59  
Email: Hans.LUNDGREN@oecd.org
Mr. Kevin WILLIAMS*
Head of In-depth Evaluation
SGE/EVIA
Château de la Muette 301
2 rue André-Pascal
75016 Paris
France
Tel: +33 1 45 24 18 67
Email: Kevin.WILLIAMS@oecd.org
*participated in the Updates session on 16 June

Ms. Susanna MORRISON-MÉTOIS
Junior Policy Analyst
DCD/REED
Annexe Delta 2084
2 rue André-Pascal
75016 Paris
France
Tel: +33 1 45 24 84 09
Email: Susanna.MORRISON-METOIS@oecd.org

Ms. Angèle N’ZINGA
Assistant
DCD/REED
Annexe Delta 2084
2 rue André-Pascal
75016 Paris
France
Tel: +33 1 45 24 96 68
Email: angele.nzinga@oecd.org