Review of National Evaluation Systems and Capacities for Evaluating Progress towards the SDGs – Philippines

7ᵗʰ NEDA M&E Forum - 20 November 2018

Content

1. Background

SDGs: East Asia and Pacific Regional Office's support for localization, monitoring and **evaluation**

Review of National Evaluation Systems and Capacities in Asia Pacific for Evaluating Progress Towards SDGs in 5 Case Study Countries

2. Objective

1. Generate knowledge to guide evaluation capacity development for the SDGs;

2. Showcase successes, lessons, and learnings;

3. Foster peer learning among stakeholders; and,

4. Contribute to informing global, regional, and NECD guidance

3. Methodology

	Enabling Environment	Institutional Capacity	Individual Capacity
SDG Principles	Integration	Accountability Inclusion	Evidence
Demand			
Use			
Leadership			
Resources			
Technical Capacity			
Institutional Arrangements			
Values and Standards			

Capacity Factors

3. Methodology

	Enabling Environment	Institutional Capacity	Individual Capacity
SDG Principles	Integration	Accountability Inclusion	Evidence
Capacity Factors Demand			
Use			
Leadership			
Resources			
Technical Capacity			
Institutional Arrangements			
Values and Standards			

3. Methodology

	Enabling Environment	Institutional Capacity	Individual Capacity
SDG Principles	Integration	Accountability Inclusion	Evidence
Capacity Factors Demand			
Use			
Leadership			
Resources			
Technical Capacity			
Institutional Arrangements			
Values and Standards			

3. Methodology

Data Collection

1. Document review

2. Key informant interviews
   - 11 agencies (Planning, M&E units)
   - 7 non-states (CSOs/NGOs, think tanks)
   - 3 Development Partners + UNDAF M&E Group

3. Focus groups (10 agencies/ organizations)

4. Validation Workshop (to be conducted)

4. Preliminary Findings

Enabling Environment

1. NEPF (2015) and RBMER (2016) raised awareness among senior management, basis to allocate more funds

2. "Culture of evaluation" taking root in some agencies; countervailing pressure to implement projects, utilize budgets in others

3. Results used mostly by program managers, lesser extent by senior management, occasionally Congress; local governments

4. Results used to improve program design & implementation, expand program or hire more personnel, develop new policies, innovations become templates

5. Strong data systems to support monitoring of performance indicators; some progress in prioritizing SDGs; so far seems little discussion on SDGs beyond indicators

4. Preliminary Findings

Institutional Capacity

1. Established M&E infrastructures in most agencies; however some gaps in integration/inter-operability

2. More & more have focal M&E units; however many positions do not have specific M&E qualifications

3. Most conduct or join capacity building activities; resources to conduct evaluation are ad hoc

4. Procurement is a constraint – limited bidders, long process

5. Results Framework & budget indicators can serve as basis to identify priority evaluation (more size & priority)

4. Preliminary Findings

Individual Capacity

1. Emerging appreciation among middle level managers & technical staffers, however less strong among decision makers

2. Adequate training opportunities (vs current needs); however no focal M&E units in many agencies and no specific M&E positions

3. Some gaps – basic evaluation techniques, new tools and methodologies, drafting TOR for external evaluators, contract management, engaging decisions makers

4. Limited supply of evaluators? Shortage (e.g. lack of bidders) vs. adequate (many sources – academe, research institutes, consulting firms, individuals)

5. Conclusions

Strengths

1. Developed M&E infrastructure and national data system to support SDGs

2. Growing base of evaluation experience to launch a national evaluation system

3. Sustained feedback loop with external stakeholders, Congress

4. Strong linkages with development partners

5. Conclusions

Limitations

1. Policy Framework requires operationalizing

2. Lack of clarity over leadership and central coordination

3. Low awareness of SDG evaluation requirements, principles, methodologies

Recommendations

From Stakeholders *(summary)*

1. Operationalize NEPF; make evaluation more dynamic (e.g. more citizen participation)

2. Adopt whole-of-government approach to reduce conflict of interest in NEPF; legislated evaluation policy; clarify roles and promote inter-agency collaborations

3. NEPF with corresponding budget to support local programs; budgets should include hiring of qualified staff and consultants; budget support for citizen participation

4. Work on integrated & inter-operable data systems; create framework for inter-agency access to data; public all evaluation results in open data system/portal

5. Expand CSO participation to avoid "suki" system; inform stakeholders of key policy changes especially in areas of high interest (e.g. BUB)

Recommendations

From Consultants

1. Government-wide, system approach vs. focused, gradual, program-oriented approach

2. Factors to consider – highly uneven capacity across agencies, resource gaps exceed fiscal appetite, need to gain experience (collaboration)

3. Program approach can produce results in short-term, provide system managers experience and knowledge of issues, build base for gradual development of national evaluation system

4. Recommendation: create program of evaluation around the SDGs by identifying key government programs & interventions in a limited number of priority SDG targets