8th M&E Network Forum

"W&E" in M&E

Documentation Report

8th M&E Network Forum

"M&E" in M&E

Standing united to strengthen national capacity for evidence-based decision making

Documentation Report[1]

19 - 20 November 2019
Crowne Plaza Hotel, Ortigas Center,
Quezon City, Philippines

July 2020

[1] Consolidated outputs by Maria Ligaya Laura Morales, with inputs from Rainier Allan Requinala, Ruby Ann Manalo and Kristina Angeli Lopez. Submitted to Ms. Kathleen Ivy Custodio of UNDP, in fulfillment of their duties as documenters of the 8th M&E Network Philippines Forum.

Contents

Abbreviations

APEA	Asia Pacific Evaluation Association
AO25 IATF	Inter-Agency Task Force on the Harmonization of National Government Performance Monitoring, Information, and Reporting Systems
ARTA	Anti-Red Tape Act
BTMS	Budget Treasury and Management System
CBMS	Community-Based Monitoring System
COA	Commission on Audit
CoRE-SDGIs	Core SDG Indicators
CPBRD	Congressional Policy and Budget Research Department, House of Representatives
CSC	Civil Service Commission
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
DA	Department of Agriculture
DAP	Development Academy of the Philippines
DBM	Department of Budget and Management
DDIT	Digital Data Imaging Technologies
DENR	Department of Environment and Natural Resources
DepEd	Department of Education
DFA	Department of Foreign Affairs
DILG	Department of the Interior and Local Government
DIME	Digital Imaging for Monitoring and Evaluation
DLSU	De La Salle University
DND	Department of National Defense
DOF	Department of Finance
DOH	Department of Health
DOLE	Department of Labor and Employment
DOST-PCIEERD	Department of Science and Technology - Philippine Council for Industry, Energy, and Emerging Technology Research and Development
DPWH	Department of Public Works and Highways
DRRM	Disaster Risk Reduction and Management
DSWD	Department of Social Welfare and Development
ECCD	Early Childhood Development Program
EODB	Ease of Doing Business
ETF	Evaluation Task Force
FGD	Focus-Group Discussions
GOCCs	Government Owned and Controlled Corporations
IED-ADB	Independent Evaluation Department - Asian Development Bank
IPA	Innovations for Poverty Action
IPC	Institute of Philippine Culture
IPU	Inter-parliamentary Union
LBP	Land Bank of the Philippines
LGU	Local Government Units
LIDAR	Light Detection and Ranging
LRT	Light Rail Transit
MER	Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NEDA	National Economic and Development Authority
NEPF	National Evaluation Policy Framework
NGAs	National Government Agencies
NHA	National Housing Authority
PDP-RM	Philippine Development Plan Results Matrices
PFM	Public Financial Management
PGC	Participatory Governance Cluster
PH-OGP	Philippine Open Government Partnership
PIDS	Philippine Institute for Development Studies
PMS-OPES	Performance Management System - Office Performance Evaluation System

Abbreviations

PPAs	Programs, Projects and Activities
PREXC	Program Expenditure Classification
PSA	Philippine Statistics Authority
PSRTI	Philippine Statistical Research and Training Institute
RA	Republic Act
RDC	Regional Development Council
RBMER	Results-Based Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting
RBPMS	Results-Based Performance Management System
RRNDP	Rural Road Network Development Project
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SEPO	Senate Economic Planning Office
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Fund for Poverty Alleviation
VNR	Voluntary National Review
4Ps, Pantawid Pamilya	Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program

List of tables

8th M&E Network Forum

Standing united to strengthen national capacity for evidence-based decision making

19 - 20 November 2019
Crowne Plaza Hotel, Ortigas Center,
Quezon City, Philippines

I. Background of the Activity

Towards the goal of increased use of evidence from monitoring and evaluation (M&E) to meet societal goals and leave no one behind, the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) annually convenes M&E practitioners and stakeholders in government, development partners, academe, civil society, and private sector to exchange knowledge and experiences, and find ways to collaborate on strengthening the practice.

Since 2011, the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Network Philippines provides development practitioners with a platform for dialogue on strengthening M&E capacity in the Philippines.

The previous forums paved the way for milestones that change the evaluation landscape in the Philippines, such as the signing of a Joint Memorandum Circular that gave rise to the National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF). This year's forum seeks to weave all prior milestones into a story unfolding to reach more milestones.

With the support of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), this year's Eighth M&E Network Forum was a call for the whole of government to take concrete steps towards the increased use of evidence from monitoring and evaluation to achieve results. Enhanced usability entails ensuring proper information fit: evaluation agendas are drawn up to be responsive to real-life challenges, and practical solutions inform interventions. Following the whole of government approach, enhanced usability also underscores the need to pool together all WE have and need—financial, intellectual, and human resources, as well as the exercise of political will—for the rigorous conduct of monitoring and evaluation toward improved policies and programs.

This year's theme is an invitation to take stock of the M&E ecosystem, and for agencies, sectors, and individuals who comprise the ecosystem to understand their roles as part of this space, and weave in the WE perspective in their practice. While the WE perspective draws inspiration from international norms and global trends for a more inclusive M&E, WE in M&E is an opportunity to deliberately learn from local practice and to reflect upon how far WE have gone, where WE want to go, and how WE can get there together.

The current evaluation landscape will benefit from a solid commitment to work stronger together to implement continuing and realigned strategies toward meeting development targets. Laying the foundation for inclusive growth, high trust, resilient society and a globally competitive knowledge economy entails a commitment to walk the talk, and ensure monitoring systems and evaluation results are used to their fullest potential to leave no one behind.

II. Highlights of the 8th M&E Network Philippines Forum

A. Day 1: November 19, 2019

A.1 Preliminaries

The Eighth M&E Forum opened on a Tuesday (November 19) at 9:30 am at the Grand Ballroom of the Crowne Plaza Hotel in Ortigas Center, Mandaluyong City. It was attended by a total of 366 participants from National Government Agencies (NGAs), Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), Development Organizations, Local Government Units (LGUs), academia and media. The Forum was organized by the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA), with support from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

The Forum started with the singing of the Philippine National Anthem. Thereafter, Ms. Nastassja Quijano, the event moderator, welcomed and greeted the audience. She introduced herself as someone who is known to be a development consultant but stated that she considers herself as M&E advocate.

Ms. Quijano mentioned that the government has worked towards strengthening an evidence-based and results-based culture in the Philippines. This includes fostering a network of M&E practitioners, professionals and advocates committed to this vision, which the NEDA has spearheaded in 2011 by holding the very first M&E Forum.

After her preliminary statement, Ms. Quijano moved to the next part of the opening program. She acknowledged that the Forum is greatly honored to be welcomed by three distinguished civil servants and introduced them one by one for their respective welcome remarks. Officials representing NEDA, DBM, and UNDP gave their respective remarks to formally open and set the tone for the 8th edition of the Forum.

A.1.1 Opening and Welcome Remarks

Former Socioeconomic and Planning Secretary Ernesto Pernia gave the first welcome remarks of the Eighth M&E Forum. A complete copy of his speech can be found in Annex 2.1. The following are some of his key messages:

- Paraphrasing Nobel Peace prize awardees Prof. Esther Duflo and Abhijit Banerjee, Former Sec. Pernia said that economists, policymakers and public policy analysts are more like plumbers- they solve problems with a combination of intuition grounded in science, some guesswork, and aided by experience, and on a bunch of pure trial and error. He explained that this is the reason why continuous monitoring and evaluation is so important because monitoring and evaluation of data will continually teach them the right way to plumb, so to speak, adjusting their policies based on the data.

- In the past few years, great strides have been made in further cultivating the M&E landscape with the public launching of the National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF) in 2015. Jointly issued by the NEDA and DBM, the NEPF has paved the way for an evidence-based culture in the public sector.

  The NEPF is a framework for the purposive conduct and evaluation of policies, programs and projects in the public sector in support of good governance, transparency, accountability and evidence-based decision making.

- Sec. Pernia stressed the need to engage more with all stakeholders in using M&E to craft well-informed government policies and developing programs and projects that catalyze reforms.

- Sec. Pernia also announced that on the second day of the forum, another milestone in the implementation of the NEPF will be unveiled with the launching of the National Evaluation Portal, which took place on Day 2. The portal will serve as a repository of the NEPF, its guidelines, learning modules, and all the evaluation studies commissioned by NEDA under the M&E fund. It will also serve as online platform that enables a community of practice for dialogue and knowledge exchange on monitoring and evaluation.

Budget Secretary Wendel Avisado delivered the second part of the welcome remarks of the opening ceremony. A complete copy of his speech can be found in Annex 2.2. Some of the highlights from his speech are as follows:

- Sec. Avisado reminded the participants that as one of the lead stewards of good governance and public expenditure reforms in the country, the DBM jointly issued with NEDA the National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF) in 2015 to provide guidance on public sector evaluation, and support good governance, transparency, accountability, and evidence-based decision making. This policy framework seeks to provide managers and government with the procedures, templates and tools in designing, provisioning, and ensuring the quality of evaluations.
- Other milestones in M&E followed suit. In 2016, the DBM issued National Budget Circular Number 565, which adopts the Results-Based Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting, a policy that harmonizes all monitoring, evaluation and reporting objectives.

- To put into action these M&E policies the DBM partnered with other key government agencies to start the use of information technology to capture vital information used for monitoring and evaluation. DBM, together with the Bureau of Treasury and the Commission on Audit, spearheaded the development of the Budget Treasury and Management System (BTMS) to provide a common and modern information system for the public financial management operations of the government of the Philippines. It will provide real time online monitoring of appropriations allotment of the nation's and disbursements among others. As of October 2019, 108 (or 90 per cent) of the 120 top spending agencies are in the various roll up stages of the project. This is already twice the initial target of 54 agencies to be covered for this year. Once all 120 agencies are fully on boarded around 60 to 70 per cent of the total government expenditures will be captured in the system.

  Currently, seven agencies are already fully implementing the DBMS and at least 90 more are targeting do so by the end of this year.

- Sec. Avisado noted for the next two years they envision to get not only the top 120 agencies, but also touch base with the remaining 146 agencies or so to adopt the system including all Government Owned and Controlled Corporations (GOCCs) receiving subsidies from the National Government. Furthermore, DBM is also targeting to complete by 2020 the development of the BTMS with the modernized government E-procurement system to fortify the link between the planning, procurement and budget utilization.

- Project Digital Information for Monitoring and Evaluation (DIME) is another key initiative of DBM, undertaken together with the Department of Science and Technology. Launched in March 2018, the following project seeks to monitor the status of implementation of high value priority government programs and projects through the use of various digital data emerging technologies, such as satellite images, light detection and ranging (LIDAR), open roads platform, and geo-store and geotagging.

- In 2019, Project DIME has monitored more than 1,400 government infrastructure projects worth P16 billion or 91.7% of these have been validated through the various DPIP. While project DIME is still a work in progress, it has already been recognized to play a vital role on the transparency and accountability efforts of the government during the first anniversary of the Presidential Anti-Corruption Commission held last March 2019 in which the DBM was a silver awardee.

- Sec. Avisado informed the forum participants that DBM would be issuing the Budget Call for 2020 soon. He shared that he has already advised all government agencies who will be proposing projects for funding such as DPWH, DA and DOH that they have to secure an endorsement from the Regional Development Councils (RDCs) first before they get further processed for funding.

- Sec. Avisado commented that given the crucial role of M&E and the volume of projects and services the government is undertaking, it is not enough that only few participate in the monitoring process. He pointed out that indeed, there is strength in greater honesty and in numbers.
- Sec. Avisado noted that DBM through the Philippines Open Government Partnership has been actively engaging Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and together with the Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG), crafted the Participatory Governance Cluster Performance of Projects Roadmap 2017 to 2022 and the National Action Plan, beginning from 2019 and setting into practice a whole of societal approach in governance.

  He emphasized that DBM promotes participatory monitoring and evaluation approaches and taps the expertise and support of non-government organizations to help the department keep track of program implementation at the community level and to carry out third party monitoring on the progress of the Philippine's open government initiatives.

  He noted that under DBM's, next PH-OGP National Action Plan, Project DIME was listed as one of DBM's international open government commitments. He added that there is even a business process guideline manual to provide information on how non-government stakeholders can participate in project monitoring.

- An interactive Project DIME portal that has DIME transparency website is also being developed. The DIME portal contains key performance information on ongoing programs and projects to reach the public for comments and provide feedback thereon. While all OGP initiatives undergo third partner review, other government agencies that are putting emphasis on mainstreaming participatory and monitoring approaches are the Commission through their citizens participatory audit, the Department of Education through their Last-Mile Schools Program, the Department of the Interior and Local Government through the Subaybayan platform and an application called Development Live.

- Sec. Avisado stated that while the reported may be small steps when viewed from the perspective of the journey towards Ambisyon 2040, success lays the sum of all combined efforts. He pointed out that the use of CSO monitors and advances in information technology have greatly enhanced M&E, noting that their words are embedded in DBM's key budgeting principles of spending within means on the right priorities and with measurable results.

- Sec. Avisado quoted David Osborne and Ted Gaebler, as follows:

  "If you cannot measure results you cannot tell success from failure. If you cannot see success, you cannot be rewarded. If you cannot reward success, you're probably rewarding failure. If you cannot see success, you can never learn from it. If you cannot recognize failure you cannot correct it. If you can demonstrate results, you can win the public support."

Mr. Enrico Gaveglia, UNDP Deputy Resident Representative, delivered his own speech. A complete copy of his speech can be found in Annex 2.3. Some of the highlights from his speech are as follows:

- Mr. Gaveglia explained that ecosystems typically bring together multiple players of different types and sizes in order to create scale and serve (government/markets, etc.) in ways that are beyond the capacity of any single organization or even any traditional industry. Their diversity and their collective ability to learn, adapt and crucially innovate together are key determinants of their longer-term success and ultimately their survival.
- Beyond government, the National Evaluation Policy Framework recognizes the role of civil society, academe, businesses, and development partners in advocating for equity-focused and gender-responsive evaluation systems, in providing capacity building, technical assistance and public reporting and dissemination of M&E information to civil society.
- As to the question of where do WE want to go and how do WE get there as M&E practitioners, Mr. Gaveglia emphasized it is important to recognize that M&E systems are dynamic, evolving and requiring constant update from a broader set of ecosystem inhabitants.
- Mr. Gaveglia stated that certainly, the whole community wants the following:
  - That M&E is mainstreamed across government institutions.
  - Systems and processes are well established, harmonized and open to evolution. It is similar to your mobile applications – continuous upgrade is the refrain of your system settings.
  - Innovation is of essence. Business-as-usual will make it hard for institutions to keep up with complex and multi-dimensional development problems.
  - Finally, evaluation studies are being championed in global fora and the Philippines has a role to play on the international stage, promoting a stronger global network and relationships for a world-wide learning.
- UNDP remains committed to contribute to an increased sense of awareness of self and others in this newly defined space of interaction between institutions.
- One of UNDP's relevant initiatives is the Strategic M&E Project. Financed by NEDA, it aims to create tangible experiences across selected government agencies for M&E support and evidence-based decision making.

A.1.2 Photo Ops

After their respective speeches, Ms. Quijano called the distinguished officials of NEDA, DBM and UNDP to head back on stage for a photo opportunity.

A.1.3 Overview of the M&E Forum

After a quick sensing on how many participants have participated in previous M&E forum and how many are attending for the first time, Ms. Quijano proceeded with the overview.

Ms. Quijano stated that this year's theme is in recognition of "We" in M&E. Essentially, it is a call for everyone to ensure the increase use of evidence in achieving development goals.

She explained how the logo and design elements embody the theme. She brought the attention of the participants to the logo and explained that the indigenously-patterned circle represents the M&E community who will convene for the next two days to advance its collective aspirations. Ms. Quijano expounded on what is meant by the use of evidence, and what can be done to make it happen then moved on to the explanation of the forum objectives.

As explained by Ms. Quijano, the Eighth M&E Network Forum generally aims to serve as an opportunity to better connect with the M&E community and to strengthen capabilities in doing M&E better. Specifically, the forum aims to contribute towards the following objectives:

1. Strengthen the consensus for embedding and improving M&E practices towards achieving development goals;

2. Secure commitment from decision-makers to invest bigger in M&E systems, competencies, and infrastructure to better track and manage the results of key social and economic programs;

3. Provide a venue for strategies that can make M&E more inclusive and responsive, and allow the general public to know why monitoring and evaluation is indispensable in meeting social and economic development goals;

4. Strengthen the M&E community that supports one another and reinforces local and internationally accepted, and culturally appropriate norms and standards in conducting M&E.

As designed, Day One sessions mapped the current M&E ecosystem to allow participants to situate their practice against the context of a larger M&E community. The sessions focused on the experiences of agencies and institutions that have made substantial headway in ensuring that evidence from M&E are used to inform policy reform and decision-making.

On the other hand, Day Two sessions sought to provide an opportunity for enhancing M&E skills and competencies towards improving the usability of M&E results. Parallel breakout sessions were organized to (1) showcase approaches, methodologies and results of recently concluded evaluations, (2) promote learning based on M&E tools and strategies, and (3) discuss about building and reinforcing communities of practice that can facilitate and sustain the WE perspective.

Ms. Quijano also introduced the Attendify mobile application as a platform that will be used throughout the event.

She provided an overview of its features and how it can be used. She encouraged everyone to share their forum moments through Attendify. Before moving on with the next activity, Ms. Quijano informed the participants on how non-forum participants can keep track of the Forum events through Facebook.

A compilation of the PowerPoint Presentations shown throughout the two-day event can be accessed at bit.ly/8thMEForum. Annex 3 lists down all the available presentation materials in the link.

A.2 Where are WE in M&E?

Two presentations were delivered to the plenary to provide the Forum attendees with an overview of what has been achieved so far with regard to M&E in the Philippines. NEDA and DBM, the two lead agencies in the monitoring and evaluation of government programs and projects, shared their updates on their respective reforms to strengthen M&E.

Where are WE in M&E?
Status, Challenges, and Prospects of M&E in the Public Sector
Dir. Violeta Corpus
Director, Monitoring and Evaluation Staff
National Economic and Development Authority

Before starting with her presentation, Dir. Corpus acknowledged the presence of various government agencies in the plenary. She then proceeded with her presentation. Dir. Corpus provided a snapshot of where WE, members of the monitoring and evaluation community, are situated in terms of coverage, reforms, and activities, as well as challenges and opportunities in Public Sector M&E. Following are the main highlights of Dir. Corpus's presentation:

On the planning cycle:

- The planning cycle is composed

of (i) Needs, Assessment, (ii) Plan Intervention, (iii) Plan Implementation, and (iv) Monitoring and Evaluation. Dir. Corpus emphasized that M&E should be superimposed on the various stages of the project cycle and must be embedded in the design of the program or project. Needs assessment takes into account the perceived and real needs of the society. Based on the assessment, a plan for addressing such needs is developed with a corresponding budget, after which the implementation of the planned activities, programs and projects of the agencies follows.

- Dir. Corpus said that the very important aspect is monitoring all those interventions from the very beginning as they are being designed. Thus, the need to talk about information systems and other activities apart from evaluations such as internal assessments by agencies, work planning, budgeting adjustments in the workplans, adjustments in the budget, and others. These are all geared towards ensuring what the government implements are those that are truly needed for the right amount of resources, in the right time, and with the desired results.

- Currently, M&E practitioners in the Philippines normally put their efforts more on the big M or on monitoring and little on E or evaluation, if at all. However, since it is their advocacy to have evidence-based planning and decision making, evaluation efforts must then be heightened, hence the need to continue in advocating the practice of evaluation in the government, and fostering a culture that enables it.

On the M&E results framework

- Dir. Corpus presented the M&E results framework of NEDA. Central to this framework is the societal goal of building the foundation for inclusive growth, a high trust society and globally competitive knowledge economy. She remarked that this overarching goal is interconnected with the sectoral goals that are driven by sector agencies. The agencies, in turn have their respective and appropriate organizational outcomes and major final outputs that are ultimately translated into programs, projects and activities.

- At the various levels of these interconnections are the corresponding documents and M&E reports. At the very top, which where the Societal goal intersects with the sectoral goals, is the Philippine Development Plan and its accompanying document, the Results Matrices (RMs).

  RMs specifies the results indicators committed to by all the departments, consistent with their organizational outcomes. Next to the PDP and its RMs, other planning documents in order of scope include the Regional Development Plans and Regional RMs, Program Expenditure Classification (PREXC) care of DBM and Project's Logical Framework c/o implementing agencies.

- The M&E reports produced from the top down within the M&E Results Framework presented by Dir. Corpus include Socio-Economic Report, Regional Development Report c/o NEDA, SONA Technical Report c/o the Office of the President-Presidential Management Staff (OP-PMS), Annual Reports (Agencies), Budget/ Financial Accountability Reports care of DBM, Budget Execution Document care of DBM, ODA Portfolio Review, RPMES Reports, Project-level Reports and Project Evaluations Reports (care of Agencies/ DPs).

On the National Evaluation Policy Framework

- In 2015, a joint Memorandum Circular was signed by both DBM and NEDA, giving rise to the National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF). There is already a set of draft guidelines on operationalizing the NEPF, which, during the Opening Remarks, Sec. Avisado committed to sign once officially transmitted to DBM.

- As stipulated in the NEPF the scope of public sector monitoring includes those indicators committed in the RMs, programs and projects supported through ODA and local funds, and the current Administration's priority programs and initiatives. Moreover, Section 5.1 of the NEPF stipulates that "All projects/programs…are EVALUATED at least once at the end of their program/project life cycle or as frequently as necessary".

On NEDA's M&E activities

Dir. Corpus showed a list of the M&E activities that are being undertaken by NEDA which include the following:

- Annual Portfolio Review;
- Formulation/ Updating of the Results Matrices of the Philippine Development Plan;
- Project Re-evaluation;
- Project Implementation Reviews;
- Project Facilitation/Problem-Solving Sessions cum Field Visits;
- Impact Evaluation;
- Ex-Post Evaluation;

On the Philippine Government's "Build, Build, Build" program

The "Build, Build, Build" program of the government now has 100 priority projects which have to go through the Investment Coordination Committee process. The "Build, Build, Build" projects can also be subjected to reevaluation while they are being implemented to check if there is a need to modify its scope, or if they need additional funding or just simply restructuring.

On the NEDA commissioned evaluation studies

- NEDA has so far commissioned seventeen evaluation studies since 2017, ten of which have been completed and other five are still for to be completed. The studies were done both, at the national and regional levels. Those implemented and commissioned by the Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS) were not included in the list as PIDS has its own funds in doing evaluation studies, most of which can be seen and accessed in the PIDS website.
- There was a second stream of evaluation studies undertaken under the Policy Window Philippines with assistance from DFATD Australia through 3ie, a nonprofit organization doing rigorous impact evaluations. Since 2014, there were at least 4 rigorous impact evaluation studies, that had to undergo a baseline study phase and wait a little while (one and half years to two years) before an impact evaluation can be done. So far, NEDA has completed impact evaluation of Special Program for Employment Studies, while three impact evaluation studies are still ongoing (DSWD-Impact Evaluation of the Sustainable Livelihood Program, Supreme Court-Impact Evaluation for Small Claims Procedures and e-Court Program and Supreme Court-Process Evaluation for Continuous Trial Program).
- The third and biggest chunk of impact evaluation studies that NEDA has undertaken is through a partnership with UNDP. The Strategic Monitoring and Evaluation (Strategic M&E) Project does simultaneous evaluations and advisory services provided by UNDP. The project also aims to build capacity at the agency level, which volunteered to be evaluated. The seven thematic studies are aligned with the themes under PDP and crucial SDG targets. Another remarkable output of the project is the NEPF guidelines, where UNDP has provided assistance in its formulation. The development of a national evaluation agenda will also be undertaken building on the valuable insights and lessons learned generated by the pilot thematic studies.
- Right now, NEDA has identified some case studies that would be undertaken starting next year at the national level/sector level. In addition, the UNDP-NEDA Strategic M&E project is also trying to work out formulating a certificate program possibly with the Development Academy of the Philippines (DAP) so that there is a standard set of learning program for M&E. And of course, the system also keeps track of how programs and projects are developed from the DBM list and then if they are ever implemented, then they have to be monitored until they are completed and then finally to be evaluated.

- Dir. Corpus announced some of the evaluation studies undertaken under the UNDP-NEDA Strategic M&E Project will be presented on the second day of the Eighth M&E Network Forum. She noted that the Anti-Red Tape Act (ARTA) Case study is very important and timely in light of the newly created Anti Red Tape Authority. She noted that the authority has really picked up from the results of the study, which were used in determining the roadmap for the authority itself.

On key activities undertaken in 2019 and the ones planned for 2020

- Dir. Corpus referred back to the main objective of her presentation by asking "where are we now and where are we headed?". She then proceeded to discuss the key activities undertaken in 2019 and the planned milestone activities for 2020 and beyond.

- In 2019, which is the demonstration stage, 28 evaluations were commissioned, twelve (12) of which have been completed already while sixteen (16) are still ongoing. NEDA is trying to have a call for proposals for its regional officers for the internally managed NEDA studies. The NEPF guidelines have to be released duly signed by NEDA and DBM secretaries. Further, NEDA will try to identify the top six agencies that get the biggest chunks of the national budget for coaching in doing evaluation. The conduct of the M&E network forum that provides learning sessions for M&E and lastly the project will likewise try to develop the professional learning program with the DAP.

- For 2021, which is the deepening stage, the targets include the completion of all the ongoing studies. Government agencies who want to do their own evaluations could also do so provided they have to comply with the documentary requirements of the DBM. By next year DAP will have to start off with a standard learning program on M&E.

- For 2021-2022, which is the sustainability stage, the vision is for the 2023-2028 PDP to be shaped by the evaluations already. Another long-term plan is Tier 2 budget proposals to be backed by evaluations.

On challenges faced by M&E practitioners

- In terms of the challenges being faced by M&E practitioners, Dir. Corpus's discussion focused on the following:

    - The absence of dedicated Evaluation Management Units in agencies, and an Evaluation Secretariat that will drive the Evaluation Agenda at the national level, which should have evaluation specialists, experts, and support staff, with adequate funding and other sources.

    - Weak or absence of institutional base for evaluation in most of the agencies or need to embed evaluation in the design phase of program/project.

    - Availability and accessibility of robust baseline data needed to evaluate programs and projects

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

- Dir. Corpus noted that there are representatives from the senate planning offices in the plenary who could provide updates on the status of their proposed bill on evaluation. She remarked that if ever the bill is approved then agencies will now be allowed to have budgets for evaluation and the necessary human resources to support it.

- Dir. Corpus shared that NEDA wants to spearhead the crafting of an evaluation agenda by initially identifying capacity needs, come up with the capacity building training program through any recognized institution and fine-tune the guidelines as it is used. She invited the participants to the evaluation assessment session on the second day of the Eighth M&E

Network Forum, which the Forum participants are welcome to attend

- Dir. Corpus explained that not all programs and projects are evaluable at a given time. Agencies have to check whether their programs are evaluable in terms of current available data. She provided tips in the conduct of evaluations, as follows:

  - Undertake an evaluability assessment to determine evaluation of project in items of the available data.

  - Get the consent of the agencies and that because of some sensitive issues it is also a requirement to get clearances from the agencies and even clearance from the PSA for the household surveys and instruments to be used.

  - After checking for evaluation, prepare for the appropriate terms of reference, in terms of reference evaluation plans.

  - Set-up the peer review for that evaluation.

- All the steps in conducting evaluations are adequately described in the guidelines. Further, the evaluation results can then be presented during the annual M&E Forum.

- Lastly, Dir. Corpus remarked that NEDA wants its partners to continue working on the legislative aspect of how to institutionalize the practice of evaluation in the country through the evaluation act.

Dir. Corpus acknowledged the presence of SEPO and CPBRD, because early this year they mounted their own internal training program through UNICEF assistance. She expressed her delight that she got invited in both trainings to really give them an overview of what NEDA wants to do in terms of evaluation.

She mentioned that the efforts of the Senate and Congress to beef up their evaluation capacity, as they want to understand the proposed Evaluation Bill, its nuances and the requirements for implementing the act should it get promulgated. Dir. Corpus noted that some of the senators like Sen. Angara and Sen. Recto have expressed interest and presented their ideas with regard to the possibility of evaluating the AFP Modernization Act and the Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization Act. In conclusion, Dir. Corpus said that the M&E community is together in strengthening the M&E practice, and that NEDA and DBM are very much willing to provide assistance to government agencies with regard to their Monitoring and Evaluation requirements.

Where are WE in M&E?
DBM Strategies and Initiatives and Project DIME
Ms. Rosario Nuñez
Division Chief, M&E Division
BMB-F, Department of Budget and Management

Ms. Nuñez presented on behalf of Ms. Tessie Gregorio, who was at a budget hearing at the time of her presentation. Her presentation basically focused on two topics: the DBM strategies and initiatives that support the results-based monitoring and evaluation reporting policy, and the Digital Imaging for Monitoring and Evaluation or Project DIME. Following are the highlights of Ms. Nuñez's presentation:

- The issuance of National Budget Circular 565 gave way to Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation Reporting (RBMER) policy, which seeks to strengthen the use of evidence-based results for decision making and improved government performance in the delivery of goods and services. The RBMER policy framework summarizes the operating arrangement, the delineation of functions, among the oversight agencies.

- The Budget and Treasury Management System or the BTMS is the official public financial management system of the government that will manage and store the financial transactions of the national government agencies. It will enforce systematic comprehensive and real time monitoring reporting and processing of government financial information through a central database that supports the public financial management functions, such as budget preparation and execution, cash and debt management and revenue collections among others. It aims to achieve the following objectives:

- To eliminate multiple stand-alone systems and provide real-time online monitoring of budget information.

- To standardize and automate processes, formats, and reporting across the national government

- To consolidate government-wide reports through systematic real-time recording and reporting of all revenues, expenditures, assets, and liabilities.

■ The BTMS was initially implemented by DBM and BTR, both as oversight and spending agencies while the COA has special access to support its oversight and auditing functions. Other spending agencies use this system for budget execution and accountability.

■ Ms. Nuñez stated that DBM recently embarked on an ambitious project to leverage technology to strengthen monitoring and evaluation called Project DIME or Digital Information for Monitoring and Evaluation. Ms. Nuñez said that as earlier mentioned by Sec. Avisado, Project DIME was developed and implemented in collaboration with the DOST.

■ The objective of Project DIME is to ensure transparency and accountability in the implementation of programs and activities and projects, dealing with physical infrastructure projects. Through DIME, selected big ticket programs and projects are monitored by validating the reporting performance of national government agencies through the conduct of desk review and use of digital data and imaging technologies such as the LIDAR, the satellites, drones and other technologies.

■ The initial gains from Project DIME from its first year of implementation are as follows:

- Prescribed standard monitoring template for infrastructure projects;

- Improved status reporting;

- Validated the existence and progress of selected projects through the use of DDIT and/or field visit;

- Spearheaded dialogues among implementing agencies concerned;

- Recommended measures to resolve implementation issues;

- Developed monitoring tools for the National Greening Program (Monitoring and Assessment of Planting Activities or MAPA) and irrigation systems (Remote Assessment for Irrigation Networks or RAIN).

■ Ms. Nuñez noted that the standard monitoring template has been adopted by some of the implementing agencies such as DPWH and DOH. The template contains three parts, namely, the project details, the physical information and the financial information at the individual project level. The project details provide information such as the title of the project, the region, the province, the municipality, the barangay and the coordinates where the projects are located. The financial information provides data about the amount of operation, allotment obligation and disbursement while the physical information provides target vs. actual start, target vs. estimated end, current status, and the percentage of completion.

■ With the use of the aforementioned monitoring template, DBM can now determine the progress of the project, whether it is implemented on time or behind schedule. Likewise it improves the status reporting within and among the agencies. Monthly reports are now being submitted by DPWH to DepEd, DOH and DA to account for the status of projects they have implemented on behalf of these agencies, such as the constructions of school buildings, farm-to-market roads and health facilities. Ms. Nuñez remarked that before, these agencies were given very late reports on their projects or none at all. Particularly notable is the DOH's establishment of a monitoring and reporting system for its Health Facilities Enhancement Program.

- To demonstrate that Project DIME was able to validate the existence and progress of selected projects through the use of DDIT and/or field visits, Ms. Nuñez showed the satellite image of the new Bohol Airport before and after its construction.

- Ms. Nuñez also showed how the MAPA and RAIN, two newly developed monitoring tools, are being used for reforestation and irrigation projects, respectively.

Ms. Nuñez ended her presentation by sharing DBM's plan to have an interactive DIME Transparency Website with public feedback, response and reporting platform. The afternoon session resumed with the presentation of monitoring systems being used by government agencies. Before the presentations, Ms. Quijano shared some of the participants' reflections from the "ME Time" posted in the Attendify. Taking-off from the last post on the need for a database system, she introduced the first speaker of this afternoon.

A.3 Spotlight on Monitoring for Results

While there is substantial interest in drawing evidence from evaluations to influence results, robust and real-time monitoring systems are undeniably indispensable in informing and recalibrating programs and projects to achieve desired outcomes.

The afternoon session resumed with the presentation of monitoring systems being used by government agencies.

Speakers from DILG, DAP, and NEDA shared some tools that allow for real-time data capture and monitoring among their respective agencies, and shared lessons learned for the benefit of other agencies who wish to develop their own monitoring tools.

Ms. Quijano introduced the speakers one by one for their respective presentations. When all three speakers were done with their sharing, she facilitated a question-and-answer.

A.3.1 Community-based Management System

DILG's Implementation of the Community-Based Monitoring System (CBMS)
Charity V. Agbayani
Local Government Operations Officer V
Local Development Planning Division, DILG

Ms. Agbayani's presentation focused on DILG's implementation of the CBMS. She provided a background on its development, and described its features and tools for monitoring Core Local Poverty Indicators (CLPIs). She also shared how CBMS data are utilized in planning and budgeting. As shared by Ms. Agbayani, the CBMS was developed by the Community-based Coordinating Network of the De La Salle University. The CBMS Network has been a DILG partner since 2003. Following are the highlights of her presentation:

- The CBMS is "an organized way of collecting data at the local level for use of local government units (LGUs), national government agencies (NGAs), non-government organizations (NGOs), and civil society for planning, program implementation and monitoring. It is a monitoring tool intended for greater transparency and accountability in resource allocation". It can identify who and where the poor are, as well as what their needs are to improve their life conditions. It can capture the multi-dimensional geo-political level.

- CBMS uses two types of questionnaires: the Household (HH) Profile Questionnaire and the Barangay Profile Questionnaire. The HH Profile provides information on the HH characteristics such as education, political participation, health and nutrition, income, employment and livelihood, housing and tenure, water sources and sanitation, impact of climate change and access to programs. On the other hand, the Barangay Profile Questionnaire provides relevant information on anti-poverty projects and activities implemented at the barangay (village) level.

- The CBMS data capturing is envisioned to be the primary source of data for local planning and budgeting. It was developed to address gaps on frequency of data collection, sufficiency of sample size, and disaggregation of data.

- Alternate sources of data are available like the Census and national surveys. However, census data, while disaggregated, are too far in between. National surveys, on the other hand, may be much more frequent but samples are only representatives at the regional level.

- Facilitating the use of data in local planning and budgeting will provide additional use of CBMS data, which will improve an LGU's return on investment in CBMS data generation. It will also make local planning and budgeting more transparent since its basis is data validated by the community and presumably known by the community.

- Currently, the data are very rich at the barangay and household levels. Through the CBMS, the DILG elevates the use of such relevant information at the national level.

- The CBMS can automatically generate the following data: (i) 13 + 1 Core Local Poverty Indicators, (ii) other specific indicators, (iii) CBMS Composite Index, (iv) Millennium Development Goals, and (v) sectoral data for Comprehensive Development Plan.

- CBMS has aided LGUs in pursuing meaningful devolution by providing data used in participatory planning and budgeting, disaster risk reduction and management, localizing and monitoring the MDGs and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and fostering better transparency and accountability.

- Ms. Agbayani provided the Department's conceptual framework on M&E. Monitoring involves the use of resources as inputs to certain processes and activities that the Department is undertaking to produce results or outcomes, which come in three forms: outputs, effects, and impact. Outputs are the results of activities, and are part of monitoring. Effects (or implications) and outcomes (i.e., implication to a much broader prospect) fall under evaluation.

- As discussed by Ms. Agbayani, the benefits of the CBMS are as follows:

1. CBMS monitors the 13+1 Core Local Poverty Indicators.

    - The CLPIs are distributed as follows: two are related to health, one for food and nutrition, two for water and sanitation, another two for shelter, one for peace and order, three for income, one for employment and two for education.

    - There are three (3) CBMS indicators: (i) Survival, (ii) Security, and (iii) Enabling. Indicators for health, food and nutrition, and water sanitation are classified as Survival; shelter, and peace and order are under Security, and income, employment, and education are Enabling indicators.

2. CBMS has helped improve planning and budgeting at the local level. Specifically, CBMS data are useful in the following ways:

On Planning:

- On situational analysis, problem/issues identification: CBMS can provide comprehensive data on economic, demographic, social situation including structure of household, income sources, disaggregation and socio-economic status. It can also provide data for benchmarking enabling comparison across area and planning status.

- On vision and objective: CBMS can provide data for performance indicators, targets and target setting.

- For interventions: CBMS can provide data for configuring programs, activities, and projects (P/A/Ps) based on characteristics of beneficiaries including beneficiary characteristics.

- For implementation: CBMS can provide data for prioritization and budgeting.

- For monitoring: CBMS can provide baseline data for M&E

On Budgeting, CBMS can:

- Provide better data for determining sectoral or departmental expenditure ceilings;

- Provide data for independent validation of income estimates;

- Provide the legislative body with better data for assessing proposals;

- Provide review bodies with better data beyond statutory requirements;

- Provide data for performance review.

3. CBMS can help localize SDGs and track SDG indicators:

- In line with the localization of SDGs, SDGs are LGUs' mandates. As frontline entities, LGUs are given the powers and responsibility essentially to promote the general welfare of the people, protection of the environment, preservation of peace and prosperity in their respective localities. These are consistent with Section 16 (General Welfare) of the Local Government Code of 1991 (RA 7160).

- In regards to this, encouraging and capacitating LGUs to take action will serve as a catalyst to spur implementation of SDGs-responsive programs and projects. However, there is a need to increase awareness, consciousness, capacities and link SDGs in the governance mechanisms of LGUs to contribute to the achievement of SDGs.

- CBMS can contribute to the SDG localization mechanism with the establishment and maintenance of database for progress monitoring, planning and policy-making; inclusion of SDG in the long-term vision, medium-term development plans and sectoral plans; and, prioritization of SDG-responsive PPAs, matching priorities framework of LGUs and performance assessment and awards.

- Of the 232 global SDG indicators, there are 155 initial listed for the Philippines SDG indicators. Out of these, 39 indicators can be generated through CBMS.

4. CBMS provides data for the alignment/harmonization of national and local plans.

- CBMS can provide crucial data to the alignment/harmonization of national and local plans and budgets; synchronization of local planning, investment programming and budgeting; strengthening provincial oversight; harnessing national government support to local priorities; performance assessment and investment.

- The Philippine Development Plan (PDP) 2017 – 2022 is the first medium-term plan to be anchored on the 10 Point Socio-Economic Agenda geared towards the attainment of Ambisyon Natin 2040. Ambisyon Natin 2040 articulates the Filipinos' collective vision of "Matatag, Maginhawa, at Panatag na Buhay Para sa Lahat". It also takes into account the country's international commitments such as the 2030 SDGs, which aims to "leave no one behind".

- Executive Order (EO) No. 27 series of 2017 mandates all government agencies and instrumentalities including LGUs to implement the PDP. This required alignment of local plans and investment programs with the PDP.

- Alignment and harmonization of local plans with the PDP is implemented through the formulation of PDP Results Matrix. It contains the statement of results to be achieved, , the corresponding indicators for goals, outcomes, and outputs; baseline information; annual and end-line targets and responsible agencies.

- PDP Results Matrices are localized through Provincial Results Matrices. It is a statement of results should be achieved with corresponding indicators, baseline, annual and end of line targets at the province level

- Pursuant to EO 27, the DILG and NEDA collaborated on the localization of the PDP-SDG through the issuance of JMC 2018-1 dated November 26, 2018. JMC 2018-1 aims to ensure national-local convergence, complementation and harmonization of priorities as contained in the PDP and international commitments such as SDG, and strengthens vertical linkages across different levels of local government in development planning and budgeting.

- In order for Provincial Results Matrices to be effective, the following interventions are necessary:

  - Provincial-level adoption of geographic-based perspective in planning and investment programming that incorporates plans and budgets of cities and municipalities.

  - Exercise of provincial oversight in planning, targeting and implementation and monitoring in-fulfillment with the provision of LGUs on the oversight functions of the Province over its component cities and municipalities, the oversight agencies engaged in provincial and joint oversight over cities and municipalities.

  - Strengthen province-cities-municipalities' interface in dialogues and require province-cities-municipalities database system, in which CBMS is needed.

  - Harmonization of local plans and investments – prescribing improved financial management policies, systems and rules with context of convergence through identification of interdependence and areas for complementation in planning, investment programming, budgeting.

- In relation to the DILG initiative on the PDP Formulation, Ms. Agbayani shared that DILG requires LGUs to submit provincial RMs every April 30. This serves as basis for monitoring the performance of province and cities vis-à-vis targets. LGUs are also mandated to use the Provincial RMs in local planning, specifically in the identification of prioritized PPAs that will contribute to the attainment of RMs and the SDGs.

5. CBMS data provides the basis for correct program targeting by the Implementing LGUs.

   - CBMS data was used to identify eligible beneficiaries for the following LGU interventions:

     - Formulation of comprehensive multi-sectoral plans/ development plans
     - General welfare/health program
     - Environmental and sanitation program
     - Maternal, child, and infant health programs
     - Livelihood programs
     - Alternative Learning System

6. Poverty Status can be monitored overtime through the CBMS:

   - Ms. Agbayani presented a sample report that can be generated through CBMS. The report featured maps showing problematic areas and the magnitude of problems.

   - The report can be used as basis for identifying interventions meant to address poverty in the short and medium term. The interventions can be integrated by the LGUs in crafting their local development plans.

7. Across time, before-and-after implementation of CBMS can also be generated:

- With the proper use of CBMS, changes in the current situation of LGUs due to implementation of interventions can be mapped out.

- Using panel data, easing up of problematic areas can be shown by comparing areas across years.

8. CBMS data has paved the way for LGUs to receive a range of awards and citations. In some cases, the award has monetary considerations.

- In line with the implementation of CBMS, DILG performs the following roles through its regional and provincial trainers:

  - continued advocacy on the uses and importance of CBMS
  - facilitate conduct of CBMS training module at the LGU level (i.e., Training of LGU trainers on CBMS to build their capacity in providing technical assistance)
  - (iii) provide capacity-building for LGUs in CBMS - including implementation of training, post-workshop, mentoring support, data support, and technical support among others (i.e., Modular Training by DILG-accredited trainers)
  - monitor the progress of the implementation of CBMS activities and consolidate the validated data,and maintain a CBMS database repository at the national or regional levels. LGUs are required to submit monthly and quarterly physical and financial reports. Financial reports were only required from LGUs enrolled in the 2016 bottom-up budgeting.

- CBMS is an LGU initiative. Monitoring of CBMS activities by Implementing LGUs is being monitored by the DILG central office through the submission of monthly and quarterly progress reports. DILG central office, through its regional and provincial offices, is working closely with the LGUs and ensures these offices provide appropriate and timely technical assistance on CBMS.

- With the passage of RA 11315 (CBMS Law), a large majority of LGUs were able to benefit from the uses of CBMS. As of October 2, 2019, CBMS is now implemented in 78 provinces (35 of which are province-wide), 1,100 municipalities and 111 cities covering 31,110 barangays. Previously, , collection of CBMS data was largely paper-based technology but has graduated to the use of Android-based technology.

- As a closing message, Ms. Agbayani shared two quotations, one from Ms. Carly Fiorina and another from DILG Secretary Eduardo Año:

  "The goal is to turn data into information, and information into insight." – Carly Fiorina

  "Be more than just responsive, be PRO-ACTIVE." – Sec. Eduardo Año

A.3.2 Harmonization of National Government Performance Monitoring, Information, and Reporting Systems

Inter-Agency Task Force on the Harmonization of National Government Performance Monitoring, Information, and Reporting Systems Setting-up, Implementation, and Monitoring the Results-Based Monitoring System (RBPMS)
Maria Rosario A. Ablan
Program Director, Center for Governance
Development Academy of the Philippines (DAP)

Dir. Ablan's presentation focused on the rationale and key features of the RBPMS, experiences in implementing, monitoring its implementation, and usefulness in monitoring the progress and improvements in agency performance. Prior to starting her presentation, Dir. Ablan asked participants to raise their hands in response to the following questions:

1. How many are working in working in government?
2. Of those working in government, how many were born between 1980 and 1990?
3. Of those working in government, how many were born before 1980?
4. What was your experience when you were in government during the1990s?

When no one took the floor to answer, Dir. Ablan proceeded to describe the situation of the public sector in the 90's vis-a-vis performance management by referring to her presentation materials. The list she presented showed several performance management problems, which basically pointed out to the misalignment of goals, weak link of plans and budget allocation, poor planning, weak monitoring system, and poor performance management system. This necessitated a change in performance culture and mindset. Thus, the government came up with reforms in its performance.

Following are the highlights of Ms. Ablan's presentation:

- The government's first attempt at performance reform came in 2000, through the development of the Organizational Performance Indicators Framework (OPIF). In the mid-2000s, the Civil Service Commission (CSC) came up with the PMS-OPES (Office Performance Evaluation System). The PMS-OPES was in use until 2009, when it was replaced by the OPIF Book of Outputs. This development established the link between the budget and desired outputs.

- Annually from 2011 to 2016, new performance systems were introduced by government. Noticeably, the performance and budget reforms progressed from focusing on outputs towards outcomes and well towards indicators.

- Through the Strategic Performance Management System introduced by CSC in 2015, monitoring of individual performance of government employees towards the achievement of agency-specific targets was also made possible. Individual performance was measured through the Individual Performance Contracts (IPCs) which all government employees were required to submit. IPCs had to be aligned with organizational outputs and outcomes. The link between good performance and monetary incentives was established in 2016 with the implementation of the Performance-based Compensation. Finally, starting in 2018 and until this year, the government is going through the Budget Modernization Bill wherein reforms implemented by DBM focus on citizens' participation in monitoring government performance.

- The years 2011 to 2016 saw the implementation of three crucial policies related to performance and incentives. These laws include: (1) Administrative Order No. 25 (AO 25) series of 2011, or the Results-Based Performance Management System (RBPMS), (2) EO No. 80 s. 2012, or Performance-based Incentive System, and (3) EO No. 201 s. 2016 (or Salary Standardization Law). AO 25 s. 2011 was issued to harmonize governments' performance system. EO No. 80 overhauled the existing performance-based incentive system, while EO No. 201 updated the government salary scheme to include the NEDA top-up bonus.

- Two other issuances in 2016 (i.e., EO No. 1 and EO No.2) sought to mobilize a more responsive government, streamline government operations and make expedient transactions with the public, and enforce a more transparent bureaucracy, and hence support further moves to measure government performance in a more robust manner, such as the RBPMS.

- The RBPMS has five levels of accountability, namely:

  - **Policy accountability**: Accountability for the selection of policies are reflected in the PDP, and priority programs of the leadership of the government.

  - **Program accountability**: Means that achieving the desired outcome of the government is expected to achieve also the needs of the citizens.

- **Performance accountability**: Refers to the efficiency and economy of operations by the government.

- **Process accountability**: Refers to adequate use of resources.

- **Probity and legal accountability**: Refers to adherence or observance to rules and regulations and ethical standards.

■ The different levels of accountability are reflected in the RBPMS Framework. The framework establishes the link of organizational outcomes to the sectoral goals and societal outcomes of the PDP. Through the framework, performance indicators of agencies monitor the vertical link of individual outputs, organizational outcomes and societal outcomes. Ideally, this pushes agencies to implement their programs in consideration of their financial stewardship; internal processes; citizen/client satisfaction, and development of staff capacity through leadership, learning and growth in their implementation of programs.

At the same time, organizational performance is linked to the individual performance through the Strategic Performance Management System.

■ The AO 25 Inter-agency Task Force oversees and manages the implementation of RBPMS. It is chaired by DBM and co-chaired by the Office of the President, with oversight agencies such as NEDA, Department of Finance (DOF), and Presidential Management Staff (PMS). Through the years, these agencies have been closely coordinating with each other, allowing good flow of information with other oversight agencies like COA, Office of the Ombudsman, Commission on Higher Education, Career Executive Service Board, Government Commission for GOCCs, Local Water Utilities Administration, and DILG. DAP serves as technical secretariat of the task force.

■ RBPMS has been in existence for eight years and has gone through various phases. 2012 marked the Initiation phase, followed by the Harmonization phase in 2013, Stabilization phase in 2014, and Institutionalization phase in 2015–2016. Changes in criteria and ranking system for performance bonus occurred in 2016. The years 2017 to 2019 are characterized as Tightening phase; (i.e., requirements are more refined to reward those with exemplary performance). In 2019, focus was also geared towards aligning performance with results that matter to citizens.

■ Since 2012, DAP has been monitoring compliance and performance through the Agency Compliance and Performance Scorecards. The Scorecards show whether an agency has achieved (or not) its target, and how far along. The scorecards are stored in databases and can be accessed through the DAP website.

■ Since 2012, the RBPMS and PBIS gains are as follows:

- Integration of mechanism for performance reporting, monitoring, and evaluation in the government (i.e., link of individual to office to division and organizational performances to the PDP).

- Harmonization of system of performance reporting and evaluation allowed sharing of information and promoted transparency.

- Plan and budget is based on performance that is focused on citizens.

- Enhanced accountability for results and target accomplishment.

- There is a notably heightened transparency among government agencies.

- There is high participation rate of government in RBPMS, 99% participation rate has been maintained since 2014. While submission of RBPMS report is voluntary, agencies are required to submit justification if unable to participate in its implementation.

- Agencies have become increasingly compliant with governance standards (i.e., great compliance to submission of SALN, Citizen's Charter, and Report on Ageing Cash Advance has been noted since the RBPMS implementation in 2012).

- Agencies better understand their respective roles and mandates.

- There is a marked improvement in the quality of performance indicators.

■ Despite the numerous gains, the task force still faces challenges related to the implementation of RBPMS. The challenges include:

- Improving the quality of some indicators for more nuanced linkages to actual performance.

- Mitigation of unintended consequences such as tendency of some agencies to game the system
.

- Simplification of processes.

- Looking into ways to use the volume of data.

- Evaluation of the RBPMS to determine its impact to the government.

As summarized by Ms. Quijano, the RBPMS underwent its own evolution and journey, and the inter-agency task force was a crucial factor that aligned the framework, activities, steps and tasks. As a previous government employee, Ms. Quijano also affirmed the tedious process involved in the submission of reports, and commended the task force for acknowledging it as one of the challenges. After expressing her excitement over the forthcoming outcome of the RBPMS impact study, she introduced the last two speakers for this session who shared on the government's efforts in laying down the groundwork for the SDGs evaluation.

A.3.3 Groundwork for SDGs evaluation – NEDA

The 2019 Voluntary National Review of the Philippines on SDGs
Myrna Clara B. Asuncion
Assistant Director
Social Development Section, NEDA

AD Asuncion's talk included an overview of the Global 2030 Agenda, insights and analysis from the Second Voluntary National Review (VNR) and preview of plans moving forward based on the report's findings. Following are the highlights of AD Asuncion's presentation:

■ The Philippines signed the Agenda 2030, more commonly known as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), in 2015. After only one year, the Philippines reported its first national review (VNR) on the SDGs in 2016. Three years after, in July 2019, the Philippines presented its second national voluntary review on the SDGs.

■ The Global Agenda 2030 is the first international commitment where the country has not only agreed to present on what has been done based on commitments (i.e., SDG goals, targets, and indicators) and on what is being done by the countries (i.e., Implementation, but also provided an overview of monitoring and evaluation, Follow-up and Review at the national, regional or Asia-Pacific in the case of the Philippines and global levels) to keep track of the country's progress to achieving the SDGs.

■ For the national review, the participating countries agreed to assess their own performance every four years. AD Asuncion remarked that the Philippines is a show-off, having already conducted its national review twice, i.e., in 2016 and mid-2019.

■ There is no SDG Plan for the country. but the SDGs were meshed within the current and future PDPs.

On VNR progress along five SDG goals
Based on indicators from PSA through the SDG Watch, below are the Philippines' accomplishments:

- Near-universal primary enrollment rate (94%) and primary completion rate (92%).
- The 2018 GDP per capita is the highest ever at 6%. Unemployment rate of 5.3% in 2018 is the lowest in 50 years.
- Faster income growth for the bottom 40% of the poor.
- There is reduced number of persons directly affected by disasters between 2015 and 2018 (an estimated of 165,000 people).
- There is reduced incidence of bribery (2.5% in 2016 to 1.9% in 2017).

On Mobilizing Stakeholder Support

- There is access to education for vulnerable groups such as the PWDs, IPs, out-of-school youth, and overseas Filipinos.
- Certain NGOs support government initiatives to teach in remote areas such as the TeachMe, who pay their own teachers and teach up to two years, mostly in remote areas where there are no DepEd teachers.
- There are also firms in the country who employees comprise more of PWDs (deaf and mute).
- Timely weather information through Project NOAH. Project NOAH is not a government project, but a collaboration with the academe.

- Because of these initiatives, other sectors of the society have also been encouraged to do their own part. For example, the Publicly Listed Companies (PLCs) are reporting the Sustainability Report, and Philippine Business for Environment (PBE) and UNDP reporting on the Transformational Business Report.

- Most important is the partnership with local government stakeholders. NEDA was provided with the various activities being undertaken through the earlier presentation by DILG on the CBMS and their localization efforts.

- On the national government side, the KALAHI-CIDSS empowers local governments and poor communities, and provides funds for the implementation of priority local development activities or projects.

On Strengthening Policies and Institutions of Government

This part is very important as it puts into law projects of government that are effective and efficient, meant to protect them from the whims of changing leadership.
For example:

- Green Jobs Act (Sustainable Development initiative) – The Act promotes decent jobs that are environment-friendly.
- Expanded Maternity leave – a measure to encourage mothers to stay in their jobs even after giving birth.
- Inclusive business models involving marginalized sectors.
- Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps).
- Bangsamoro Organic Law.
- National ID System.

- AD Asuncion ended her power point presentation by sharing NEDA's wish to gather all the initiatives of stakeholders into one website (http://sdg.neda.gov.ph), which can be shared to all those who want or interested to learn and contribute to SDGs initiatives. As a parting words, she said that "this is not only our way of telling that it can be done but we want to ensure not only in government but together with the other stakeholders that our initiatives towards attaining the SGDs will reach the poorest, will reach the most vulnerable, and will reach those who are left farthest behind".

- AD Asuncion wrapped up her presentation through a video that highlighted the close link between the Philippines' long-term vision (i.e., Ambisyon Natin 2040) and the Sustainable Development Goals. It summarized the key features of the SDGs, the Philippines strategies for implementation, and its accomplishments along the SDG agenda.

A.3.4 Groundwork for SDGs evaluation – PSA

Monitoring of the Sustainable Development Goals: Updates of National and Sub-national Initiatives
Wilma A. Guillen
Assistant National Statistician
Social Sector Statistics Service
Philippine Statistics Office

This topic focused on strengthening data collection tools, systems, and statistical monitoring of the SDGs at the national and local levels, including PSA participation in the crafting of the Philippine Voluntary National Report (PVNR). Specifically, Ms. Guillen provided a background of the SDG goals, targets and indicators, also shared the challenges and lessons learned in the four years of SDG monitoring, initiatives in addressing data gaps, initiatives in localizing the SDGs, dissemination mechanism and future plans. Following are the highlights of Ms. Guillen's presentation:

On SDG Goals, Targets, and Indicators

- Collectively, the SDGs are a set of 15-year development agenda to achieve the 17 goals with 169 targets to be monitored through the use of 232 unique indicators (or 244, if repeating the included indicators). These indicators comprise the Indicator Framework, which addresses the previous problems on misalignment of goals, weak link of plans and budget allocation, and absence of established performance.
- A lot of consultations, technical meetings and workshops engaging various stakeholders at the national and local levels were undertaken at the country-level assessment of the 232 indicators (i.e., the Philippines' Voluntary National Report) in 2016 – 2017.
- As a result of the SDG Indicators Assessment, the Philippines has classified the 232 indicators into three types, depending on data availability. These are:
  - **Tier 1 indicators** – composed of 202 global and national indicators that the Philippines is ready to monitor, because there is a sound methodology and regularly available data.
  - **Tier 2 indicators** – involves 55 indicators wherein data are not regularly produced.
  - **Tier 3 indicators** – composed of 74 indicators that cannot be monitored due to absence of methodology for data collection.
- Of the 244 indicators, 13 are not applicable in the country. Using graphical presentation, Ms. Guillen showed the distribution of the global and SDG indicators along the 17 SDG goals.
- As an offshoot of the PNVR, the PSA Board approved Resolution No. 9 in May 2017 which establishes the initial list of Philippine SDG Indicators. This establishes the Philippines' monitoring of 97 targets (out of 169) and 155 indicators that can be readily monitored. The indicators comprise of 102 global indicators adopted by the Philippines, and 53 "proxy" or supplemental indicators. "Proxy" indicators refer to indicators that may be used as alternate indicator to monitor the targets and goals.

On Challenges and Lessons Learned, and Initiatives in Addressing the Gaps:

- The year 2019 marks the fourth year of monitoring the SDGs. Based on previous PNVRs, the PSA shared that partnership played a key role in achieving the goals. However, issues related to confusion in data collection and submission, also the need to review and re-classify the indicators has to be addressed.
- Ms. Guillen elaborately discussed the extent of review during her presentation, and provided the status of accomplishment. In general, this pertains to the review of one to four indicators related to poverty (health and well-being, education, water and sanitation, affordable and clean energy; life and land; as well as peace, justice and strong institutions).

- To address the challenges, PSA issued the Philippine SDG Data Flow and Reporting Mechanism through PSA Board Resolution No. 11 series of 2019 to establish timely data provision and data collection of Tier 1 indicators. Multi-disciplinary SDG Teams were created within the PSA, and Focal Persons (i.e., directors of NGAs) per agency were also identified to facilitate SDG monitoring and coordination.

- Establishment of data collection methodologies is needed to address the data requirements of the 142 Tiers 2 and 3 indicators. In line with this, PSA continuously sought technical guidance from the Interagency Experts Group on SDG Statistics, and ensured that strategies are included in the Philippine Statistical Development Plan. Other strategies were also explored such as including questions on SDGs in surveys using government funds. Thus, any agency that will undertake surveys using government funds is required to secure PSA clearance on the survey methodology and questionnaire through the Statistical Survey Review and Clearance System. Through this system, PSA provides technical guidance on the survey methodology and ensures there is no duplication in terms of statistical data generation.

- Localization of SDGs is a leading initiative of the Philippines among Asia and the Pacific regions. Through this strategy, SDG indicators are aligned with or integrated into the development plans from the national to the city/municipal levels. Monitoring of SDG indicators is also synchronized with the monitoring of development plans at all levels to avoid duplication in the use of resources.

On Localization of the SDGs

- SDG localization involves four components, namely: (i) raising awareness, (ii) setting the local agenda, (iii) planning for SDG implementation, and (iv) monitoring and evaluation.

- Raising awareness involved consultations in 2015. When the initial list of global indicators was endorsed by the UN Statistical Commission in March 2016, country-level review started.

- Setting local SDG agenda involves the adoption of global goals and targets to the local context through an evidence-based and collective process. This led to the identification of the initial list of Philippine SDG Indicators (i.e., 155 indicators), which is still subject to change depending on the review of Tier 2 and 3 indicators.

- Planning for SDG implementation aims to ensure that vertical and horizontal coordination, multi-stakeholder partnership and whole-of-society approach happens so that SDG goals can be achieved. This component involves mainstreaming of the SDGs in local plans and policies.

  So far, SDGs have been mainstreamed in local programs, plans and policies up to the provincial level through the Provincial Results Matrix. Steps are being undertaken to align SDG indicators in the municipal development plans. Financing analysis and investment strategies are crucial in planning for SDG implementation.

- Local M&E systems will ensure that SDG implementation remains on track and support the development of local capacity for more responsive and accountable governance.

- Ms. Guillen shared the agency partnerships formalized from 2017 to 2019 in line with the SDG implementation.

- One of the major outputs of the SDG localization is the identification of Core Regional SDG Indicators (CoRe-SDGIs). After the regional SDG assessments, 70 indicators (or 62 unique indicators) were identified to monitor 42 out of the 97 Philippine SDG targets out of the 169 global targets, and monitor 14 out of the 17 goals. The CoRe-SDGIs does not include indicators for Goal 6 (Clean water and sanitation), 12 (Responsible consumption) and 15 (Life on land).

- Most of the indicators are for monitoring SDG goals on poverty, food sufficiency, health, education, and gender equality. Most health-related information come from DOH admin data such as the FHSIS and national demographic surveys.

- Initial CoRe-SDGIs have been recommended by the Regional Statistics Committees, the highest policy making body on statistics at the regional level chaired by NEDA regional director and co-chaired by PSA regional director, with regional line agencies as members.

- The regions have started monitoring regional CoRe-SDGIs through the SDG Watch. The link to access the portals of Cordillera Administrative Region, National Capital Region, Central Luzon, Central Visayas, and Davao regions was provided by Ms. Guillen.

  The SDG Watch presents the baseline year data and updated data for every SDG Goal, target and indicator. Strictly speaking, the baseline year should be 2016. But in the absence of 2016 data, this data referred to is the available data closest to 2016.

- PSA is in the process of coming up with computational procedures to determine progress for achieving targets.

- From 2018 to 2019, the Philippine Statistics Research and Training Institute (PSRTI) has conducted several seminars for provincial/city/municipal planning officers and other regional offices to raise awareness on SDGs and identify SDGs that can be monitored at their levels. A seminar on basic statistical analysis for SDGs was also conducted.

- Linking of CoRe-SDGIs from the municipal, city/provincial, regional, national and global levels will be undertaken once the municipal CoRe-SDGIs have been identified. This will allow determination of contribution of municipalities, cities and provinces to the achievement of Philippine SDG targets.

- The municipal level SDG assessment showed that data availability ranges from almost 74% (Laguna) to as high as 87% (Bohol). CBMS was very useful in municipal level monitoring, not only of the SDGs but for planning purposes as well.

- While CBMS proved to be useful, not all municipalities were conducting CBMS at the same time. Thus, PSA is taking the lead on the enactment of RA 11015 (CBMS Law), in coordination with DILG and DICT (for data banking). Under the law, municipal LGUs are also required to maintain their own database as basis for local planning, programming and investment.

- The 1st draft of the CBMS Implementing Rules and Regulations is being presented to Congress at the time of Ms. Guillen's presentation. If approved, the law mandates LGUs to conduct CBMS in a synchronized manner. RA 11015 will build on current experiences and technologies in implementing the CBMS.

- Information about the global and Philippine SDG indicators are available through paper-based and electronic means, namely: (i) brochures, (ii) PSA SDG webpage **https://psa.org.ph/sdg**, (iii) SDG Watch, (iv) SDG database – at Open data portal, and the (v) SDG Story maps, and (vi) enhanced SDG database, once developed and fully operational.

- The Philippine SDG Indicators brochure contains the 155 indicators and targets.

- The PSA SDG webpage was developed for transparency and replicability. Through the webpage, data on the global and Philippine SDG targets and indicators can also be accessed, including definition of concepts and methodologies.

- SDG Watch presents baseline and updated data, and later, it will be able to monitor the progress of SDG implementation vis-a-vis the targets once determined by NEDA.

- By clicking on a particular spot in the SDG Story Maps, relevant SDG statistics will pop-up that is specific to the selected area/place. This is still a work in progress, along with the enhanced SDG database. The SDG database is an internet-based data collection portal where agencies can input data as part of the SDG Watch monitoring.

- Ms. Quijano wrapped up the presentation of Ms. Guillen then acknowledged the presence of the acting Australian Ambassador to the Philippines, Mr. Richard Sison. Following this, she invited the speakers on stage, then facilitated a question-and-answer session. The questions and corresponding responses are indicated in Table 1.

Table 1. Questions Raised and Corresponding Answers (Spotlight on Monitoring for Results)

Questions	Response
From Attendify, for Ms. Agbayani: Has there been an evaluation of CBMS as a tool for promoting transparency and accountability? Are there certain indicators or events that you will see transparency and accountability?	**Ms. Agbayani, DILG:** When it comes to monitoring of transparency in evaluation, we do not have an exact tool to monitor that one. We just traced how LGUs were able to use CBMS data in improving poverty situations in LGUs, how they used their resources.
Ms. Quijano: There are certain indicators integrated in CBMS like judicious use of resources as a proxy for transparency. Can people access that kind of information if their LGU has that kind of data?	**Ms. Agbayani, DILG:** Before, with the CBMS Network, they shared generic data. But due to the Data Privacy Act, hindi na basta-basta ma-i-share (data can't be shared right away). Researchers and other LGUs who need the data directly seek the LGU's permission if they want to use it.

From Attendify, for Dir. Ablan: In the implementation of the RBPMS, can you please cite other major issues you faced?	**Dir. Ablan, DAP:** One major issue is the mindset of the agencies because sometimes they still see RBPMS requirement just as compliance. It's not really. If you look at the framework of RBPMS, it's really aligning all plans, programs and targets towards achieving the organizational and societal goals. This is an issue we sometimes encounter until now.
Were agencies responsive to AO25 Assessment? How are these determined?	It's really the validating agencies, the agencies oversight that does the assessment. It's not really a separate requirement. Supposedly, an agency already knows if they were able to meet the requirements of oversight agencies. For example DBM, achieving the MOU targets. There is already a discussion with the oversight agencies. Agencies sometimes, they already understand why they are being assessed like that. It's really a very open form of assessment.
There are instances when monitoring systems paralyze the performance, wherein the focus tends to be more on the compliance rather than	We always discuss with agencies that they have to really use the RBPMS, not just compliance, to monitor their performance to help them achieve their goals. We try to do some

Questions	Response
performance. How does the AO25 secretariat ensure that productivity and performance is primacy over just mere compliance?	orientations and discussions, and technical assistance.
Ms. Quijano: What have you observed in the progress or this evolution of the RBPMS? Do you see any improvements or changes? **Rejoinder of Ms. Quijano:** They are on their own journeys in improving the way they participate in this monitoring system.	In the early years of the RBPMS, there were a lot of agencies, especially those which really did not make it, that learned their lesson. And now, we can say they are really improved and integrated the system in the way they do their monitoring. These are the agencies that really proved themselves. But for those who still think of it as compliance, sometimes it's hard to change the mindset.
For AD Asuncion and Ms. Guillen: How does localization of SDGs complement our voluntary national review and the way we monitor the SDGs? Trivia: Philippines is one of the seven countries that voluntarily reported twice on the SDGs	**AD Asuncion, NEDA:** Localization is integral to the voluntary national review. It is also integral in monitoring the attainment of SDGs because of the core principles of sustainable development and leaving no one behind. **Ms. Quijano:** It's very integrated already in how we implement our development plans.
	Ms. Guillen, PSA: Our localization efforts are an innovative approach because we wanted to link from the global to the national, regional, provincial and municipal level. But of course, we always say that they can come up with their own indicators that will be relevant beyond these core indicators. So, that's where you can see the linking, the alignment to the development plans, horizontally and then vertically as well.
Ms. Quijano: How do you solicit support from these local actors especially SDGs are very packaged globally? So that is one effort, the can make their own indicators. What are the ways?	**Ms. Guillen, PSA:** Partnership is the key. We engage. As representatives of our respective NGAs, we talk to each other because we don't want to duplicate the work of each other, but rather to complement. So when they have this JMC on the crafting of the provincial results matrix, PSA was there. At the start we insisted they also include tagging in identifying the SDG indicators because we cannot have a separate monitoring of the Philippine Development Plan and provincial development plan separate from our global commitment. That would form part also of the stewardship

	of the limited money of the government. We wanted that when we monitor the provincial plans, the regional development, the national development plans, we are also able to monitor our commitment at the global level.
Ms. Quijano: I think what you said is really the We perspective – looking at this endeavor as a collaboration among all the different agencies that we have	No. For example, in the DILG-led activities, they would be coordinating the activity, funding the activity with the LGUs. PSA is there participating, providing technical guidance in identifying indicators, assessing whether we can say that we are ready to monitor these indicators or not yet.

Following the Q&A, Ms. Quijano explained the mechanics for the exercise on "Time". This aimed to share/process learnings from the session, and identify immediate actions that can be implemented to improve current monitoring systems. Participants were instructed to post their reflections in the Attendify's Activity Stream.

A.4 Improving lives through Evaluations: Enhanced usability of evaluation results

This session focused on the use of evaluation results, and sought answers to the question "How have evidence from evaluations influenced policies and programs that spur development for all?" Officials from the Legislature (i.e., Senate and Congress) and development agencies (e.g., Asian Development Bank) presented their initiatives and practices that showcased the usability of evaluation results in terms of informing decision-making and policy reforms in their respective areas.

A.4.1 Institutionalization of Evaluation Policies and Practices in the Philippines

The presentation of the speakers from the Senate and Congress focused on two areas:

- initiatives in strengthening and integrating evaluation in the drafting of bills and policies, and;
- insights on how relevant draft bills and policies seek to institutionalize evidence from evaluations, and how these will be applied in policy-making.

Institutionalization of Evaluation Policies and Practices in the Philippines
Mr. Merwin Salazar
Executive Director
Senate Economic Planning Office
House of Senate

Mr. Salazar briefly discussed the major legislative functions, which includes (i) law-making, (ii) oversight, and (iii) budget approval, then established the usefulness of evaluations in carrying out the said functions.According to Mr. Salazar, evaluation provides the evidence for carrying out the legislative functions in general, and approving the appropriate policies and programs in particular.

Aside from evaluation's usefulness in policy/program formulation, Mr. Salazar also cited the benefits of evaluation in:

- Monitoring the effectiveness

and efficiency of program/policy implementation

- Determining relevance and impact of policies and programs
- Ascertaining their sustainability, and
- Improving existing programs and policies.

In addition, Mr. Salazar also emphasized the contribution of evaluation to good governance by promoting transparency and accountability. Then he zeroed-in to the presentation of Senate and Congress' initiatives relative to M&E.

Mr. Salazar informed the Network that the Senate recognizes the significance of evaluation, but that there are gaps, such as:

- Evaluation is not widely and systematically integrated within government processes and systems especially in the legislative branch.
- There is no M&E system in place in the legislative and judiciary systems. JMC No. 2015-01 (National Evaluation Framework) covers only the Executive branch.
- Only Technical Secretariat is involved in the development planning process, investment programming and program management.
- Access of Congress to evaluation results at the moment is zero, unless it is requested from the head of agency; it takes a while for Congress to receive this information.

In relation to this, Mr. Salazar proposed the need to enhance the participation of Senate and Congress in the current development planning process, investment programming, financing, and program management of the government to promote ownership of priorities and facilitate budget approval. To advocate for evaluation, the Senate is currently initiating three strategies related to (i) policy enactments, (ii) participation in global for a promoting evaluation in parliaments, among others, and (iii) conduct of capacity development activities on M&E. In particular, the initiatives are:

1. **Enactment of Policies of Senate Bill 788 and Senate Bill 169:** Together with Congress, the Senate is working on the passage of two evaluation-related bills in the 18th Congress: (i) Senate Bill No. 788, introduced by Sen. Risa Hontiveros and Cong. Alfred Vargas, and (ii) Senate Bill No. 169 sponsored by Sen. Win Gatchalian. These bills will address the policy implications of involving Senate and Congress in the development and planning, among others. Senate Bill No. 788, which seeks to institutionalize a National Evaluation Policy in the country, aims to standardize the conduct of evaluations. It also mandates the government to conduct evaluations, set-up an evaluation unit, allocate budget for evaluations, and give Congress and Senate access to all evaluation results. On the other hand, Senate Bill No. 169 or the NEDA Charter Bill provides the framework for harmonized/synchronized Development Planning, Investment Programming, Budgeting, Monitoring and Evaluation Processes of Government, and Monitoring and Evaluation of Plans and Programs. Mr. Salazar sought NEDA's support in lobbying for the two bills during the Committee Hearings in the 18th Congress.
2. Hosting of the Global Parliamentarians Forum Session of the 2019 Asia Pacific Evaluation Association (APEA) International Evaluation Conference, in February 2019. In this Forum, a resolution proposing the collaboration of the Inter-parliamentary Union (IPU) and the GPFE on the promotion of evaluation through parliaments worldwide was approved.
3. Addressing the capacity and training needs of the technical staff of the Senate Secretariat and Office of the Senators A Certificate Course on the Policy/ Program Evaluation for Results involving the Senate Secretariat and Office of Senators resulted to information that was used in the 2020 National Budget analysis. Ms. Salazar ended with the sharing of the Senate's future plans, which mainly involves capacity building of staff, knowledge sharing, preparation of guidebook on evaluation for legislators, and advocacy for the passage of the NEP Bill.

After wrapping up Mr. Salazar's presentation, Ms. Quijano gave the mechanics to a survey using the Attendify app to determine the participants' support on the enactment of the proposed NEP Bill (i.e., Yes, No, or Needs more information).

Institutionalization of Evaluation Policies and Practices in the Philippines
Initiatives at the House of Representatives
Romulo Emmanuel M. Miral, Jr., PhD.
Director General
Congressional Policy and Budget Research Department (CPBRD)
House of Representatives

Dr. Miral affirmed the roles of evaluation in legislation, relation of planning and evaluation, and current and future initiatives earlier presented by Mr. Salazar. Moreover, he established that:

- The importance of M&E is recognized by legislators.
- M&E is part of the way House of Representatives (HoR) does business.
- Every HoR office has an M&E component but is fragmented.

Taking a quick look on the laws passed during the LEDAC Common Legislative Agenda of the 15th – 17th Congress, Dr. Miral showed that more than 56% of the enacted laws contain provision of M&E.

Specifically, he proved the following points through the discussion of the salient features of RA 11032 (Ease of Doing Business Act/Fast Business Permit Act) and RA 11035 (Balik Scientist Program):

- Approved policies and programs are being subjected to M&E.
- Areas for monitoring and evaluation are clearly identified and included as provisions in the policies/programs.
- Procedures, mechanisms and structures for undertaking M&E are provided for in the policies/programs.
- M&E is a mandated function of the different Congressional Oversight Committees. Aside from review of the implementation of the laws, the Oversight Committees can also commission an independent study to evaluate the implementation of such laws.

Dr. Miral summarized that almost all government agencies are mandated to conduct M&E. Thus, the HoR welcomes the NEP Framework and hopes to fast-track its implementation as it will operationalize the policy provisions in the law. In addition, he pointed out that M&E is prominent in most of our laws and embedded in government systems.

For example, the General Provisions Act (GAA) provides for the general provision of doing M&E. It exemplifies the oversight functions of Congress, and enables use of COA findings and reports in ensuring that funds are utilized accordingly.

But the challenge, Dr. Miral said, is how to do M&E more effectively. Through the NEP, Congress hopes to create an M&E Ecosystem where the information made available through the different M&Es systems of the government can be put together and used in policy-making.

A.4.2 Evaluating Development Assistance in the Philippines

The speaker's presentation highlighted how development partners like ADB use evidence from evaluation to influence future development assistance policies and programs.

Evaluation for Better Results
IED/ADB's Experience on the Role and Influence of Evaluations
Benjamin Matthew Graham
Advisor, Independent Evaluation Department
Asian Development Bank

Mr. Graham provided a snapshot of how ADB operates in the Philippines, how it does evaluation in general and evaluation of projects in the Philippines, then wrapped up with some perspectives on maximizing use of evaluation results.

ADB is headquartered in the Philippines and has funded almost 700 projects worth $19.3 billion since it was established here. ADB adopts a Country Partnership Strategy (CPS) covering the three pillars of (i) accelerating infrastructure and long-term investments, (ii) promoting local economic development and (iii) investing in people. The highlights of Mr. Graham's sharing are summarized below:

ADB Role in Evaluation

- In ADB, evaluation is undertaken to support better accountability and learning. It is conducted primarily to strengthen development effectiveness. (i.e., Are the individual projects and technical assistance making a difference in the lives of the people?).

- Multi-level evaluation approach is adopted using (1) self-evaluation, and (2) independent evaluation.

- When a project ends, a self-evaluation (through the preparation of Project Completion Report) is undertaken then IED validates the PCR, or does a full evaluation of the project. It is ADB policy to subject all completed projects to an evaluation to determine the project's success and allows disaggregated comparison of projects across countries and sectors.

- Knowledge and outreach is being done in addition to the core evaluation work to share and gain more acceptance of the results and for the lessons to be integrated in the projects.

- Capacity development is being undertaken to strengthen capacities of ADB and agencies in partner countries to monitor and evaluate projects.

- IED is composed of different teams specialized in different types of evaluation.

- ADB uses different methodologies in conducting evaluation guided by the standard criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

- To ensure that evaluation findings are accepted, valued and used, ADB engages the concerned stakeholders (project implementers and decision-makers). This leads to increasing and developing effectiveness of development projects.

- ADB conducts two (2) types of evaluations, namely (i) project assessments, and (ii) country level program assessments (or thematic evaluations).

    - ADB has conducted 37 evaluations or validations of projects in the Philippines since 2007 across different sectors either funded by ADB or in partnership with private sectors.

      Based on results, Public Sector Management is the best performer, while agriculture-related projects make the most challenging sector.

    - The country level program assessment is a validation of ADB's performance across different sectors in terms of achieving thematic objectives (e.g., gender, climate change issues) covering a period of 10 years.

    - So far, ADB has conducted two country level assessment, one in 2008 and 2017. For the 2017 country level assessment, ADB looked at the 4Ps program as basis for its continued support for that type of program.

- of the laws, the Oversight Committees can also commission an independent study to evaluate the implementation of such laws.

Dr. Miral summarized that almost all government agencies are mandated to conduct M&E. Thus, the HoR welcomes the NEP Framework and hopes to fast-track its implementation as it will operationalize the policy provisions in the law. In addition, he pointed out that M&E is prominent in most of our laws and embedded in government systems. For example, the General Provisions Act (GAA) provides for the general provision of doing M&E. It exemplifies the oversight functions of Congress, and enables use of COA findings and reports in ensuring that funds are utilized accordingly.

But the challenge, Dr. Miral said, is how to do M&E more effectively. Through the NEP, Congress hopes to create an M&E Ecosystem where the information made available through the different M&Es systems of the government can be put together and used in policy-making.

Informing and Influencing Decisions

- In ADB, evaluation evidence aims to feed back into the design of future projects, programs, and strategies and how ADB operates in countries. Evaluation primarily informs the Board and Management but in some cases it informs the government where the project is being implemented.

- Mr. Graham cited two examples to illustrate the usability of evaluation findings and results in influencing future strategies and plans. This involves:

  - How the strategic and operation recommendations from the 2017 assessment of ADB strategy and operations in the Philippines covering the period 2011 – 2016 were weaved into the Country strategy for country strategy for 2018-2023; and

  - How thematic evaluations such as on public sector management and state of enterprise reform informed the development of ADB's new Operational Plan for Strengthening Governance and Institutional Capacity under its 2030 corporate strategy.

- All of the 37 project assessments conducted by ADB has findings, lessons and recommendations. While most of these recommendations focus on ADB, some operational recommendations also address government agencies and systems.

Evaluation Mechanisms

- To maximize impact, ADB's evaluation approach is three-pronged: (i) rigorous high quality – requires evidence and data; (ii) has to be well-timed - requires advanced planning; and, (iii) delivery – should be effectively communicated and engaging stakeholders. Evaluations are also be supported by outreach, information systems, capacity development, and partnerships and networks.

- Other factors that strengthen use and influence of evaluations in ADB include:

  - Engagement of stakeholders in the client country in the evaluation process. Stakeholders should be consulted at the onset, then they should review the final product.

  - Inter-departmental reviews and feedback help (i.e., ground-truthing results of evaluations).

  - Conduct of Learning events to determine what works, what doesn't work and what are the causes.

- Emphasis was placed on tracking of implementation of recommendations through a database.

All ADB evaluations include strategic and operational recommendations. These recommendations are put in the Management Action Recording Systems (MARS) database, and adoption/use is tracked by IED in medium term, and reported to Management and ADB Board. Mr. Graham ended his presentation by emphasizing that "Evaluation is about engaging and not doing evaluation in isolation". After the presentations, Ms.

Quijano facilitated a question-and-answer with the speakers. The questions and respective responses of speakers are summarized in Table 2.

Table2. Questions Raised and Corresponding Answers
(Enhanced Usability of Evaluation Results)

Questions	Response
Ms. Quijano: What can agencies, CSOs and other members of M&E Network do to advocate for the NEP Bill?	**ED Salazar, SEPO:** Rally behind the bill by attending the Senate Committee hearing; convince agency leadership to support the Bill so that Sen. Marcos will be connived; write committee expressing support to the Bill.
From Attendify: What do you think is the impact of the proposed NEP Bill on agencies that are doing evaluation and related work like COA?	**Dr. Miral, CPBRD:** NEDA should spearhead the popularization/ appreciation of the importance of M&E through round-table discussion on impact evaluation of completed projects to get the interest of legislators.
Lisa Masa, Coordinating Council for People's Development and Governance: Question for ED Salazar: Does the NEP Bill address the issue on data quality and accessibility?	**ED Salazar, SEPO:** NEP Bill provides framework and guide on data management but the details still need to be threshed out. The Data Privacy Law limits the sharing of data, so it needs to be reviewed to synchronize M&E in government.

Questions	Response
From Attendify: What do you think is the impact of the proposed NEP Bill on agencies that are doing evaluation and related work like COA?	**Dr. Miral, CPBRD:** Through the NEP Bill, a portal for repository of evaluation studies will be established and be made available to all interested parties. **Ms. Quijano:** The discussion on the Bill is still open, there are rooms for improvement, and the M&E Network might find ways on how to engage both Committees about this. On Day 2, we will learn more about evaluation studies through the presentation on Evaluation Portal. **ED Salazar, SEPO:** An audit is different from an evaluation. The performance audit may be similar to evaluation if assessing outcomes or impact of a particular program, policy or project. But audit, per se, is not an evaluation. The Bill will have no negative impact on COA's function. It is not a duplication of what COA is doing. NEP will augment or enhance COA's performance audit. Data from COA Audit will be used in evaluation.

Were agencies responsive to AO25 Assessment? How are these determined?	**Mr. Graham, IED-ADB:** We share a lot of common methodologies with Supreme Audit Institutions (SAIs) in doing performance audits. It looks a lot like evaluations but SAIs are mandated by law to report to Congress and serve a stronger accountability function. Evaluation is more focused on learnings. SAIs are natural partners of ADB because they often do similar things.
From Attendify: Can you give us examples on how you engage stakeholders or other partners to do evaluations or advocate for evaluation? **From Attendify:** What do you think is the impact of the proposed NEP Bill on agencies that are doing evaluation and related work like COA?	**Mr. Graham, IED-ADB:** One of the things we are doing increasingly is, when ADB Operations designs a project, the initial project concept is sent to IED to look at the design and monitoring framework (DMF). We do not influence the design of the project because it jeopardizes our ability to independently evaluate the project in the end. What we do is we look at whether project is evaluable at the end by looking at the data and the way the DMF is adequate to do evaluation.
	When we evaluate an agency project, we engage the agency to get data, their experience on the ground in terms of implementing and usefulness of the project. Engagement is both internal and external (with agencies in partner countries).

After the awarding of tokens to the speakers, Ms. Quijano reminded the participants to post their comments to the “WE Time” , then gave the instructions to the next activity “It’s about Time” involving a question from the participants to reflect: “What can you do to promote usability of evidence from M&E?”She encouraged participants to share their comments in the activity stream of Attendify then moved on to the next session.

A.5 #AskMeAnything

To set the tone for the learning sessions on Day 2, a panel of local, regional and international M&E experts were invited to do a special Q&A session on M&E best practices, processes and other queries from the participants. The M&E experts who graced the activity include:

- Dr. Mary Racelis, Research Scientist, Institute of Philippine Culture (IPC)
- Ms. Nasreena Sampaco Baddiri, Country Director, Innovations for Poverty Action (IPA) Philippines
- Dr. Tara Kaul, Evaluation Specialist, International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3iE)
- Dr. Marites Tiongco, Dean, School of Economics, De La Salle University (DLSU)
- Mr. Martin Porter, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, UNICEF.

Participants were invited to send in questions through the mobile application, or raise their questions in plenary. The questions and corresponding responses are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Questions Raised and Corresponding Answers (#AskMeAnything)

Questions	Response
For all panelists: Can you site a current project or study that you are doing right now or done before that you can say has influenced policy or program delivery?	**Dr. Racelis, IPC:** A research/study of why communities resist relocation projects even if a house and other services are being provided showed that for informal settlers, it is not just about the house but also the proximity to income-generating activities. Preferred location is near-site or in-city. As a result, and to the extent possible, NHA upgraded sites or identified relocation sites with better access to facility, services and work/livelihood. **Ms. Baddiri, IPA:** Our evaluation results for KALAHI-CIDSS-NCDDP helped give focus to the design of DSWD's follow-on project to IPs. **Mr. Porter, UNICEF:** Study on capacity of government to assess SDGs conducted with NEDA and UNDP showed that agency efforts are not synchronized. Evaluation results helped NEDA on how to use its Strategic Evaluation Fund. **Dr. Tiongco, DLSU:** The Alternative Learning System (ALS) curriculum was revised with influence from the ALS study; it also gave rise to the K-12 Program.
For Dr. Racelis and Dean Tiongco: What are the challenges to translating academic research/findings for policy makers and decision makers in government? How can we address these challenges?	**Dr. Tiongo, DLSU:** Evaluation results are basis for informed decision. Policy-makers listen to academe; we prepare policy brief and get invited to present in Senatorial and Congressional Hearings to deepen their understanding of issues.

Questions	Response
	Dr. Racelis, IPC: IPC shares results of studies to stakeholders by organizing sessions specifically for this purpose. Academics have a special power to bring together communities because we have certain credibility about "honest" data, and we know all the partners. **Ms. Quijano:** Academy act as a bridge within the community and decision-makers.
From Attendify: Can you cite a specific example or project that you handled (completed or ongoing) that demonstrated community participation in monitoring and evaluation?	**Dr. Kaul, 3iE:** In sub-Saharan Africa, we engaged a community in generating qualitative and quantitative data to a nutrition impact study. The information communities gave about the impact of nutrition to them that helped us understand the situation.
Lisa Masa, CSO: What is your opinion on CSOs (e.g., Oxfam) being "red-tagged"? What are your suggestions to address the issue?	**Mr. Porter, UNICEF:** It is a tricky situation. Despite our desire to help them, we have to recognize that we are impartial. **Dr. Racelis, IPC:** NGOs have the

	ability to work with disadvantaged communities. Government should recognize this. Tagging should be backed by data and information. Tagged NGOs should continue to dialogue with government.
For all panelists: Given the current state of evaluation the government has, in what areas of evaluation does the government need to focus on to further strengthen its evaluation function?	**Dr. Kaul, 3iE:** Aside from answering the questions "Is it working? Who is it working for? How is it working", Impact Evaluation should also answer the question "At what cost?" We need to do more work in making sure that evaluations are really useful through cost-efficiency analysis. Data should be collected in a manner amenable to evaluation and comparing different alternatives. The Philippines is fairly advanced in terms of doing evaluations with a wide breath of available research on multiple projects and sectors. There is a space to undertake systematic review or synthesis of all the evidence to draw high-level lessons from these. The Evaluation Portal is one great step in trying to learn from the existing evidence.

Questions	Response
	Dr. Racelis, IPC: Most evaluation criteria for public investments are about infrastructure. But what happens to the people—the IPs, women, PWDs? Someone should look at the social and environmental effects of these investments especially to those at the margins. **Ms. Quijano** reframed the response into: Are we asking the right question? Who are we getting this information from? **Mr. Porter, UNICEF:** Aggregated data presented does not reflect the same picture across the entire country. Disaggregate data to get the full story especially as it relates to the SDG indicators. **Dr. Tiongco, DLSU:** With the institutionalization of CBMS, it is one way of disaggregating data. And with NEDA's Small-Area Estimates, there is really progress in doing disaggregation of data.

	Ms. Quijano summarized that disaggregated data is coming up as an important feature in communicating M&E result and analyzing them.
From Attendify: How does your organization raise awareness about the importance of conducting evaluation especially to the beneficiaries (like the general public) of your projects/ programs? Were you able to find out if their interest/appreciation about conducting increased?	**Dr. Kaul, 3iE:** From the evaluations we have supported, what turned out to be more useful and more used are that which we kept the audience front and center, from planning to implementation and dissemination. 3iE requires a very strong engagement and dissemination plan right from the beginning. This strengthens people's desire to listen to the evidence once produced. That is why in our dissemination plans, we deem it important to identify who will be the key users of the evaluation (i.e., policymakers, program managers, implementing agency); they will be the audience. In terms of products: we present our studies for publication in economics journals and other academic publications, and in conferences and talks. The design of appropriate products depends on the key audience. Examples include

Questions	Response
	Technical Summaries (1-pager or 1-minute videos summarizing the key issues and results and lessons), Policy Briefs, and exploring Multi-media.

After the allotted time, Ms. Quijano wrapped up the session. She reminded the participants to use the Attendify to send in their remaining questions.

Before formally closing the first day of the Forum, Ms. Quijano asked the participants to post their reflections about Day 1 sessions (i.e., "How do you feel about Day 1") in the Attendify. In response to posts regarding the need for more trainings/capacity building in the agencies, Ms. Quijano announced that flyers will be distributed featuring pipelined trainings on M&E from the Philippine Statistical Research and Training Institute (PSRTI).

Day 1 formally closed with a photo opportunity with all participants rallying the M&E theme "We in M&E".

B. Day 2: November 20, 2019

The second day of the Forum commenced through the facilitation of Ms. Quijano. Before doing the recap of Day 1, she urged those in attendance to encourage friends and colleagues to try to catch up with the sessions and checked if there are new comers.

B.1 Recapitulation of Day 1

To formally start the second day of the Forum, Ms. Quijano revisited highlights of what transpired on the first day. She began with the sharing of key messages from the welcome messages of the distinguished NEDA, DBM, and UNDP officials that contextualized the "Putting We in M&E". Then she made a walk-through of the current landscape of M&E and the desired future by summarizing the inputs of NEDA and DBM representatives.

Key messages from the sessions spotlighting monitoring for results, enhancing usability of results and special Question-and-Answer were also provided by Ms. Quijano. Selected posts on the activity "ME Time" (priorities for the next six months), "WE Time" (learnings that will be applied right away), "It's About Time" (what can be done to promote usability of evidence from M&E), and the Forum Poll on the NEP Bill were also presented in plenary.

Moving on, Ms. Quijano set the tone by disclosing that Day 2 focuses on strengthening capabilities to do better M&E as a community. She walked through the participants on the breakout sessions and learning sessions that will be happening. In relation to this, she reminded the participants to send a Personal Message to the Q&A of the Attendify for questions regarding session assignments.

After encouraging the participants to check the Activity Stream of the Attendify for feedbacks, she introduced the next speaker who discussed a new system that will help inform the M&E community and the general public of evaluations done in the Philippines.

B.2 Launching of Evaluation Portal

Assistant Director Jesse David of the NEDA-UNDP Strategic M&E Project presented the rationale for the Evaluation Portal, discussed its key modules and provided the status of the development of the portal, and next steps. His presentation also featured a live demonstration of the Evaluation Portal.

The Evaluation Portal is an online, web-based management information system that will serve as a repository of all evaluation studies, policies, manuals and other learning materials. It is envisioned as a platform for the M&E community of practice to share information, knowledge and practices.

The Evaluation Portal has a dashboard and is composed of four key Modules, namely:

1. Evaluation Management Module,
2. Guidelines and Policy Module
3. Learning Module, and
4. M&E Network (Community of Practice).

The Homepage highlights the key features of studies or events. It has a link to available government resources that allows access to the full documents such as the Joint NEDA-DBM Memorandum Circular, National Evaluation Policy Framework, National Evaluation Capacity Development Plan and the National Evaluation Agenda. As discussed by Mr. David, the specific features of the modules are:

- The Evaluation Management Module which contains studies uploaded to the portal. Through the search engine that allows selection of (i) project title, (ii) type of evaluation, (iii) status, and (iv) completion year. Each of the four tabs leads to the relevant details of the study/project as well as a list of ongoing, completed and planned and evaluation studies per agency.

- Guidelines and Policy Module presents the National Evaluation Policy Framework. It provides the details per chapter and sub-chapters.

- The Learning Module of the portal is envisioned to be populated with all the learning materials related to evaluation to include training modules, video presentations and online resource materials. NEDA plans to upload the module on Training on Impact Evaluation commissioned by the De La Salle University (DLSU). It also intends to tie up with the Development Academy of the Philippines (DAP) on the development of short-term and long-term training courses on evaluation. The training modules will be uploaded in this section of the portal. For the purpose of this presentation, dummies were uploaded.

- Under the M&E Network (Community of Practice) Module, one can access the agenda, schedule and PowerPoint presentation materials of the eight M&E Network fora.

According to Mr. David, the design and development of the portal started this year. It is targeted to be completed by January 2020 and fully operational by March 2020.

Meantime, Mr. David shared that NEDA will upload completed studies under the M&E Fund to the portal. When fully operational, all agencies will be requested to assign Evaluation Managers for content management and to upload studies in the portal. Coordination with institutions will also be undertaken to link their studies' executive summary, lessons learned and recommendations to this portal. The Users' Training will be conducted in January 2020.

After encouraging the participants to coordinate with NEDA in case they want to share evaluations for uploading in the portal, Ms. Quijano asked the participants to proceed to the venue of the parallel session of their choice bookmarked through the Attendify.

The list of participants to the breakout and learning sessions are attached as Annex 4. Annex 5 presents the consolidated insights during the parallel sessions.

B.3 Spotlight on Concluded and Ongoing Evaluations

Recently concluded and ongoing evaluations focusing on specific phases of evaluation were presented in this session.

Each presentation showcased good practices and lessons learned to guide those who will commission and implement their own evaluations in the future. Each presentation shed light to specific questions on the different phases of evaluation.

In addition, presenters also shared how the evaluation questions were framed to measure and establish the impact of the programs they evaluated/are evaluating to citizens.

Finally, and where applicable, they also shared methods that promote inclusivity in monitoring and advocating the use of results.

Through the guidance of sub-group facilitators, the learning objectives of the sessions were addressed by the speakers, along with clarifying questions and suggestions about the studies.

The sessions usually started with the NEDA facilitators providing an overview of the topic, followed by an introduction of the speakers prior to their presentation, then opening the floor to question-and-answer to surface questions and clarifications which were addressed by the speakers.

Following are the highlights of each of the parallel sessions.

B.3.1 Break-out Session 1: ARTA Study

1st Topic: How to communicate results and get buy-in from stakeholders (Evaluating the Anti-Red Tape Act of 2007: Lessons for Policy Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Transitions)
Speaker: Ms. Czarina Medina Guce
Facilitators: Cheenee Santiago, NEDA and Arjelette Andes, NEDA
Documenter: Rainier Requinala, UNDP

Discussion Points

- Ms. Cheenee Santiago, Economic Development Specialist 2, Project Management Staff, NEDA explained that the breakout session will focus on the recently concluded evaluation study commissioned by the UNDP-NEDA Strategic M&E project, which is the Assessment of the Anti-Red Tape Act of 2007 (RA 9485).

  She did a roll call of the Forum participants who signed up for this breakout session, which she noted was the very first to be filled up to full room capacity. She added that the evaluation study was the first to move forward among the seven evaluation studies commissioned under the Strategic M&E Project. The breakout session would focus on how to communicate the results and how to get the buy-in from the stakeholders.

- Ms. Arjelette Andes, Economic Development Specialist 1, Project Management Staff, NEDA, introduced the resource person and main author of the Anti Red Tape Act evaluation study, Ms. Czarina Medina Guce of the Ateneo de Manila University.

- Ms. Guce noted that the evaluation was the first of many research projects that were undertaken under the Strategic M&E Project of UNDP and NEDA. She said that she was the lead evaluator of the case study while Mr. Kidjie Saguin and Ms. Kathleen Jovellanos provided her with research assistance. They also got a lot of help from Thinking Machines Data Science, which is a data analytics firm.

- To provide the breakout session with a research overview, Ms. Guce noted that the UNDP-NEDA Strategic Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Project took on several policy evaluations projects. She added that it was very strategic when they did the evaluation study because it was the time when the IRR for the ARTA (RA 9485) was being drafted. She narrated that they went around the agencies trying to get feedback and taking on as many lessons as they could.

Further, Ms. Guce explained that the evaluation was shaped by a policy transition and not a strict evaluation of ARTA for ARTA's sake. Coming to the evaluation, Ms. Guce remarked that their perspective has some action research component, which is to make sure that all the lessons coming from the ARTA is usable for the implementation of the Ease of Doing Business Act (EODB). Signed into law on 18 May 2018, the EODB Act combines the ARTA and the doing business policies. Thus, Ms. Guce noted, the ARTA study became more challenging as it became an action research and not just an evaluation study.

- On engaging public policy discourse, Ms. Guce qualified that ARTA was landmark legislation as it addressed the Red Tape in the frontline service delivery. She commented that Red Tape is a "tale as old as time" and has been perennially present alongside bureaucracy. She shared Max Weber's comments on bureaucracy that the roots of red tape have already been there. Ms. Guce enumerated several negative effects associated with Red Tape, as follows:

  - Red Tape is seen as a constraint to market development and doing business and therefore it is within the interest of stakeholders to take it out.

  - It is seen as facilitative of corruption because when people lining up for frontline services try to circumvent processes when they encounter blocks in service delivery.

  - Red Tape also has costs to government because there is an opportunity costs and it can be measured how much is lost to Red Tape.

  - As a frontline service issue, Red Tape is a compliance burden posed on clients with no objective value to stakeholders.

- Ms. Guce explained the concept of client satisfaction, which is a contrary concept of Red Tape. She noted that since the 1970s, research literature is rich in terms of using the variable of client satisfaction as a proxy indicator for government effectiveness. In other words, asking the client how satisfied they are means you are also measuring your effectiveness. However, client satisfaction also has both subjective and objective dimensions which are central to the ARTA. In light of these concepts, Ms. Guce reminded the breakout session participants of the ultimate objective of the ARTA law which can be found in the Declaration of Policy (Section 2) of the Act, as follows:

  "It is hereby declared the policy of the State to promote integrity, accountability, proper management of public affairs and public property as well as to establish effective practices aimed at the prevention of graft and corruption in government. Towards this end, the State shall maintain honesty and responsibility among its public officials and employees, and shall take appropriate measures to promote transparency in each agency with regard to the manner of transacting with the public, which shall encompass a program for the adoption of simplified procedures that will reduce red tape and expedite transactions in government."

- The ARTA 2007 was translated in a very concrete manner into the ARTA integrated program of the Civil Service Commission (CSC). This institutional mandate of CSC has been the main channel of implementing the ARTA law. Some of CSC's programs related to ARTA were as follows:

  - **Report Card Survey (RCS)** – Ms. Guce shared that the evaluation team found out that CSC was not able to implement it across the country because of resource constraints (costly and takes time.) What CSC did, however, was to focus on feedbacks from their Contact Center ng Bayan (The People's Contact Center) and from observations to zoom in on the few critical issues requiring their attention and prompt action.

  - **Contact Center ng Bayan (CCB)** – Ms. Guce noted that the evaluation team found out all sorts of complaints. She noted that the team studied the process beginning from the filing of the complaint until such time that they were resolved.

- **Service Delivery Excellence Program (SDEP)** – This is CSC's catch-up program given to agencies and frontline officers that fall short of the ARTA standards.

- **Citizen's Satisfaction Center Seal of Excellence (CSC-SE)** – This is CSC's award component of the ARTA program.

- Of the 4 program components of CSC's ARTA integrated program, the evaluation team just focused on the data sets of the report card survey and the contact center ng bayan.

- Ms. Guce differentiated between the ARTA and EODBA. EODBA now includes both business and non-business transactions which would give a big boost to the efficiency standards of government service delivery. This means that the standard 3-5-7-20 processing time now applies to all types of government transactions and not just on business transactions. In this light, Ms. Guce commented it was very important for the evaluation team to find out what worked and what didn't work so that as the new standards for EODB are already being imposed, the national government could benefit from a real understanding towards on the ground issues and concerns at the various government offices dealing with public services. Moreover, EODBA called for a backend infrastructure and administrative systems that support a more efficient transaction environment. This entails developing databases and knowledge systems as well as having interconnectivity. The EODBA also requires government agencies to have a shorter processing time, automatic approvals, limited contact and a "two strike policy".

- The final output of the evaluation study is 120-page long addressing all questions on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. She enumerated their key findings, as follows:

  - Agency-level initiatives, client satisfaction, and improved frontline service delivery.
  - ARTA Integrated Program Components and Relevance to the Frontline Service Experience.
  - ARTA's Unsubstantiated Evidence on Contribution to Curbing Corruption.

- The detailed findings are discussed below:

On Agency-level initiatives, client satisfaction, and improved frontline service delivery:

1. There was positive and statistically significant association between improvements in ARTA implementation and client satisfaction. Service quality dimensions such as response time, attention and positive outcome, also matter in shaping satisfaction among clients.

- The main determinants of client satisfaction were really those pertaining to the direct experience variables.

- This finding was also backed up by the case studies they did which pointed out that the high performing agencies and frontline services had clear agency level programs to make their processes efficient. Some of the notable agencies were Philhealth (through their service kiosks) and BIR (through the initiatives of Commissioner Kim Henares).

- As for economically challenged municipality such as in Arayat, Pampanga, even small investments in technology such as the queuing system or some sort of computerization matters.

  However, there were some agencies and some offices that despite their agency level attention and agency level investments in technology, they still cannot cope with the density and complexity of transactions at hand.

These include for instance Quezon City Government and the Land Registration Authority. The transactions being handled by LRA for instance would always require several days because of the nature of their transactions in spite of the fact that they also invested in database management and computerized systems. Thus, there's an apparent need for greater innovations coming from these agencies when density and complexity of transactions don't just adjust when complying with the ARTA standards.

2. The analytical tracks in the evaluation all highlight that ARTA compliance does not automatically yield outputs that sufficiently address the efficiency level desired for frontline service delivery.

- ARTA implementation and compliance requires a policy and program ecosystem at the level of the agency supported by leadership and management prioritization and agency-level initiatives.

- ARTA standards of efficiency (particularly the number of days per kind of transaction) also require review of the standards per se to respond to variables such as nature of, and volume and density of transactions.

- Ms. Guce noted that there's an apparent positive correlation between ISO certification and client satisfaction. However, it is not representative of the whole data as ISO certification is like an agency level initiative already and is quite expensive.

- Ms. Guce also shared that she was at the EODB conference of the DILG the week prior to the 8th M&E Forum, which was attended by 800 LGUs. She said that the LGUs' main concerns in the implementation of the EODBA were on resources. The LGUs were basically saying "if we will comply with all the data set and the information technology that's required, where would we get it?"

- DICT is developing software that can be used but would take some time to deploy everything. These were lingering concerns that the team also highlighted in the report.

On ARTA Integrated Program Components and Relevance to the Frontline Service Experience:

- Not all components of the ARTA integrated program had the same impact on citizen experience.

- Those with strong positive impact on citizen experience include Citizen's Charter, no lunchbreak policy, physical set-up and basic facilities. These were backed up by the case studies undertaken by the evaluation group.

- The research team found out also that there's a difference between the transaction time and waiting time. It's possible that the transaction time may take less than five minutes but the waiting time could take very long, which would make the citizen dissatisfied.

- Public assistance and complaints desk has a positive effect on satisfaction. However, the anti-fixing campaign and identification cards do not have any influence on satisfaction.

  This is because these are already secondary and would be needed if the citizen is already complaining. What matters the most is the face to face transactions.
- Contrary to the expectation that Citizens Charter, as one of the core features of the ARTA and literature saying that it should work because it sets expectations/fear between government and citizens, the case studies pointed out that there were negative feedbacks on the Citizen's Charter as most of them were overloaded with information and the presentation are not effective (e.g. they are just posted on a tarpaulin with very lengthy and small texts). Interviewed citizens wanted something more user friendly such instructional videos and the likes; asking questions from the staff manning the Public Assistance Desks or from the

security guards, who figured prominently from the interviews conducted by the evaluation team.

On ARTA's Unsubstantiated Evidence on Contribution to Curbing Corruption:

- There was unsubstantiated evidence on ARTA's Contribution to Curbing Corruption. The evidence that they tried to get is not definitive if ARTA really has curbed corruption

- This was backed up by the fact that when the evaluation team went around various agencies, they also encountered many fixers. Some of these fixers have become very innovative such as they are now using the internet to transact or there are those who take advantage of the senior citizens, persons with disabilities and pregnant women lanes.

- Another problem with regard to fixing is the supremacy of culture and community over regulations. Ms. Guce shared that in one of their interviews, one government staff said there was a case where one of their co-workers was reported to have committed Red Tape but nothing happened afterwards.

- Ms. Guce noted that political ineffectiveness has also contributed to the problem of Red Tape. She commented that the ARTA integrated campaign focused more on the anti-fixing campaign, which is mostly done through the posters and the hotlines. However, Ms. Guce pointed out, there seems to be a lot more work needed to make the ARTA more effective that has to happen on the backside interagency follow through. She said that CSC knows what is happening as they have prepared reports but what happens thereafter is not clear.

▪ In spite of the aforementioned nuances, there are still lessons to be learned from the ARTA implementation, as follows:

- There are elements in the report card that can be mined for insights/analysis (e.g., information on the type of fixing transactions, where and who they are, and other related information).

- The study of the hidden costs clarified that the hidden costs are different from what the RCS qualified as grease money. How the hidden costs are tallied in the survey do not give a clear picture if it's fixing money.

- Ms. Guce also narrated that CSC Legal Department was able to show her a document showing that a government employee has been terminated because of fixing money. However, CSC do not have the consolidated feedback from their regional offices. Ms. Guce noted that CSC was claiming that the impact in terms of sanctions is higher than we know.

▪ In spite of the aforementioned nuances, there are still lessons to be learned from the ARTA implementation, as follows:

- There are elements in the report card that can be mined for insights/analysis (e.g., information on the type of fixing transactions, where and who they are, and other related information).

- The study of the hidden costs clarified that the hidden costs are different from what the RCS qualified as grease money. How the hidden costs are tallied in the survey do not give a clear picture if it's fixing money.

- Ms. Guce also narrated that CSC Legal Department was able to show her a document showing that a government employee has been terminated because of fixing money. However, CSC do not have the consolidated feedback from their regional offices. Ms. Guce noted that CSC was claiming that the impact in terms of sanctions is higher than we know.

Table 4. Questions Raised and Corresponding Answers (ARTA Study)

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
Ms. Katherine Lingan, Department of National Defense: 1. Has the evaluation study considered cultural dynamics? 2. Has the evaluation study looked into the gravity of regulation versus meeting the target itself? Has the regulatory nature of ARTA impacted the framing of the policies? 3. Could some of DND's transactions be exempted from ARTA as they are quite sensitive in terms of security concerns?	**Ms. Guce:** It is important to have policy structural support at the beginning and for government agencies to have agency level initiatives. In the case of the BIR, they know that they are doing the ARTA related initiatives because it's the BIR's current policy thrust. Same is true with LGU employees who were doing things because it's the priority of their mayors because they've heard their mayors utter them during flag ceremonies. It also helps for instance that when you see computerization programs it also shapes the culture of continuous improvement/ innovation. What the evaluation team saw from all the tracks of the analysis is that the biggest value of ARTA was that it set a standard that everyone knew. Part of the function of a policy regulation is to tell you what to expect so you know when something is deviating or not. She reframed the question as "do you get better outcomes when you have a regulatory policy or when you have an enabling policy?". As far as they understood so many assumptions were made in the implementation of the ARTA, such as the availability of resources, etc. So it's a good insight to have this conversation as maybe there is value in looking at the impact positively reinforcing and negatively reinforcing policies and how they come together for the outcomes that we want. From what they know, it is up to the agencies to define what is simple, what is complex and how they would like the standards to apply to them.
Mr. Julius I. Dumangas, Congressional Policy and Budget Research Department, House of Representatives: What is the definition of fixing?	**Ms. Guce:** In ARTA there is no definition of fixing but in EODB there is already a definition. "Fixer" is defined as any individual whether or not officially involved in the operation of a government office or agency which has access to people working therein, and whether or not in collusion with them, facilitates speedy completion of transactions for pecuniary gain or any other advantage or consideration.

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
	There seems to be a way to incorporate costs that able clients are willing to pay to expedite transactions such as in the case of the passport system, wherein applicants have the options to pay for faster delivery. She observed that it's not fixing per se but rather it preempts fixing. **Mr. Jaifreed Cabangal, Office of Dir. Gen. Perez of the Anti-Red Tape Authority:** I was part of the "scrubbing" people of the IRR. Even in the Bicam, it was agreed upon that it covers all even to the extent of including the quasi-judicial. The reason why ARTA covers the front end and the backend transactions is because the law covers government to business, government to client and government to government based on the principle that everybody deserves high service standards. With regard to the concern of DND, if the transaction is at the backend then it is covered by the "no contact policy". It is only the officer in charge of the specific transaction who is stipulated in the Citizens' Charter who can interface with the clients.

Ms. Lingan, DND: Issuance of security clearance should not be a frontline service because of security concerns. But DND has been forced to classify it as such because there is an actual interfacing with a client (who can be an organization or a person). Technically, it will take 20 to 40 days to process security clearances. Hastily doing so might endanger the person, the department or even the country. The dilemma of DND is if it should declare the transaction as a frontline service and if ARTA will see it as violation should it not do so.	**Mr. Cabangal, Office of Dir. Gen. Perez of the Anti-Red Tape Authority**: The classification of whether a transaction is frontline or backend should come from the agency and not from the Anti Red Tape Authority. I suggest establishing a good communication procedure between the frontline staff and the backend staff in a way that could protect the client. With regard to the processing time of security clearances, the Anti Red Tape Authority did not write the law but is just implementing it. For transactions that would require more than twenty days (such as DA's transactions that would require for plant to grow first), the agency should send the Anti Red Tape Authority with a list of all these transactions explaining what are the necessary steps in their processes and why the process would take long, backed up with scientific evidence. **Ms. Guce:** The preceding conversations were characteristics of what we saw coming in into the ARTA, EODB and the IRR. The Anti Red Tape Authority has just

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
	been created and has been trying to catch up with all the requirements for implementing the law. One of the lessons learned by the evaluation team as it went around academic circles, M&E practitioners and policymakers was that there's a lot more to get aligned with in terms of the new expectations brought about by the EODB law.
Mr. Dumangas, CPBRD: What exactly are the independent and dependent variables that the evaluation team measured?	**Ms. Guce:** The evaluation team actually has a results framework or Theory of Change when we conducted the evaluation study. Internally, we called it "sapin-sapin" (literal translation in English is layer-upon-layer), because it's very colorful. The evaluation took several steps including an inception workshop, development of a framework, created the tools and consulted with NEDA, UNDP and CSC just to align everything. We used the Section 2 of the ARTA law to be the basis for identifying the desired outcomes. The reason why it was "sapin-sapin" is because we

	unpacked what was covered by the ARTA Integrated program. We also looked into how individual agencies translated the ARTA into their own initiatives. The evaluation team was also very cognizant of the fact that when you have [...] outcomes like graft and corruption in public financial matters, you have to take into account all the other initiatives. That's why the evaluation also explored the ISO accreditation since DBM advised us that government agencies are also being encouraged to get their ISO accreditation. Some of the database of the evaluation was shared by other agencies such as DBM. The long and short part of the experience was being deliberate and strategic. The evaluation team encountered several challenges including the fact that doing M&E for government means collecting data from everywhere and putting them together and try to make sense of it.

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
Atty. Maribeth Padios, office of the Ombudsman: There was a mention a while ago about the constraints in the conduct of the Report Card Survey. It was a resource and bureaucratic constraint. Since this was not conducted, what was the recommendation of the team towards the evaluation and assessment?	**Ms. Guce:** I appreciate the question about the RCS as it was where the evaluation team showed fantastic collaboration. This statistical analysis could only make substantive models out of the comparative years. The tool and the deployment were almost the same for years 2014 to 2016. The stats were taken from this period since this is where the log res model could be created. However, the data science part cleaned the team from start to finish. What we did is to get similar variables and made data learning adjustments. What was amazing in the process was that even if the statistical method and data analytics dealt with the constraints of the data sets differently, we arrived with more or less the same findings. With the accidental positive results of the two methodologies, it would be really good to explore various techniques available to us now, knowing very well that data isn't as robust, available and complete as one might want it to be. It is therefore up to the Monitoring and Evaluation practitioners to be
	creative and strategic with what tools and analytical approaches to use to come up with a set of narratives.
Acting Director Kristine Laguros, Office of Policy Planning and Coordination, Department of Foreign Affairs: This question is a more practical one, which probably would benefit all of us government agencies because you're going to be subjected to the requirements anyway. Can we get exemption from ARTA frontline categorization, because for security reasons, for example, are we going to put in the Citizen's Charter about the China issue?	**Mr. Cabangal, Office of Dir. Gen. Perez of the Anti-Red Tape Authority:** Before answering the question, let me clarify that this is not an Anti-Red Tape Authority event so it is not probably the best venue to discuss the matter. The Anti Red Tape Authority does not allow exemptions, but rather the agencies should be able to classify their transactions properly. An exemption would mean that there will be no liability for the agency if they went beyond the prescribed processing time. It is therefore important for agencies to justify their processes for the Anti Red Tape Authority to allow the processes to be given more leeway. ARTA is using the whole-of-government approach which means that the other agencies should know or could have an easy access to know the standard procedures of all other agencies, except if the information is classified.

Acting Director Laguros, DFA: Can we extend the deadline of Dec. 6 for redoing the Citizen's Charter to include business and non-business transactions?	**Mr. Cabangal, Office of Dir. Gen. Perez of the Anti-Red Tape Authority:** The ARTA law was passed in 2017 and the IRR came into effect in 2019. The Citizen's Charters are also not new and should only be adopted to the new IRR. While we can provide lectures to help the government agencies, we are also experiencing constraints and challenges of our own. The total number of staff at the Anti Red Tape Authority is only 65 with an average age of 25 years old. However, we are very much willing to provide lectures upon the request of the agencies by emailing us at ***info@arta.gov.ph***.
Eden Garcia, National Irrigation Administration: Is the 3-7-20 applicable if your client is internal? Our processes is highly technical and takes a long time (e.g,. you cannot complete the design of a dam in 20 days).	**Mr. Cabangal, Office of Dir. Gen. Perez of the Anti-Red Tape Authority:** Internal clients are covered by ARTA. If the process is highly technical, you can go beyond the 20-day period (extendable to 30.) Another option is to provide justification to the Anti Red Tape Authority backed up with scientific evidence.

B.3.2 Break-out Session 2: PAMANA and ECCD

2nd Topic: How to prepare for and initiate evaluations (PAMANA and ECCD Study)
Speaker: Maria Carmen Fernandez, Innovations for Poverty Action Soumen Bagchi, IPE Global
Facilitators: Alexander Glova, NEDA and Cathy Bucay, NEDA
Documenter: Kristina Angeli Lopez, UNDP

Discussion Points

PAMANA

- Evaluation strategies involving sensitive programs such as PAMANA was presented by IPA's Ica Fernandez. IPA was mandated by the government 1) to assess PAMANA's effects on peacebuilding and development; 2) to identify PAMANA's concepts and implementation gaps and challenges; 3) to enhance PAMANA's existing processes and mechanisms to facilitate future program assessments; and 4) to provide recommendations for future development and peacebuilding efforts.

- In order to proceed with their evaluation, an overall theory of change (TOC) comprising of track complementarity and addressing root causes guided the monitoring and evaluation of the program. But since several conflict lines (Completion Agreements, CPP/NPA/NDFP, and Bangsamoro) exist within PAMANA, this overall theory of change was disaggregated, retooled, and realigned in line with the contexts of these conflict lines.

  Specifically, for PAMANA in areas under completion agreements, IPA conducted a survey to 1807 respondents in 178 Negros/Panay barangays; and a case study in Negros Occidental which focused on Community Peace Dividend (CPD) and Sustainable Livelihood Program (SLP).

- For PAMANA in CPP/NPA/NDFP areas, they did a time series and crime data.

- Lastly, similar with the methodology in PAMANA in completion areas, IPA also conducted surveys and a case study for PAMANA in Bangsamoro. Two thousand nineteen (2,019) respondents in 103 barangays in the SPMS box and adjacent municipalities were involved in the survey study while the case study focused on PAMANA-MNLF and ARMM-Humanitarian and Development Action Plan (HDAP) projects.

- Along with the TOC, evaluation criteria for the program were also presented such as relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability. Although, findings of the team were not shared due to the sensitivity of the program, they still provided recommendations and take away from their study. One of which is to encourage line agencies to coordinate, implement programs efficiently and consolidate data, especially on sensitive programs such as PAMANA. Additionally, they also suggested aligning programs in the local level during planning and programming. And connected with this is the localization and disaggregation of the TOC per conflict line.

Early Childhood Care and Development (ECCD) Program

- Although the ECCD Program is still in its early phases of evaluation, IPE Global's Mr. Soumen Bagchi presented their experiences and strategies in evaluating the ECCD.

- One of the objectives of the ECCD evaluation is to assess the program's policy planning, funding, accreditation, and outcomes. IPE was also mandated to help the ECCD council in determining the program's future direction, and to assist the council in capacity building.

- Although not yet approved by NEDA, IPE's methodology and data collection methods were also shared with the group. Their evaluation will involve two phases. For the first phase, a composite score will be developed through various key indicators from the 2017 National Demographic and Health Survey. This score will then guide IPE to determine which sites will be selected for the second phase, wherein a case study and focused group discussions will be conducted. Also, on the second phase, a multilevel interview from key informants at the national, regional, provincial, and municipality level is proposed.

- Mr. Soumen emphasized the need not only for quantitative, but also for qualitative data, and the presence of clear objectives during an evaluation planning. Furthermore, he said that IPE Global's evaluation criteria on their every project are guided by OECD-DAC's, which are relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and equity.

- Since the evaluation was still in its first phase, lessons learned, and recommendations shared by Mr. Soumen were based on the early stages of ECCD evaluation planning and their past projects. Similar with PAMANA, ECCD gave importance to the TOC of the project that guides them with the planning and strategizing for their methodology. He also advised that during evaluations, evaluators need to ensure that they are fully integrated into the overall process of the implementation of the program. He emphasized that evaluation should not be a discreet one-time function. He advocated for the presence of technical and rigorous data that will guide evaluators through their assessments. Although implementers will provide their own data, evaluators should also conduct their own data gathering to cross-check the implementer's data. This will give a good grasp on the overall status of the program. And lastly, he advocates for data and evidence-based evaluations, wherein the data will speak for itself. Because for him, it is easier for people to accept an argument if facts are well presented.

Table 5. Questions Raised and Corresponding Answers (PAMANA Study)

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
Fely Baday, DepEd: I'm just wondering why impact was not considered in evaluation design or parameters?	**Ms. Fernandez, IPA:** For one, Ma'am, the time series is not long enough to establish impact. From the very beginning, we spoke to NEDA and OPAPP. Also, PAMANA is still running. Usually, impact evaluation is done much after. Actually, we saw the challenges on actually establishing causal things. So, we can't go there yet.
Aida Talavera, COA: Looking at the four components, I was looking at something. Kung ito yung field criteria mo, saan mo ibabangga yung field data. Wala akong nakitang banggaan. Kasi di ko sya nakita doon. (If these serve as your criteria, how do we [in the context of auditing state funds] cross-check our field data? I can't seem to see how)	**Ms. Fernandez, IPA:** Sige po. I am really glad you're asking this question. Also because I know, I think under GAAP, PAMANA will have to undergo a special audit under COA. The reality, Ma'am, is that the financial aspect and we weren't provided with financial data to evaluate. All we had was partial files on financial transactions and then there was one gestation analysis they did but internal to OPAPP which looked at how the time-lapse between the programming of the project and the actual delivery.
	On average, it took 2 years for each program to be actually brought on the ground, but we didn't run it by ourselves. It was based on a process that OPAPP themselves run the agencies. So you're right, we should have done it, but we're not given the data to do it.
Alexander Glova, NEDA: But Ica, these are not intelligent funds, right? They are project funds. They should be easy to get. I mean we have BMOs (the Bangsamoro Office), don't we? [Di ganun?] But the records will still be there.	**Ms. Fernandez, IPA:** The transition happened though. They are there not sir. With all due respect po.
Kathrina Cabana, DICT: What are problems or obstacles that you encountered during the program?	**Ms. Fernandez, IPA:** Every step of the way Ma'am. So one had to do with basic data access or data quality. So, for example when we came on board, this is around the time that there was a change between Sec Dureza and Sec Galvez. I'm not sure if you heard but then prior to the assumption of Sec Galvez, the program manager of PAMANA was relieved of duty by the president himself for corruption. So,

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
	when the new admin came on board and we were given the mandate to do the evaluation, files were missing. What we had to do was to go to the different staffs who were involved in PAMANA even prior to 2017, 2018, 2019. Full disclosure, I still work in OPAPP and we're able to track them down. But we were going to staffmembers and looking for files all night.
Alexander Glova, NEDA to Aida Talavera, COA: What was presented was the allocations and you wanted to check it against actual spending. Ganun ba yun (Is that what you meant), Ma'am?	**Aida Talavera, COA:** Hindi, andito kasi sa kanilang evaluation criteria e. So, you have an evaluation criteria. Ito yung set of items na kailangan mong i-validate sa field. (No, I'm instead referring to the evaluation criteria and how they relate to the items that you need to evaluate on the field.
Alexander Glova, NEDA to Aida Talavera, COA: So hinahanap nyo yung matrix (do you wish to see the evaluation matrix)?	**Aida Talavera, COA:** Actually, it's not just really the spending I'm looking for. For example, isang sample is yung provision ng water diba, yung potable water? So in that context, ano yung mga itinanong natin sa survey questionnaire relevance... Kasi sa mga tao ang nakikita yung project e. Yun yung nakikita e. Yun yung nafifeel nya e. Yung tubig na nakukuha nya doon. (One example is on the provision of potable water, right? So, in that context, were we able to ask that in the questionnaire? Were we able to take account what the beneficiaries see, and feel—in this case, the potable water they now get (as a result of the interventions?)
Acting Director Laguros, DFA: Can we extend the deadline of Dec. 6 for redoing the Citizen's Charter to include business and non-business transactions?	**Ms. Fernandez, IPA:** Sige Ma'am, baka (maybe) we can talk about this outside because I'm only showing the broader project. The program design and evaluation. Iba po yung mga (We have a different set of) subproject evaluation questions. So, we do have questionnaires for these things. Access to water, the actual effects of the different subprojects on their lives. And if you notice, we had multiple instruments. We had 2 surveys for the two major areas, plus case studies na (that are) more [or] less quantitative, or more qualitative. And we also have particular sub-projects. What we're looking for in terms of a project level efficiency

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
Aida Talavera, COA: The reason why I'm asking is that ang activity na to di ba is meant for us to understand based on a learning exchange, from a real experience na kung ano ang naging design given these limitations. It's not really the details of the program, and the subject matter of evaluation, but the evaluation mechanism itself. Given these findings of the evaluation saka itong criteria of evaluation, pano natin ginather ang data ng mga yan. Ano yung process na dinaanan natin. Kasi para sakin, pag mag design ka ng evaluation, with certain criterias, dapat nag a-agree yung may ari ng programa. Tapos nag a-agree din kung anong klaseng data yung ginather tapos kung paano siya ginather. Iyon yung hinahanap ko. (Given these findings of the evaluation and the evaluation criteria, how did we gather the data? What processes did we go through? For me, the implementer of the program being evaluated should have a say in both the evaluation criteria, as well as the kind of data to be gathered	was difficult to do because we're looking at 19 different agencies with multiple subprojects costing multiple billions of pesos na (already), I think up to several thousands of projects. What we're able to do was zero on particular kinds of projects. For example, in Samar, we looked at road projects. We compared multiple road projects within the western Samar area. Comparing which ones were delivered and which ones were sub quality. So, we had those particular questions but not at this level that I'm showing you right now. But I think the more granular case level. **Ms. Fernandez, IPA:** NEDA can we show you the evaluation matrix because then we can show you the kinds of questions asked. **Alexander Glova, NEDA:** I suppose malaking portion ng budget napunta sa projects di ba (a big portion of the budget went to projects, right), so a simple associating having these projects to improve access to these projects.

to measure against the criteria and how they plan to gather the said data. I guess that's what I was looking for).	
Aida Talavera, COA: No, no. I am not looking for the cost. The reason why I came here is to have additional knowledge on how an assessment is done dito sa conflict na relevant naman na programa (in a conflict area that is relevant to the program). Kasi ginagawa rin ng COA yan (COA is also doing that). Not only performance audit.	**Ms. Fernandez, IPA:** For example, so what we can do for example, for NPA, within the NPA conflict line. We have an evaluation matrix for the entire program. We now created evaluation matrices for each of the conflict lines. So for example, for NPA, we had the same criteria, similar questions, but more sub questions, directly related to the kinds of projects and delivery mechanisms focusing on this particular conflict line. Yun po (So there). So and again those questions and ways of measuring them were agreed on with NEDA, with OPAPP, and with the different line agencies. For example, at this level, we now divided them for each of the particular zones, no. So in Bicol for example, what we focused on in terms of projects' efficiency and effectiveness were CDD (community-driven development) programs, KALAHI-CIDSS. Okay? Under Samar, we looked at particular roads,

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
	under Cordillera we focused on IP communities. So imagine po, nested po sya (questions on the situation of a specific conflict line is nested within a broader set of questions for all conflict lines). You have a national program level theory of change and these evaluation questions, we had a list of questions for the entire conflict line, and we had another subset of sub question for each of the zone and project types. Yun po. Sorry po we can't explain that thoroughly. **Alexander Glova, NEDA:** May survey po sila na tinanong yung mga household (They have surveys they conduct at the level of household beneficiaries). So I suppose may question talaga na ganun (there are such kinds of questions, anyway).
Cleofe Saniel, NEDA: Is it possible to look at certain components where you can test the TOC on all the three lines, so at the end you can consolidate and check against the overall theory of change for the entire PAMANA so that we can just really look at it. But I	**Ms. Fernandez, IPA:** So for example, KALAHI doesn't appear in all three lines. They heavily appear sa (in) NPA areas, partially dun sa (in) RPA and CPLA. Wala sya sa (It does not appear in) Bangsamoro. At the same time, you're right though. We started in a

don't know of course there is a context for each. But overall somewhere, there is an overarching framework that ties the three, so my sense is that you look at three different lines or if you choose, let's say, projects, I don't know, let's say KALAHI -CIDSS which is present in the three lines so you can see we're here and we put them the circumstances. What works here and there?	certain approach in a sense that you already had to design a broad TOC and research matrix which covers all. And you had particular questions. Those shared questions include for example, effects on violence. So we're able to look at how PAMANA incidence affected violence within the particular zones. So that's something that although the datasets are slightly different, you can now compare it across the board. So those certain things which are comparable. Even source delivery, the speed of how a program is delivered in gestation analysis, you could (analyze). But now for the other effects which were agreed on TOC, they had to be subdivided. For example, that's the certain takeaway of the PAMANA evaluation. There are things you can do, at the ambient level, at other things, particularly for the peace building component, how we look at a particular TOC. So say for example, there are now massive evaluations of CDD in the Philippines. So they're comparing KALAHI-CIDSS for

	example, to the ARMM Social Fund Project (ASFP) which is what they did in the Bangsamoro. For example. In terms of addressing conflict, a CDD program in, for example, Bangasamoro, can have a particular effect on conflict. The opposite is done to CDD program in for example, NPA areas.

Table 6. Questions Raised and Corresponding Answers (ECCD Study)

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	
Evangeline Paran, NEDA: I would like to ask the sampling scheme because you said you would only choose two regions, one, I felt here in the PH, each region has its distinct individuality. I think the study would have something to do with cultural determined practices so I would suggest that we choose more than one, although the same category, but perhaps two for one part and two for the other part. Just so that we can have better qualitative information that we want to get from this study.	**Mr. Bagchi, IPE Global:** Very good suggestion, Ma'am. Very good advice. We would certainly take note.

B.3.3 Break-out Session 3: Nutrition Study

3rd Topic: How to implement evaluations (Nutrition Study)
Speaker: Ms. Jed Asiaii Dimaisip-Nabuab, Innovations for Poverty Action
Facilitators: Malou Eudela and Jimina Garin, NEDA M&E Staff
Documenter: Ruby Ann Manalo, UNDP

Discussion Points

- The presentation began with describing the key features of the Philippine Plan of Action for Nutrition (PPAN) 2017-2022 and its Strategic Thrusts, the focused programs of the formative evaluation study which are Infant and Young Child Feeding (IYCF) and Micronutrient Supplementation Program, and key target to focus on reduction of stunting among children aged zero to five.

- The evaluation team integrated IPA's standard methods in conducting evaluations in implementing the study. These involved implementing the following data quality controls (at the minimum): survey/data collection plan, quality assurance plan and materials, bench test survey, pilot survey, accompanying surveyors and spot checks (for quantitative), high frequency checks (for quantitative), back checks, scrutinize and edit as necessary, double entry and reconcile.

- The quantitative component of the study was complemented by data and findings from six case studies (six municipalities from six provinces) and involved the following processes: preparatory work (desk review and consultations), sites selection, data collection, rapid analysis (while in the field), daily de-briefings, conduct of focus group discussions with the interviewers (from which questions were revised as necessary), search for opportunities to improve collection during implementation while prioritizing which data can be analyzed immediately based on connection with the data collection, constant validation (through feedback and presentation, as well as round of consultations to the evaluation reference group), in depth analysis (line-by-line coding of transcriptions).

- Another component of conducting evaluations is the structure of the evaluation team. In IPA, a typical evaluation team structure is led by an academic lead (through IPA's network of academics), and composed of a lead evaluator, associate, field manager, field coordinator (who oversees the group of enumerators for qualitative interviews and ensures that everyone will be ready to discuss every night).

- IPA's key minimum must do's for data security and ethics, as well as knowledge management and transparency, are also applied to ensure that are secured and safely backed up.

- Key recommendations of the study are the following:

  - **Monitoring and evaluation (OPT missing data)** – implication: possible data manipulation (seems); not all children are covered; measurement instruments are not precise (not used or difficult to carry); lacking enough equipment for measurement

  - **Focus efforts on the barangay level** – PPAN is cascading slow, diminishes at the municipal, particularly to barangay levels; workers are overworked (doing multiple roles), plantilla position; lack of awareness of implementation fidelity of key programs, develop/strengthen M&E systems.

  - **Strengthen program that address stunting** – focus on feeding programs, F1K not captured; focus on acute malnutrition over chronic malnutrition – focus on visible programs, incentivize programs that focus on other programs.

  - **Sharpen messages around stunting** – do not see stunting as a medical concern, make simple, salient, and solvable

Potential impact evaluation ideas proposed are to: 1) improve and leverage OPT and 2) provide innovative platforms for service delivery

- Ms. Dimaisip-Nabuab further emphasized that: 1) Nutrition is not just about the feeding program and 2) the population, in general, does not provide enough attention to stunting – this affects the overall development of the child.

- Key messages:

  - Establishing minimum must-do's or criteria/standard processes on implementing an evaluation in several phases (preparatory work, data collection, validation of design and emerging findings with constant feed backing with stakeholders) are critical in ensuring that all critical information is considered while conducting this process. Primary key is to establish and understand an intervention's theory of change or logical framework at the beginning of the evaluation (design and inception phase).

  - Continuous collaboration and consultations with stakeholders, particularly with the clients/target beneficiaries and program owners are important during the implementation of the evaluation, to accordingly firm-up and adjust the methodologies, instruments, used in the different phases of evaluation; particularly during data collection, as well as for evaluators to properly understand the context of the situation/problem the intervention intends to address.

  - Always consider usability of results and prepare to adjust the evaluation's time frame, strategies, and approaches accordingly. In the case of PPAN evaluation, evaluators adjusted its time frame to ensure that findings and results are readily available to influence and serve as input during the midterm/planning adjustment of the PPAN.

  - Equity considerations in the conduct of evaluations (e.g. minority representations, cultural components, understanding of community values) should also be applied during implementation. This may include translations of interview questions or having data collectors with knowledge of local dialect, customizing tools to be used.

Table 7. Questions Raised and Corresponding Answers (Nutrition Study)

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
Joselito De Vera, PNVSCA: To start the ball rolling, I have two questions: 1) How does a stunted child look like? This is to help us visually imagine what is a stunted child (1 year, 2 years old, vs 5 years), and 2) for our young generation, is there a study on pre-natal care? How to take care of unborn child? For those young people who are not aware.	**Ms. Dimaisip-Nabuab:** I have no available photo at the moment. But the current misconception is that when a child looks normal, we assume no problem because it appears that he/she is normal. As for the second question, I have no knowledge at the moment of a related study, but the government recognizes this problem through the First One Thousand Days (F1KD) program/ policy. Through this, prenatal care is advocated and promoted to all.
Maudi Maadil, Institute of Islamic Studies, UP Diliman: From an academic research perspective, I believe that the numbers of minority affect the data collection as a whole.	**Ms. Dimaisip-Nabuab:** Okay, let me answer and rephrase the questions into how do we customize and contextualize the tools used for data collection considering the diverse

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
As I am from Mindanao, I'm interested to know how we can standardize the questionnaire, considering the diverse characteristics of the community. Also, how do we look at issue of nutrition in the aspect of Badjaos in Tawi-Tawi?	community. We first translate the guides and test them. In this study, we used semi-structure interview guides. We actually put more value to the training of interviewers because it is important for interviewers to be familiar with the context in order to provide and acquire deeper and richer story. On the question of the Badjao and other ethnic minority, we primarily refer to what are the global standards as it is. In this study, we don't have clearance to conduct interviews to indigenous peoples due to difficulty of reaching them, so they were not able to part of the study.
Rhona Montebon, Save the Children Philippines: I don't have questions but I would just like to comment that nutrition is a multi-dimensional issue. We should value the importance of looking at all the different factors that contribute to malnutrition, aggregates of packet of the different components.	Ms. Dimaisip-Nabuab thanked and acknowledged the comments of Ms. Montebon.

I think it is also important to consider the metric from the community itself, and less about the global standards. This may be more powerfully used from the case studies. It is critical to give regard to what the community thinks on the relevant components of the program implementation in their respective communities. They will know better. In the meantime, we can focus on the lowest 20% and mobilize concern for the most vulnerable of their population, to uplift the state of nutrition of the community as a whole.	
Karen Brillantes, UNDP: I just recently came from an international evaluation conference in Egypt, and one of the things we talked about is the importance of equity in conducting evaluation. How does IPA implement equity considerations in the conducting the evaluation? (i.e. gender, inclusivity, etc.)	**Ms. Dimaisip-Nabuab:** This is very much related to our primary recommendations on strengthening OPT measures. Through this, we ensure that everyone is represented in the program, regardless of status, gender, among others. We also try to address certain perceptions of parents as to how do their children fare compared with

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
	the others, and ensuring that all have properly went through the program interventions.
Marianathe Kay Misa, DSWD: I have four questions actually. 1. Did the study look into how the program was able or unable to address root causes of stunting? 2. Did study explore other programs addressing stunting? So NNC would know who to coordinate with. 3. Were cultural or special considerations taken into account during the evaluations? 4. What was NNC's response to the findings?	**Ms. Dimaisip-Nabuab:** On the first question, we prioritize considerations and tailor fit the messaging of recommendations to make it more possible for the government to respond. Second, we also recognize that programs aimed at addressing stunting are there, but needs more tweaking, to be more appropriate. Third, we considered the general view of public on stunting as genetics matter, tried to tailor fit this on the questionnaire. For areas where a different dialect is most commonly used, we have the interview guides translated to local dialect such as in Tagalog, Bisaya, and Hiligaynon. For the fourth question, I will refer you to our friends from the National Nutritional Council (NNC), Dan Salunga, who has already started acting on some of the results of the study.

implementation in their respective communities. They will know better. In the meantime, we can focus on the lowest 20% and mobilize concern for the most vulnerable of their population, to uplift the state of nutrition of the community as a whole.	**Dan Salunga, NNC:** Thank you for the wonderful presentation Ms. Jed. From our end at NNC, we have already formed a Stunting Working Group to more appropriately address the misconceptions about stunting. We are very thankful to the evaluation team as well for adjusting their timeline in order for us to immediately use the study's findings and influence the midterm updating of the PPAN implementation. At the moment, we are also leading an initiative to establish a Data Quality Audit Protocol to ensure that data are not being manipulated in the field. We are also advocating for integration of the nutrition plan in different LGU/ municipality plans. At the moment, we are on the Management Response process with NEDA and UNDP regarding this study. I'm just not sure yet if we can already share with you, but we are grateful to IPA, NEDA, and UNDP for this initiative. **Malou Eudela, NEDA M&E Staff (facilitator):** Dan is right about

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
	the MR process, this is one of the processes articulated in the draft of the National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF) Guidelines which we'll cascade to all agencies soon.

B.3.4 Break-out Session 4: Rural Road Network Development Project and LRT Study

Fourth Topic: Conducting Evaluations for transport infrastructure (Rural Road Network Development Project Study and Light Rail Transit Line Impact Evaluation 2)
Speakers: Skilty Labastilla (on behalf of Dr. Roehl Briones), CPRM Consultants, Inc. (RRNDP Study) and Cesar Umali Jr. and Manuel Jose Camagay, Certeza Infosys Corp. (LRT2 Study)
Facilitators: Paul Tatlonghari, NEDA and Jan Corrado, NEDA
Documenter: Maria Ligaya Laura Morales, UNDP

Discussion Points

RRNDP Study:

- The speaker started by asking the participants' permission to read the report prepared by their Team Leader to ensure that results are accurately conveyed. He discussed the structure of the report then proceeded with the details.
- The Rural Road Network Development Project (RRNDP) is a DPWH-implemented project with funding from the Government of Japan. RRNDP was implemented in three phases from 1991 to 2006 covering a total of 26 provinces, with a scope of 1,000 kilometers of road networks (mostly secondary roads) including 82 bridges.

- The impact study was anchored on RRNDP's Theory of Change, which postulates that the improved roads will reduce transportation cost and improve supply of transport services in the intermediate term; and improve access to health and educations services, farm incomes, employment generation and non-farm incomes in the long-term eventually contributing to an improved standard living of rural households.

- To measure project impact, CPRM looked at: (i) Total Household Income and averaged at the barangay level, (ii) Compared income in barangays traversed by RRNDP roads with non-project barangays (i.e. differences in income), (iii) Barangay data in 1990 and 2017 to compute propensity scores (e.g., population, percent of concrete/paved national roads).

- Household Survey and Process Evaluation were used as data gathering techniques.

- The Household (HH) Survey focused on generating data on variables such as HH income, transport activities, farming activities, ownership of vehicles involving a total of 3,000 samples (i.e., 15 HHs each from 100 project barangays and 100 non-project barangays) selected through random sampling. Nine provinces in project barangays were chosen while adjacent provinces and municipalities were selected in non-project barangays. Process Evaluation involved Quality Assessment (or interview of key informants) and Engineering Assessments (or field validation of projects by engineers).

- Qualitative Results were analyzed using "Before" and "After" analysis while impact evaluation used the "With" and "Without" Project.

- Overall, almost all of the projects are of adequate quality and are being heavily used. In general, the roads subprojects have achieved the intended standards and appear to be generating the full range of intended effects. Most of the subprojects have undergone subsequent improvements with funding mostly from the national government, given several years have elapsed. Eleven subprojects are rated well-maintained, four are moderately well-maintained, five are fairly well-maintained, and three are poorly maintained. All the poorly maintained roads are provincial roads, which were damaged by a big flood resulting from Typhoon Lando which affected Northern Luzon and Nueva Ecija.

- On Qualitative Assessment Results: All outcomes expected from the Theory of Change have materialized in the subproject sites (i.e., reduced travel time, increased traffic volume, ease in marketing products, more efficient access to health and education services, modal shifts, lower transport cost, greater access to markets, and no reported environmental impacts).

- Using "With" and "Without" Project scenarios, the study found out that the share of concrete paved roads in the Province and population in the municipality in 1990 are positively related to selection of a barangay as a project site. Actual project barangays, on the average, have higher predictive probability of selection compared with non-project barangays. Specifically, the impact results are:

  - Household characteristics are highly similar between project and non-project barangays. HH heads tend to have up to third year secondary schooling, on average; only 1/8 are farm operators.

  - The dominant agricultural activity is farming of crops (dominated by annual and temporary crops). Palay is the most commonly planted crop; more common types of annual crops include assorted fruits and coconuts.

  - HHs in project areas has lower travel cost per week and average travel time in project areas is much lower.

  - RRNDP local roads are rated better quality than in non-project areas.

- Transportation expense for enterprise is much lower in project areas compared with non-projects areas.

- Total HH income is lower than national average, which is consistent with the absence of urban HHs in the sample.

- On a per-capita basis, HH income is about double the national per-capita poverty threshold in 2015 (i.e., PHP 22,000).

- More than 2/3 of HH incomes come from employment, 13% from farm enterprises and the balance almost equally split between non-farm and other income sources.

- Across vehicle types, HHs in project areas owns fewer motorbikes and tricycles and slightly lower cars, vans and trucks. Overall, in project areas, there are fewer vehicles per 100 HHs compared to non-project areas.

- The speaker also shared limitations of the analysis, as follows:

  - Absence of baseline data

  - Inconclusiveness of the positive impact of RRNDP on living standards due to absence of statistically valid evidence

  - Time elapsed may have allowed numerous factors to influence standard of living of samples, and

  - Other similar road projects in non-RRNDP areas may have conferred the same types of benefits as that of RRNDP.

- Based on the findings, CPRM Consultants put forward two sets of recommendations: one focusing on M&E, and the second on the evaluation design.

  M&E-related recommendations include:

  - Invest in a GIS system and use of GIS in mapping the road projects and compiling a database of road inventory with road quality indicators without defects and road sections not traversable by regular speed.

  - A key constraint in the conduct of study was a comprehensive database on all roads and road quality at the barangay level. Most LGUs do not have database on their roads.

  - Invest in a GIS system to compile database with road networks together with indicators of road quality (e.g., presence of defects by category, road sections not traversable by regular speed)

  - The road inventory can be quickly overlaid with political boundary map to disaggregate inventory at the local jurisdictions down to the barangays, and further overlaid with the digitized or updated land use map to identify which road section directly traverse areas of economic activities (whether agricultural or non-agricultural), and area characteristics.

- Implement a GPS-enabled driving test for road quality monitoring to allow exact replication by other inspectors.

- Engineers of DPWH, LGUs and COA will benefit greatly from adopting the road quality measurement and procedure outlined in the study. The link to GPS and the recording system allows all relevant observations (e.g., road damage, road improvement) to be exactly replicated by other inspectors. The driving test provides indicators of road quality that accurately qualifies the data from the road inspection.

- **Recommendations related to Evaluation Design:** The evaluation constraints noted in the study can be readily addressed in future evaluation studies by adopting the following in the evaluation plan:

  - Design an evaluation study prior to road project implementation incorporating a baseline study of relevant HH-level variables.

- Guided by the Theory of Change, the baseline study ensures that the indicators of HH performance or well-being are measured without the project. The sampling should be large enough to allow for sufficient statistical power given a plausible effect. The variables that should be collected include:

- Barangay level: community characteristics, presence of public facilities, general terrain, land area, proportion of agricultural area, proportion of barangay roads paved

- Household level: income by source, expenses, net income, transportation activities and costs, assets, characteristics (demographic indicators by HH members). HH expenditures may also be collected for a more comprehensive measure of HH living and standards.

- Implement an end-line study within two to three years after completion of the road project. This allows sufficient time to elapse, to observe differences in HH level outcomes and local level outcomes like modal shifts without being confounded by other road improvement projects.

- Include an adequate set of "control" subjects in the baseline study. The "control" subjects (HHs, barangays, etc.) should be identified at the outset as similar to the "treatment" subjects in all respects but without receiving project intervention. "Control" HHs or barangays should be selected under a randomization strategy with suitable controls for selection bias.

- Identify control areas in such a way that they remain credible control areas at least until the end-line study. Ideally, the areas should be selected such that no similar road projects would have been implemented until the end-line would have been completed. The baseline study should be large enough such that observations that do not qualify as true control subjects at the end-line can be safely dropped without much decline in statistical power.

- Other recommendations pertaining to Road Investment and sustainability of benefits from road investment were not included as they may not be relevant in the topic.

LRT2 Study:

- The LRT2 Impact Evaluation findings were jointly presented by Mr. Umali and Mr. Camagay. Mr. Umali focused on the evaluation process and findings, while Mr. Camagay reported on the technical/engineering aspect and findings. This is aligned with the study's lesson of combining M&E expertise with sector specialties such as transport expert.

- The LRT2 Project, or Metro Manila Strategic Mass Rail Transit, is a 13.8-kilometer elevated rail line along Radial Road No. 6 conveying 175,156 to 202,333 passengers daily across eleven stations located in Santolan, Pasig City up to Recto Avenue, City of Manila.

- The impact evaluation was conducted to:

  - Ascertain whether the project appraisal assumptions were met and the intended project benefits were realized;

  - Provide lessons learned during project implementation and operation and maintenance; and

  - Capture any unintended benefits which can be attributable to the project.

- Evaluations were crafted guided by the criteria of effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and relevance. Specific questions focused on surfacing data on whether project: (i) was implemented as planned, (ii) being operated as intended, (iii) intended benefits were realized, (iv) there are unintended benefits, (v) extent of contribution to alternative transport system, and (vi) contribution to overall goal of sustained public-transport-based development.

- The LRT2 project had no Theory

of Change; the Research Team retrofitted a Theory of Change for the Project. Based on the TOC, project resources involving civil works, train equipment, capacity building activities, consultancy services and other inputs are expected to lead to a completed infrastructure and non-infrastructure outputs, which are envisioned to contribute to "sustained public transport development, safe, comfortable, efficient and affordable transport sector". In terms of societal goal, RRNDP is expected to contribute to an "inclusive growth and poverty reduction, trust and resilient society, globally competitive knowledge economy".

- The study was completed before the collision and fire incidents which happened in May, so the contents of the evaluation was not affected by these incidents.
- Emphasis on context: before the incidents, the LRT2 was performing very well.
- Overall findings: Prior to the collision and fire incidents, the LRT2 Project was performing very well.
- The results of the LRT2 are categorized into: (a) Economic Impact, (b) Construction and Implementation, and (c) Operations. Presented in an infographic manner, the specific results of the study are:

Economic Impact

- Absence of LRT2 on its current route will make the R-6 corridor Manila's most congested road.
    - LRT2 services an average of 184,476 passengers daily. It will take about 13,177 public jeepneys, or 18,488 UV express, or 38,895 cars to meet this demand, which will result to heavy traffic.
- LRT2 generates the expected impacts, as follows:
    - Reliably faster travel (about nine to nineteen minutes faster across stations within the rail line).
    - Significant travel time reduction for trips beyond east and west endpoints (i.e., 3 hours for jeepneys vs 1 hour for LRT2).
    - More than 90% of satisfied LRT2 riders enjoy three key features: comfort, safety, and affordability.
    - LRT2 riding experience can be improved when technology-based features are introduced (e.g., wi-fi connection, informative LED screens, digital payment scheme).
    - Estimated value of vehicle operating cost savings is P 92 million.
- Non-attainment of ridership projection due to "Pickrell Effect":
    - In order to win bigger budget, ridership was estimated at 510,000 daily.
    - Despite the significant impact of K-12 in 2014, the ridership projection was not met.
- Less efficient design (elevated LRT is 2.5 to 3 times more expensive).

Construction and Implementation

- Significant implementation delays:
    - Overall, LRT2 Project experienced a three-year delay in project implementation.
- Negative effects of project delays:
    - Due to project delays, price escalations in materials were experienced, and interest charges and foreign exchange risks were also experienced.
- Right-of-way acquisition and procurement are the biggest delay factors for the LRT2 project:
- Due to slow process of procurement, it took several months to a year before parts were made available. For example, there were no replacement parts for hydraulic stuff.

Operations

- Only 8 train sets out of 18 are operational:

  - LRT was originally designed to operate on eighteen train sets; each train set is composed of four cars. Only eight train sets are operation, ten sets are not operational.

  - Before the fire and collision incidents, maintenance was very good.

  - There are no reserved trains for emergency (ideally, two or four train sets should be on stand-by).

- Slow procurement process for parts and components become a major constraint to maintenance and sustainability:

  - LRT2 is different from LRT1 and MRT3; there is no inter-changeability and interoperability. LRT2 is the best light rail line in Metro Manila, but raw materials for maintenance are not readily available.

- Fair Box ratio is below 100% (i.e., revenues cannot cover operation expenses due to low daily ridership).

- Main Recommendations:

  - Expedite construction (from Santolan to Port Area) to catalyze ridership growth and facilitate small entrepreneurs from the Port Area/Divisoria to the rich untapped commercial regions of Antipolo and Montalban.

    - LRT2 was originally designed to have end-to-end operation (from Port Area to beyond Santolan). Due to delays brought by Right of Way (ROW) issues, financial difficulties and funding, construction is only up to Santolan, which is not a perfect station.

    - Construction for the Santolan to Port Area section has started; this will service Divisoria, where enterprises/ entrepreneurs are located.

    - When completed, will no longer mostly serve as a "school bus" and revenue will not be affected by school breaks, class suspensions and other academic discontinuation.

  - LRTA to immediately address parts procurement issue by collaborating with DOST, DTI, engineering universities and capable local fabrications to handle spare parts localization.

    - CPRM recognized the pro-activeness of LRTA. But LRT2 is just a 15-year old system. Maintenance is very good, except for the two incidents after the evaluatio.

    - Procurement issues really need to be addressed. "Procurement killed the day".

  - LRTA should proactively develop rail transit as core of an efficient integrated transport system closely linked to feeder modes in one to two years with serious consideration for Bus Rapid Transit.

- C5 and C6 are not yet completed; whenever a new administration comes in, the masterplan is disregarded. "I do not discount all the efforts but, forgive the term. If you deploy incompetence in deregulation, because they will decide on their own, you will experience chaos in the city."

- Mr. Umali took over to present the details on how the evaluation was conducted. In consideration to the type of participants (i.e., M&E Specialists). He attempted to add practical applications in future evaluations.

- The research team adopted five Good Practices in the conduct of evaluation, specifically on Evaluation Process/methodology:

  - Baseline-constrained evaluation approach:

    - Due to the absence of baseline data, Recall was used to generate relevant information using HH survey, Rail Rider/ Commuter Survey, and focus-group discussions.

- Secondary data like ex-post evaluation done in 2009 was mined to generate baseline data. The challenge with secondary data is care should be undertaken to ascertain data comparability and quality.

- Project Management Records like project office were also used as the issue with Recall is that it takes time, makes the questionnaire longer, and involves the risks of both unintentional and intentional distortion as a data collection tool reference. The project was started almost 3 decades ago. The Feasibility Study was no longer available because 27 years has passed since it was submitted by consultants. The Executive Summary was used in lieu of the Feasibility Study.

- Integrated Transport System Approach:

  - LRT2 Project was evaluated as a complementary system to other rail transit systems in the country. It is linked with current and future transport modes, including the Pasig Ferry System, which was also added to the analysis.

- Unintended Consequences Analysis:

  - As suggested by PIDS, the analysis hinged on the perspective that even well-meaning projects can possibly generate the opposite effects.

  - Unintended benefits include:
    (i) LRT2 as a "School Bus Service" - 44% of riders are students. Without LRT2, students will take the ground-level transport and suffer the same difficulties that regular commuters face.
    (ii) Boosting the poor man's taxi and jeep.

  - Unintended costs include:
    (i) Unintended agglomeration – various shops cropped up within the vicinity of the LRT2 Project like in Anonas Station.
    (ii) Unintended traffic generator.

- Proposed Action Plan Matrix (as suggested by NEDA)

  - To make report more useful to clients at the national, project and agency levels, a roadmap with follow-up actions for agencies (i.e., NEDA, DOTr, LRTA) was included in the evaluation report.

- Introducing Value-Adding Concepts:

  - "Pickrell Effect" – As observed in the 1990s, projections were too optimistic. This was used to contextualize original ridership projections, and the implications on project targets.

  - "Small entrepreneurs rail line" - from West to East, the LRT2 can serve as an enterprise line.

  - Right-of-Way issues should be addressed through the following approaches:

    – Inter-agency (creation of a ROW Council or Committee to address all ROW issues)

    – Project-based (Currently, ROW budget is tied to a Project)

    – Transport plan-based (recommended: based on an integrated transport plan, not just on a per-project basis).

- Certeza Infosys categorized the evaluation lessons into two categories: (i) transport-related, and (ii) research-related.

Transport Evaluation-Related Lessons:

- Complementation with other transport system – complementation between light rail services and other transport modes (the vision is not for light rail to replace any particular transport mode)

- LRT is a social investment project; it should not be subjected to the usual financial performance standards and criteria. Economic benefits are high but financial benefits are low.

- Transport plans should be legislated to be effectively funded and implemented. Such plans could serve as a basis for a plan-based ROW approach.

- Consider private sector participation - while Government promotes Public-Private Partnership, allowing the private sector to take the lead in light rail station infrastructure development could potentially compromise plans and distort the established budget.

Research-Related Lessons:

- A major deficiency in project impact evaluations is lack of baseline data. There needs to be a policy requiring that a baseline study be conducted for all major projects such as LRT2.

- The higher the degree of urbanization of the target survey area, the more survey respondents are sensitive to the day and time – and duration – of interview. This is a phenomenon that should be recognized in future surveys (budget implication).

- A better document filing/ archiving system can help improve the access of future evaluation teams to major references. Such a system, which can consist of physical and/ or electronic files, will also serve to support greater institutional learning.

- An evaluation requires an inter-disciplinary, "balanced" approach. With a statistics driven approach, stat tools may produce impressive data but so what? To what extent are the data meaningful from the impact evaluation perspective, from the transport perspective?

▪ In summary, the Key Messages of the RRNDP and LRT Study in terms of conducting evaluations, lessons learned and use of results in informing programs and policies are as follows:

"What have been your lessons learned? How is it currently being used to inform programs and policies?"

On Conducting Evaluations (How do you conduct evaluations for transport infrastructure):

- Both studies were anchored on the projects' Theory of Change.

- The two studies used qualitative and quantitative methods in data gathering. Qualitative method involved FGDs, interviews with the beneficiaries, LGU officials while Quantitative analysis used "before and after", "with and without" project scenarios.

- Quasi-experimental with propensity score matching was used for the impact evaluation of RRNDP.

- Ensuring similarities of characteristics of Treatment and Control Groups for RRNDP.

On Lessons Learned:

- The study stresses the importance of baseline data in analysis of impact; hence it should be part of project design.

- Significance increase in income cannot be established due to several years that elapsed since project completion, and the absence of baseline data.

- For social projects, parameters of project success should be more on economic benefits, rather than financial benefits.

- For projects located in urban areas, households are available at night. This has cost implications to data gathering (survey, interview), and should be considered in the evaluation design.

- Importance of interdisciplinary approach in the conduct of evaluations.

- Right-of-way (ROW) issues contributed to delay of project implementation; addressing these issues should be pursued as a Transport System-wide concern rather than on a per-project basis.

- Secondary data may be used in the absence of baseline data as basis for evaluation. But, there is a need to ascertain data comparability and quality.

On Influencing Programs/Policies:

- This is premature at this stage. The studies were recently concluded and reports are still being prepared.

Table 8. Questions Raised and Corresponding Answers (RRNDP and LRT2 Studies)

Questions	Response
Did the consultants try to look for the Feasibility Study (FS)? Was FS used for the RRNDP Project?	**Mr. Umali, Certeza Infosys:** We did not find the complete baseline study but, luckily, we found the Executive Summary which provides enough data. **Mr. Camagay, Certeza Infosys:** If I may add something on the FS. Along the way, we discovered LRT2 is like an extension of LRT1. If you notice, right now, LRT1 is operated by LRMC. At first, it was supposed to be an extension of LRT1 so the premise was something more the existing line extended from East to West. So there was no FS because of that scenario. That explains why the lack of data because LRT1 even subsidized LRT2. But with the joint venture, that separates LRTA from LRMC.
How was the issue on "control" and "treatment" groups approached? How was similarity ensured between the two groups?	**Mr. Umali, Certeza Infosys:** Yes, this was a very important feature of the evaluation design. The treatment was the R6 (Aurora Boulevard Corridor), the control is R7 (Quezon Avenue).
What is the methodology used?	**Mr. Umali, Certeza Infosys:** We used both quantitative and qualitative analytical methodologies. We did not dwell on these because these are standard methodologies.
Facilitator recapped the question for Dr. Briones: Sir, the question in three parts, basically: (i) What was the methodology used? (ii) Did we refer to the FS? (iii) How did we ensure the similarity between the control and treatment groups?	**Dr. Briones, RRNDP: (via Skype)** Okay, thank you for the question. (Technical problems encountered at this point). We did consider the Feasibility Study. Unfortunately, given the time constraints, we were not able to reflect that part in the presentation. But certainly, in the full report, you will see that we went through not just the Feasibility Study but also the several rounds of evaluation that went after it. In fact, we based the design of our impact evaluation based on what was already done and not done in these previous studies.

Questions	Response
	Now, the methodology uses a comparison of treatment and control with matching of treatment and control based on propensity scores. Now what does this mean, and why are we going to this method? We want to make sure that your treatment barangays, the project barangays and the non-project barangays, and in the presentation, it was already described how they were sampled. Despite all the care we took in making the selection, talagang comparable sila (they really are comparable). How do we know that? It should be the case that when you compare a treatment barangay and a non-treatment barangay, they would have had an equal chance before the project happens of being selected as a project site. Now we looked at the Feasibility Study and saw that there were several factors used to screen which areas would actually have RRNDP subprojects. Because of these criteria, there is a possibility that when you measure incomes today, after the project, what you're measuring is not

	really your RRNDP subproject but actually the criteria used to screen the barangays for participation in the RRNDP. So how do you control for that? We used the probability of selection methodology based on propensity scores. It's a fairly acceptable technique in the evaluation literature. It is not exactly experimental but it tries to approximate an experimental set-up by identifying which treatment barangays are properly matched with which control barangays. If you do the matching fairly carefully, it turns out that, as the results showed, we cannot really find a statistically big difference enough in the living standards measures, may be income, between the treatment and control barangays. We have to be very careful that we are actually capturing the set of many, many road improvement projects in these two different areas. So, because in Phase 1 and Phase 2 there were so many years elapsed as documented in our engineering

Questions	Response
	evaluation, that there were so many additional improvements, so it could be possibly be the case that because, well, the government did its job, even in the control barangays, nag-level up na din ang living standards ng mga households doon, na almost equal na din sila sa mga households ng RRNDP barangays (their living standards have levelled up so much that they're already comparable to households in RRNDP barangays). So we could not rule that out, but definitely what we found in the study did not support a significant impact of RRNDP.
Engr. Alex Accio, NEDA 6, for LRT 2 consultants: Sir, parang hindi na-capture yung other benefits ng LRT2: (Sir, it seems that the other benefits of LRT2 were not captured:) Yung number 1 is yung Savings natin sa CO2 emissions kasi LRT2 trains are electrically-driven. So pag wala ito at sumakay sila sa petrol-driven passenger vehicles, grabe yung contribution sa CO2. Yung project has a climate change-mitigating benefit. (The first is the Savings on CO2 Emissions given that LRT2 trains are electric-driven. Without the project, passengers will use petrol-driven vehicles that greatly contributes to CO2 emission.) Yung isa pang impact ay yung sa health ng tao kasi if you commute using the passenger vehicle, yung exposure mo sa fumes pag na-trap sa traffic is malaki. So maybe tinignan din siguro yung maybe decrease in incidence of respiratory problems. (Another impact is on the commuters' health due to high exposure to fumes especially during traffic. You may want to look at decrease in respiratory problems.) And then number three, kung pwede sana, tinignan din yung impact to family noong wala pa yung LRT section kasi: 1. Pag nag-commute ka, lalo na pauwi, you'll wait mga 45 minutes to 1 hour bago makasakay because of the turn-around. And then kung makasakay ka naman, additional delay kasi ma-trap ka din sa traffic.	**Mr. Camagay, Certeza Infosys:** Okay, let me summarize. One is emission, second is health, third is family time, and the fourth is cost of congestion vs. productivity. First, emission is being addressed in the study but the presentation is more on benefits, good practices and lessons learned. But in our study, of course, we considered that. However, the projection at that time the LRT2 is supposed to reduce car use by 600,000. Overtime, this has been cancelled. If you are aware of the ride hailing service (there is only 1 prominent, Grab). The President of Grab came to the office a month ago, he was proposing some kind of a partnership, and he updated me about Summer last year. Grab daily bookings is 600,000 – 758,000. I don't have anything against Grab, he is a friend. It is addressed. Second, health of course is addressed. But, gladly, there is modernization program for __ but under the Transport Cooperatives. The modernization program is supposed to provide safe, economically viable, environmentally safely public transport. It's taking time because there is no republic act or executive order to back it up. That is why there is some kind of resistance. But it is on the way, we are doing a lot of cash-in plans which we are doing also in DOTr.

Questions	Response
So ano ang effect sa family. So students, working parents, makarating sila earlier sa bahay, makaluto yung parents, makagawa ng homework ang mga students. So in other words, there is increased family time. (And third, can you also look at the impact of increased family time [due to savings in travel time] brought about by the LRT2?) And then lastly, we heard on radio that JICA came up with the estimate of Php 3.5 billion daily losses due to the traffic in Manila. Sana tinignan how they compute it kasi pwedeng mag-compute din ng prevention of traffic-related losses caused by labor productivity, and other things kung ma-late yung deliveries, etc. May corresponding financial costs so maganda sana kung kinompute yan to see how much ang idinagdag sa economic losses. (I hope you could also look at how JICA computed it so you could also compute for the traffic-related economic losses from lost labor time and productivity and late delivery of goods and services, among others.)	Family time is inevitable. One way of another, we have to consider that but not fully captured in the study. However, it's not fully captured in the study. What we can only capture is the use of time. When we tried to cover the entire stretch to Recto, LRT2 construction paved the way for a lot of condominiums to be built along the way, regardless who are the owners. The main target of these condominiums is either students or BPO employees, mostly workers because these are transient people who need a space in the urban community. The point is, separation from the family is inevitable in pursuit of employment. Fourth, cost of congestion. Overtime, I have seen various projections. The first time that I've seen that is in mid-2000 projected by World Bank, and over the years it has been updated. I've always been put to ask how did you commute? It can be produced from projection but we don't know the exact formula. We can project our own but who can compare assumptions;
	it's subjective. It's good that we have some kind of representative value which can be translated. Of course, delay across the world translates to loss of productivity. The best alternative was prepared decades ago, flexi time, work from home so you do not have to commute and all the other alternatives to avoid commuting. **Facilitator:** I'm sorry sir, we have to wrap up. On the last question, maybe you could address it through Attendify. On the detriment analysis, unintended benefits, I think it was captured in LRT2, right? Can we answer for RRNDP, was it also part of the study somehow? Dr. Briones, there is a question on whether the unintended benefits of the project was also considered in the study. Could you also respond to that very briefly sir because we are running out of time.
L. Santiago, NEDA Central Luzon: I am referencing my question based from what Dr. Racelis said yesterday. She said that evaluation should also include unintended, either benefits or	**Dr. Briones, CPRM:** We were also able to cover that through the Process Evaluation part where we asked residents around, the officials in LGUs whether there were some

Questions	Response
detriment analysis in evaluation. She highlighted the concerns of displaced affected families or businesses, particularly to LRT2, due to right of way. My question is whether this concern included in the completed evaluation? And if not, maybe we can include this aspect in future evaluations.	problems with drainage and so on. We have to remember that many of these subprojects are actually existing roads but in a poor condition. Essentially there was just a repaving of existing. There is not much, in that case. Iba yung (It's different in the case of a) totally new road that you [will have to build along] a hinterland or wilderness; that could have some of these erosion protection, etc., especially in the upland areas. But I don't think any of the RRNDP roads were like that.
Ahmed Cegara, LBP: My question would relate to the Theory of Change for RRNDP. I would like to ask: 1. I'd like to request clarity: When you were measuring the improvement in standard of living, why there was focus on farm income as opposed to (as I understood it from the presentation) increase in income as a whole whether farm-related or not, for the places affected by the study.	**Dr. Briones, CPRM:** If I can just quickly talk about farm income and getting income from other sources. Farm income was emphasized because that is precisely what was used in the FS to justify this project in the first place. But over the decades, it's not just farm income that was important but also non-farm income in the villages that were affected. But we managed to capture that as well in our survey instruments as well as in the Theory of Change.
2. In the context of learning on how to get data: During your study, did you get data individually (from individual families)? Or was there also a possibility of you getting data from the government offices, the municipalities for a more robust set of data for measuring improvement in standard of living?	And finally, we had to elicit income data from the affected and unaffected households because government surveys, the sampling frame or sampling design of those surveys did not take into account the very specific geography of RRNDP subprojects.

- Due to limited time, some of the participants were not able to raise their questions in plenary. The facilitator asked those concerned to send questions privately to the speakers.

- After the pending questions were answered by the speakers, the facilitator wrapped up the session. He summarized that the group discussed how to conduct evaluation for transport sector and heard some of the lessons learned. But that the last objective of how the results informed future programs and policies is still premature. The reports are still being finalized, and Management Response will be required of the concerned agencies based on the results of the studies. With that, the facilitator thanked everyone who attended the session and called the speakers on stage for the awarding of tokens.

B. 4 Learning Session 1: M&E Systems and Tools

This session looked at innovative technologies in data collection, practical application of big data analysis, community and participatory tools used in monitoring hazards. The sharing of DAR and UNICEF's actual experience in building, maintaining, and improving a well-functioning RBME was not pursued due to unavailability of agency representatives to discuss the topic.

Sub-group facilitators managed the learning sessions. In general, NEDA facilitators started with an overview of the topic/session, followed by an introduction of the speakers prior to their presentation, then opening the floor to question-and-answer to surface questions and clarifications which were addressed by the speakers.

B.4.1 Break-out Session 1: Tech and Innovation for M&E

1st Topic: Technology and Innovation for M&E
Speaker: Engr. Czar Jakiri Sarmiento, College of Engineering, UP Diliman in behalf of Ms. Claire Reyes, DOST-PCIEERD
Facilitator: AD Jesse David, Monitoring and Evaluation Staff, NEDA
Documenter: Rainier Requinala, UNDP

Discussion Points

Case of DOST Partnership in M&E and other related initiatives:

- AD David, NEDA, introduced the resource speaker for the breakout session, Engr. Czar Jakiri of the UP College of Engineering, who delivered the presentation of Ms. Claire Reyes as the latter was not able to attend the M&E Forum and asked Engr. Sarmiento to represent her instead.

- Engr. Sarmiento shared that the Department of Science and Technology (DOST) has been investing a lot of resources in establishing the foundations of monitoring and evaluation in a scientific or science-based manner. The Philippine Council for Industry, Energy, and Emerging Technology Research and Development (PCIEERD), which is one of the three sectoral planning councils of the DOST. Because of its very long name, PCIEERD is just being referred to as Innovation Council.

- PCIEERD is mandated to serve as the central agency in the formulation of policies, plans, and programs as well as the implementation of strategies in the industry, energy and emerging technologies sectors and several science and technology programs. PCIEERD funds initiatives that are science-based, conferences and people who are doing things that are in line with the three aforementioned sectors.

- PCIEERD is mandated to provide:

  - **Support for Research and Development**: PCIEERD/ Innovation Council provides financial assistance to research projects that are consistent with the priorities of the national government. These grants may be availed by research institutions, government and industry. As a tip to the attendees, Engr. Sarmiento said that the PCIEERD does not set a limit to funding for as long as the project is useful. It will usually elevate it to DOST if the funding requirements are quite high.

  - **Human Resource and Institution Development**: To advance human resource and institution development, PCIEERD encourages Filipino researchers to be more productive by providing support for disseminating their research outputs. It also aims to strengthen the capability of institutions to undertake research in S&T fields included in PCIEERD priority areas.

  - **S&T Information Dissemination and Promotion**: PCIEERD facilitates access to and utilization of information and research results by the industry, the business sector, and other potential technology users.

- **Support for Technology Transfer and Commercialization:** PCIEERD wants to provide support for accelerating transfer and commercialization of technologies generated from the Innovation Council or DOST supported projects.

- **Policy Development and Advocacy**: PCIEERD analyzes, reviews, formulates, and recommends policies and regulations to support the development of priority sectors of the Innovation Council. The activities are pursued in collaboration with experts, technology users, and other stakeholder groups of the Council. The Innovation Council provides R&D support to 21 sectors generally categorized under industry, energy, emerging technology, and special concerns such as Climate Change Adaptation, Disaster Reduction and Management, the Environment and Human Security.

- DOST has prepared a harmonized national research and development agenda to provide innovative solutions that will benefit Filipinos, particularly the poor, through a problem-focused approach to multi-disciplinary and multi-institutional research and development (R&D) collaboration.

  It is aligned with Ambisyon Nation 2040 and is founded on the three pillars of Malasakit, Pagbabago at Kaunlaran (Concern, Reform, and Development). In the past years, PCIEERD/Innovation Council only looked at the outputs of the grants-in-aid projects but with the new M&E Protocol approved in 2019, PCIEERD/Innovation Council shall be looking at the end-to-end process to include outcomes and socio-economic impacts of the project. PCIEERD/Innovation Council is looking at the long-term effects of the projects which may entail some extra groundwork but in the long run it will ensure that each project is going to be sustainable and effective.

- Engr. Sarmiento noted that the targeted impact indicators include academic, policy, economic and civic. The PCIEERD/Innovation Council has some criteria for each targeted impact indicators, as follows:

  - Academic: Publications and citations; Human Capital Development.
  - Policy: Science-based policies; reliance of NGAs on R&D.
  - Economic: Commercialization, competitiveness, regional development.
  - Civic: Equity, community, environment.

- In the Philippines, space technology and its applications are envisioned to support informed decision-making and policy formulation towards more coherent and systematic governance, socio-economic development, poverty alleviation as well as environmental, natural resources and disaster management. Given its mandate to develop, integrate and coordinate research systems for S&T in the country, the DOST/PCIEERD aims to broaden and optimize the use of space technologies in delivering key national programs.

- Recently, DOST-DBM signed a Memorandum of Understanding which aims to utilize digital imaging for monitoring and evaluation (DIME) of high-value government projects. It is hoped that the project would trickle down to smaller government projects.

  Project DIME was launched at a press conference called “Breakfast with Ben” at DBM on March 7, 2018. MOU aims to utilize DOST-developed technologies and expertise on data acquisition and management to be used for DBM’s monitoring of government projects and show the cost-effectiveness of technology interventions in DBM’s project management.

- During the first year of the MOU, Project DIME was pilot tested in two of the top 10 projects funded by the government, namely, the National Communal Irrigation System of the NIA and the National Greening Program of the DENR. During the same year, the two pilot DIME projects under a program titled "Geospatial Monitoring System for High Value Projects funded by DBM" were conceptualized and submitted to PCIEERD for possible funding by the UP-Training Center for Applied Geodesy and Photogrammetry (TCAGP), which is the research arm of the UP Department of Geodetic Engineering. The two pilot projects are the Monitoring and Assessment of Planting Activities (MAPA) and Other Applications (including Marawi Assessment) while the other project is the Remote Assessment for Irrigation Networks (RAIN). Project RAIN was handled by Engr. Mark Tupas. The team handling Project RAIN encountered difficulties in terms of data gathering due to the physical network of our irrigation system.

- Engr. Sarmiento explained the advantages and disadvantages of satellite-based monitoring systems. The advantage is that you can see the status of your project at the general level. In other words, you can find your pain points and be able to send people to provide solutions immediately. He made a disclaimer though that it is not the answer to everything. There were limitations to be considered. Under Project RAIN for instance, there were problems encountered in detecting the project sites as some of the irrigation channels were quite small. The team had to employ alternative methods of data gathering just to be able to detect the small channels.

- These R&D endeavors provided solution that is science-based and data-driven. Insights gained through data analytics and big data are also being managed. In addition, a series of training/capacity building of key personnel were also conducted for sustainability. Engr. Sarmiento commented that one of their learnings is that one-time training is not enough to transfer the technology. There should be continuous engagement with the concerned agencies to ensure the sustainability of the program.

DOST hopes that, through capacity building and technology transfer, this M&E process of Project DIME can be further improved and used continuously.

- The PEDRO Center in the Advanced Science and Technology Institute is one of the many data sources of Project DIME and other Science and Technology Application (STA) projects. It serves as multi-ground receiving and control station for Diwata-1 and 2 and other optical and radar satellites or future satellites of the Philippines. Another ground receiving station was recently launched in Davao, Philippines, which is the biggest one in the country. Engr. Sarmiento said that having a ground receiving station would allow the Philippines to get satellite imagery fast, which can be very helpful in certain cases such as during the aftermath of disasters.

- One of the major projects funded by DOST include the use of Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) and Automatic Identification System (AIS) for innovative terrestrial and maritime monitoring and evaluation. The SAR is a type of satellite image and multi spectral images are areas in the electromagnetic spectrums that cannot be seen by the human eyes but can be seen by satellites. SARs not just rely on the visuals, but rely on sounds, which means that if the cloud cover is high you can still capture information on the ground. Engr. Sarmiento noted that research applications to be developed aims to benefit the different government agencies, higher education institutions, the public and private sectors. He said that if you request data from PEDRO or from DATOS or from PCIEERD and you will use the data for operations, DOST will not charge the agency as long as it's for government projects or academic applications.

- DOST also has a Remote Sensing and Data Science Helpdesk also known as DATOS, which capitalizes on the current advancements of computing technology and applies it in the fields of Geographic Information

Systems (GIS), Remote Sensing (RS), Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Data Science to provide maps and other information for disaster risk reduction and other applications such as agricultural and infrastructure monitoring. DATOS performs the following functions:

- Evaluates requests and distribute available RS / GIS data from the archive using data sharing policies,
- Serves as processing and distribution center of RS / GIS data before, during and after a typhoon event utilizing available RS data in CoARE, PEDRO, open source, Sentinel and UN-ESCAP, among other sources,
- Develops new RS/GIS applications and conduct further research on data science (including storage analytics software/platform),
- Coordinates and collaborates with mandated agencies in validating the accuracy and acceptability of processed outputs for distribution.

■ DATOS was able to secure commitment from various institutions to invest bigger in M&E systems, competencies and infrastructure to better track and manage results of key social and economic programs:

- On traffic management, the De La Salle University has created a software application for contactless apprehension of traffic violators or CATCH-ALL. This can detect the type of vehicle, profile plate number and vehicle, and record violations into a database.
- The University of the Philippines, on the other hand, developed a Local Traffic Simulator (LocalSim) that is intended to serve as a decision support system of road and traffic engineers and planners to help solve traffic management problem. LOCALSIM was developed with the specific intention of replicating and animating the effect of local driving behaviors.
- USHER or Universal Structural Health Evaluation and Recording (USHER) system is a cost effective 24/7 structural health monitoring system for buildings and bridges which enables economical and hassle free compliance to the National Building Code. It provides and uses sensors to assess building damage immediately after earthquakes and helps prevent casualties by providing periodic building occupancy suitability and safety parameters to allow owners to maintain structural integrity.

■ DOST's Project SPARTA aims to put in place the necessary online education, R&D mechanisms, and infrastructure not only to enable the industry of data science and analytics, but also to foster smart governance practices.

■ Currently, there is a DOST-wide harmonization of the Information Management System, DOST's M&E tool which aims to provide public access, data analytics and dashboards complete with visualization and interpretation as a decision-support tool for every project manager and decision-maker.

■ To wrap up the presentation, Engr. Sarmiento relayed Ms. Reyes message that in light of the positive developments and trends in using technology in M&E, it is important to have collaboration among various stakeholders. By working together, stakeholders can maximize the resources that they have and optimize its utilization to create greater impact for the country and for the economy. Just like the case of M&E success story with DBM, DOST-PCIEERD aims to forge new and similar partnerships with local and international institutions.

■ To make the most of the time allotted for the break-out sessions, Mr. Sarmiento went directly to his presentation instead of entertaining questions for the presentation he just gave on behalf of Ms. Reyes.

DIME Project 1: Monitoring and Assessment of Planting Activities and other Applications (MAPA[2])

- Engr. Sarmiento provided a general background of Project MAPA, or the Monitoring and Assessment of Planting Activities and other Applications. He noted that the project was proposed to the Innovation Council through the Project DIME of DBM. He explained that DOST which has two cycles of funding proposals annually, prioritizes projects that are aligned with national government priorities.

- Project MAPA was implemented by a team of seven highly qualified professionals from August 2018 to August 2019. The five objectives of the project were as follows:

  - Gather baseline data related to NGP and its monitoring.
  - Conduct exploratory research on the level of applicability of using RS data in forest monitoring & assessment.
  - Detailed analysis of the NGP monitoring efforts on selected sites using remotely-sensed data.
  - Develop a procedural monitoring system suited for the NGP using available RS data.
  - Turnover of the procedural monitoring system to DBM.

- Engr. Sarmiento commented that during the course of their research they found out that because of the complexity of the process, there were some documentary requirements that seem to be unnecessary or not suitable for use in monitoring and evaluation.

- With regard to the details of the NGP monitoring efforts on selected sites using remotely-sensed data, Engr. Sarmiento reported that there were some issues encountered such as site – species mismatch, monitoring & accessibility issues and site performance in terms of plant growth.

- Engr. Sarmiento shared the gains and outputs of the project, as follows:

  - Gather baseline data related to NGP and its monitoring.
  - Conduct exploratory research regarding the level of applicability of using RS data in forest monitoring and assessment.
  - Provide a detailed analysis of the NGP monitoring efforts on some selected/priority sites using available RS datasets.
  - Develop a procedural monitoring system suited for the NGP and other reforestation efforts using available RS data.
  - Turnover of the procedural monitoring system to DBM.

Table 9. Questions Raised and Corresponding Answers (Case of DOST Partnership in M&E and other related initiatives and Project DIME)

Questions	Response
Mr. Merwin Salazar, SEPO: Are the projects of DOST mainly focused on applying new technologies in monitoring existing programs and projects?	**Engr. Sarmiento:** It is both for existing and proposed.
In light of the fact that the Philippines has been lagging in terms of technology adoption relative to other countries, are we doing something in terms of incorporating industry 4.0 in the M&E design? Are we monitoring how industries are adapting to the new technology?	**Engr. Sarmiento:** I am not from DOST so I can only surmise that DOST's answers could be based on my knowledge. What DOST has been trying to do is to encourage grassroots development. They have a start-up week. They also have a Balik Scientist program and there is going

Questions	Response
Are we monitoring how government agencies are adapting to the new technology? How do these input to policy or program formulation if we already doing that?	to be a Balik Scientist Convention. In terms of monitoring, the Innovation Council has started applying international standards (ISO accreditation) in their procedures just so it can absorb proposals or technologies from other countries. Based on my experience as a project proponent, DOST has an intensive evaluation process. They are asking not just for the outputs of the research project but also for the perceived outcomes. They are also looking for things such as who is going to be the collaborating agency for the project and who are the possible competitors of the project in the market. If in case there are already existing competitors in the market, you have to prove that your technology is more cost-effective than your competitors. If Innovation Council found out that the project would need more funding after the initial evaluation, then the project would be elevated to the DOST executive committee.

From a policy standpoint could we get some information about the results of the monitoring activities that the DOST has been undertaking? In particular, we would like to get risk monitoring results.	**Engr. Sarmiento:** The information is available but the requestor should just have to go through the channels to obtain the information. For legislative purposes, the information can be shared as they are not that sensitive. However, there is information that is quite sensitive and cannot be publicized to avoid getting misinterpreted.
Commission on Audit: I am from the Commission on Audit and doing specific monitoring of reforestation contracts, which runs to millions of pesos. The requirement is the contractor should be able to plant a certain number of trees using certain types of species. Is it possible for the competition and are there still available data in the system in terms of this specific requirements including information that could determine mortality rates and the specific heights of the trees based on the agreed contract schdule?	**Engr. Sarmiento:** It is possible to check in the system on the contractors' profile their track record and what are their contractual obligations.

Questions	Response
Eden Garcia, NIA: Are you going to cascade Project DIME so that other agencies can use if for monitoring purposes?	**Engr. Sarmiento:** It is still being fixed.
Ms. Llarina Mojica, Program Monitoring and Evaluation, Department of Environment and Natural Resources: What are the parameters used in selecting the NGP sites? Is it related to the availability of funds similar to how the COA chooses sites for conducting their performance audits?	**Engr. Sarmiento:** Based on what I know, the selection of the site is basically to have one site each representing Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao.
Is there a certain threshold with regard to the height of the trees for the Project MAPA to be able to detect the existence of the trees in a certain project site?	**Engr. Sarmiento:** Indeed, Project MAPA has limitations with regard to detecting the height of a tree that is why, as I was saying earlier, it was not a perfect solution. However, based on the data that is being generated, Project MAPA can help see the trend whether there are trees growing or none. If there are areas that seem to be non-conforming, it doesn't mean that it's already a failure but could just indicate an early warning of the
	contractor getting behind project delivery schedule. At least there is no need to physically inspect every site just to see their actual status.
The NGP has been established since 2011. What is the timeline of the MAPA study?	**Engr. Sarmiento:** If I not mistaken the timeline they used is from 2011 to 2018.
Ms. Katherine Lingan, Department of National Defense: Has there been instances when you were able to come up with an M&E system that was already "too little, too late"? What are the challenges being faced when it comes to technological injection with regard to M & E?	**Engr. Sarmiento:** The number one challenge being faced by DOST and DBM is the timing of government processes. I am not saying that the government processes are necessarily wrong but are something that DOST and DBM need to deal with in spite of their intentions to fast track urgent and important programs and projects.
Mr. Julius Dumangas, Congressional Policy and Budget Research Department, House of Representatives: I see the potential of applying technology in M&E in particular to assist the House Committee on Public Accounts whose main mandate is to examine	**Engr. Sarmiento:** The short answer is yes it can be done. However, the long answer is that there may be constraints with regard to the procurement procedures of the government that might make the development of technological solutions to address these problems

Questions	Response
all the reports and various issues related to projects. Annually, we have to review more than 300 audit reports produced by COA. During the initial meeting of the committee, it encountered problems regarding agenda setting. I was wondering if there are efforts on the part of the Commission on Audit to help the committee in its oversight functions. With the volume of reports we get from the Commission on Audit the Public Accounts committee is getting overwhelmed on what issues to prioritize. Perhaps DOST or UP can develop some technological tools to help create a better database that government agencies could build and use that in turn could help aid in legislation.	quite some time. I suggest taking a look at previous projects of the DOST that might be more useful in terms of the particular needs of the Congress. An example of this project is the Eco project developed by the Camarines Sur State University. I suggest you look for a possible partner such as from the computer science department of an academic institution, who can do database management and process optimization to help Congress or the Commission on Audit automate the reports.

- AD David thanked everyone who attended the breakout session and suggested to just post the other questions in the Attendify app. Engr. Sarmiento stated that they can also email him at **cssarmiento@up.gov.ph**.

B.4.2 Break-out Session 2: Big Data Analysis

2nd Topic: Big Data Analysis
Speaker: Pia Faustino, Thinking Machines Data Science
Facilitators: Kathleen Virtusio, NEDA and Marco Cayosa, NEDA
Documenter: Kristina Angeli Lopez, UNDP

Discussion Points

- The session focused on Thinking Machine (TM)'s experience in using technology, specifically big data, in helping the government and public sector in a data-driven and evidence-based decision making.

- When speaking of big data, one may think that it should be involving massive loads of data. However instead of thinking that way, big data can be looked at as an ecosystem that is comprised of 3 components: crumbs, capacities, and communities. We need to engage these parts when planning in making use of big data in development and monitoring and evaluation (M&E).

- One of the challenges that M&E faces and where big data can help is limited data. Big data is an alternative way of gathering large sources of data that can help in measuring and achieving indicators, without spending too many resources that a traditional data collection required.

  It can also help in providing contexts where a program operates that can further help in designing the program. And it can also address the problem of data collection where machine learning can be optimized to accelerate and find patterns that are not obvious for humans to find.

- An example of TM's work that can be useful for government and public sector is mapping poverty of the country for every 18km2 through Google's satellite imagery, NASA's nighttime luminosity, and OpenStreetMap's roads, river and points of interest. These datasets were put together and treated as proxy for a ground-truth data set (2017 Demographic and Health Survey) for estimating average household wealth. They trained a model to look for indicators and visual features of wealth provided by DHS (tin roof, concrete floor, appliances, etc.) in Google's satellite images. Instead of conducting the survey every year, which is very costly, this model makes the process of looking at these visual cues, automated, which can then help in estimating the wealth indices of a given place in the country.

- Another example is their project involving the transport sector, which used data from Waze to understand traffic patterns in Metro Manila, specifically, BGC's one-way scheme. They determined which parts of BGC, and which time of the day did the average speed went up/down on road segments.

- Another is a project with ADB and DOH that maps health care facilities using satellite imagery, vis-à-vis the previously mentioned wealth index. They estimate the nearest health care facility in those communities that have quite a few vulnerable members, and within a 2-hour travel time, which communities are within the radius of these facilities and which are not.

- Last example is their project with the World Bank - who wishes to track how money was spent on different government road projects using different big databases from DBM, DPWH, PhilGEPS – where same projects have different project names and titles but have a certain level of similarity. They built a natural language process (NLP) model to determine which project titles are similar to one another. Although making the algorithm is long, the time saved in the long run in using this algorithm is beneficial.

- However, there are still challenges when working with big data – what are the right data crumbs to get, where to get an available ground truth data to build these models, and how will decision makers make use of the data. But these challenges should not hinder the government and the public sector in using big data in development and M&E.

Table 10. Questions Raised and Corresponding Answers (Big Data Analysis)

Questions	Response
From Attendify: One challenge identified in using big data is privacy concern, data privacy protection, and data sharing, can this be addressed?	**Ms. Faustino, Thinking Machines** Yes, it can of course, from the very beginning when the project is being planned, we need to understand first "okay what big data resources are we collecting and are there personal identifying information (PII) in this big data sources?" So the big data sources we have worked with don't have PI information in them. For example, satellite imagery, it's not tied to any individual, it could just be what the landscape looks like from high above. On Waze data, Waze provides access to their data but not at the user level, so they already take that into consideration. When sharing their data, they only provide aggregated data, so the traffic lines on the map we use when we're analyzing

Questions	Response
Eden Garcia, NIA: Are you going to cascade Project DIME so that other agencies can use if for monitoring purposes?	for traffic speed you can't tie them to specific users traveling at that time. It's only "at this time, this is the average speed of Waze users who pass through these roads." But we don't know exactly who they are. So, I think in the data sources, you need to think of that, as well, and then generally like if it's a project sector company that's providing data to us, we ask that when we start the project, that they scrub their data first. So, we basically ensure that they don't include any personal identifying information in the database before they share it with us. So, we usually run private data assessment on those projects we handle.
Kathleen Virtusio, NEDA: It is in relation to the data privacy act. So that's a major concern for everyone.	**Ms. Faustino:** I don't know all the details about data privacy act and how they might connect to big data. Can somebody make the question more specific perhaps?

Jocelyn Tendenilla, DICT: Hi. You mentioned that you were able to work with government implementing agencies and private companies. May I ask what the challenges were when you had that partnership? Challenges in terms of applying big data analysis	**Ms. Faustino:** Maybe to start with specific projects, the last project, our main client there was actually World Bank and so we were working with datasets that came from the government although it is World Bank that we work with. So, one of the challenges we found was, again, moving the POC (proof of concept) to implementation. Or to roll out. So, we did develop a proof of concept, algorithm, but I think at that time it was 2016 so nagpalit ng administrasyon (there was a political transition). So even then after that we actually tried to scale up the algorithm and really integrate multiple databases, so I think that is probably one challenge. It's definitely like you know, nag change ng priorities, baka hindi matuloy yung project (political priorities change at the expense of a project's continuity), or just generally try to integrate these different agencies and I think they have different systems and different priority projects so that maybe one challenge to coordinate many different stakeholders and try

Questions	Response
	to find a system that works to different databases. Some other challenges: We're currently working with ADB and the DOH on this project that tries to look into health facilities – where health facilities are located. And so, I think in that project for example one challenge is validating the locations of these datasets and geospatial datasets, for the analysis to work, they have to be precise. The location where the hospital or primary health care facility, etc., we have to know that its validated and that requires some manual looking through the data to make sure that the coordinate is really on the right place. So I think in general, data quality is also a challenge. I think there is also the challenge that many datasets are not being readily available in machine readable format. So I think there's a wealth of data that's in maybe PDFs or in documents that are across multiple location. So I think one challenge where data learning machinery can help would be is to put those data in a format that an algorithm can work with. Can train on. So how can you get those all unstructured data into machine readable format. That in itself is a project. And do the other fancy stuff unless you get the data first in a flat file. So that's a big challenge too.
From Attendify: You mentioned satellite images can be data. how can you process it to come up with analytics that can be reported to the management.	**Ms. Faustino:** Yes, satellite imagery is a sample of big data because these images are very large. They're very large files and they're looking at terabytaes of data for the entire country in one time. That's what exactly we're trying to do. Is to take these huge masses of images and then build an algorithm that can just extract relevant indicators that can then be visualized or analyzed by government or non-profit research agencies. So if you're interested in analyzing the average HH wealth for 18km2 in the PH, you don't need all the images right? You just need those numbers. And so that's exactly what I think is the power of these computer vision algorithms is to extract the structured data from the unstructured data.

Questions	Response
Cecilia Austria, NHA: I'm just wondering what skills and expertise are needed so that the government sector can also do this kind of big data analysis. And don't need to hire agencies. But maybe they can do it on their own. What would you suggest?	**Engr. Sarmiento:** So if you have analysts, one thing is you can already start doing is self-study or start doing trainings on coding. For example. I'm not sure how wide do you use, let's say, Python, among government statisticians? Or is it merely excel based? Ano'ng mga (What are the) tools, or Stata? So one thing is to start learning program. So just a caveat, I do programming, I use Python, but mainly for data visualization and analysis purposes. I have colleagues who build the models and do that separately. Or do build data pipelines – that's a whole other level. But the common skillset we all have is programming. So that's one way to start – is to start training in using Python for data analysis so that you can manipulate datasets that don't fit on an excel file.so that's one big thing. Another is to learn data visualizations so that's also something that's accessible to everyone – is how I use visualization to uncover patterns in the data that simple tables can't reveal as well. So using visualizations

	in your exploratory process and also in presenting the results can help. For machine learning, there are a lot of online courses that can be taken. But I have to say, to implement a project like building a model to estimate poverty based on satellite imagery – it really is a multidisciplinary team. We had a team of 6 working on that. We had 2 GIS analysts, 2 machine learnists that composed of 2 engineers just to figure out how to download and save and run a model on all these imagery in a moderated way. So I think depending on the state of the project siguro, I would recommend in starting with visualization projects and then once you're looking at more machine learning projects then looking at different methodologies available. And you can even just chat and email us and we'll point you on the right direction.
From Attendify: Usually, the concern of the government is on the quality of available data. Are there tips from your company on how to assess what crumbs should be prioritized and	**Ms. Faustino:** Satellite imagery is not a crumb. Because it's quite a cake. I think there's so much wealth in satellite imagery. I do believe that the DBM has a design project that they're

Questions	Response
how data quality can be approved for data mining?	already purchasing satellite imagery. So one thing is geospatial data, there are so many things you can do with it and the thing about geo-spatial data is it scales to the whole country, there's no barangay that's not on it because you have imagery of everywhere and its external data. You don't have to work within a particular agency that needs licensing for it. You just buy it. So focusing on geospatial datasets. So there's so many datasets that still need additional validation and be shared. For example, the health facility, it's still undergoing validation. I think school buildings, there are still school buildings that are not mapped, etc. so making this data open and available can really give a lot of insight s for any development sector.
Kathleen Virtusio, NEDA: And the second question is, how data quality can be improved for data mining?	**Ms. Faustino:** One is to make it in csv or excel format. And post it all online. Make it open. So make it machine readable, make it open. And have proper docuamentation on it, with the dictionaries, use things like

	the CKAN platform to put it out. That's the number one on our wish list.
Kathrina Cabana, DICT: As a data scientist, I would like to know how do you describe NAMRIA. Do you use them?	**Ms. Faustino:** One thing I know about NAMRIA is there is a geoportal, correct? But you have to write a letter to get the data, so we usually resort to OpenStreetMap because we only do it as a small team so whatever's readily available data, yun po yung gagamitin namin (that's what we're going to use). So we haven't established partnership with NAMRIA, but we would be open to if you would be willing to provide the underlying data of that geoportal. If there are plans for that to be open. I think it should be purchased also. So that's one thing that open data is very powerful in that sense because anybody can access it instantly without having to pay for it.

B.4.3 Break-out Session 3: Participatory and Community Process in Monitoring Hazards and Disasters

3rd Topic: Community and Participatory Tools in Monitoring Hazards (Participatory and Community Process in Monitoring Hazards and Disasters)
Speaker: Dr. Emmanuel Luna, UP CSWCD
Facilitators: Rhonel Santos, NEDA and JM Mendoza, NEDA
Documenter: Maria Ligaya Laura Morales, UNDP

Discussion Points

- Dr. Luna introduced the topic by saying that the tools have been used in evaluating programs and projects in the field of social development since the 1970s. Recognizing this perspective, he focused the discussion on how they at the UP Resilience Institute used the tools in monitoring hazards and disasters given the increased occurrence of hazards and vulnerabilities. Being a DRRM practitioner, his presentation was heavily substantiated by anecdotes on the personal and professional applications of the perspectives, methodologies and tools.

- The Participation Approach in DRRM in general and M&E in particular is anchored on the Participation perspective. The Participation Perspective views:

  - **Participation is seen as a right** – participation is seen as a part of human beings, and that participation is necessary to harness human dignity;

  - **People have capacities** – people have an inherent capacity to understand, and have potentials for learning.

  - **Utilities of participation** – refers to responsiveness (i.e., awareness of their situation, the problems they face and their aspirations); once we get the people's desire and learn about their experiences, they become effective.

- Participation as a process takes more resources and time, decision-making takes longer as it will not be imposed by one person. Given the challenges about the efficiency of participation, it is an effective process in achieving the desired goal or objective. It also creates an impact that is clear to the people.

- Participation is in all aspects of development work, even in infrastructure development. Given existing capabilities, communities can be mobilized and be good partners in M&E. The DPWH has adopted Participatory M&E, and mobilizes communities to monitor project implementation.

- In participatory M&E, participants are learners as well as researchers.

- Dr. Luna usually uses Participatory Mixed-Method (Quantitative and Qualitative) in the conduct of evaluation studies. He finds it very useful as conceptualization on the study objectives and indicators to be measured are done together with the stakeholders, data are generated with the people and are responsive in both M&E.

- As shared by Dr. Luna, people's Participation in M&E may come in seven ways. Dr. Luna provided tips and guidelines on how communities can be mobilized to participate in:

  - Developing the purpose of the M&E;
  - Identifying parameters for M&E;
  - Drawing out methodology (methods of data gathering);
  - Developing instruments for evaluation;
  - Data gathering;
  - Data processing and analysis (tabulation of responses, interpretation of data);
  - Data presentation and use.

- Participatory M&E is applied to DRRM because it is the (i) local people are the first affected, (ii) first who can respond, and (iii) first who can reduce their risks.

- In DRRM, community participation is possible in these areas: (i) monitoring and evaluation of DRRM programs and services, (ii) assessing risks and vulnerabilities, and (iii) monitoring hazards and disasters.

- The CBDRRM Approach (community engagement in DRRM process) originated from the Philippines. The Filipino delegates presented this concept in the World Conference on Disaster Reduction in Kobe, Hyogo, Japan in 2005.

- Dr. Luna established that community involvement should be evident in all of the four (4) Pillars of DRRM. Communities must do M&E along these aspects. Specifically:

  - **Disaster Prevention and Mitigation** – communities must be able to identify factors that results to greater losses, and address them;

  - **Disaster Preparedness** – communities must be able to identify areas of concern;

  - **Disaster Response** – have information on the number of casualties, extent of damage to properties, crops, and the cost of damages;

  - **Disaster Recovery**

"Disaster Preparedness starts with the recognition/being conscious of hazards and risks. Each individual must monitor the risks. It is better to be thinking of risks so one can be prepared, but not to be paranoid. As development workers, before teaching the community about hazards, we must face it first."

- What are the tools used for M&E in communities to monitor hazards and disasters?

  - There are four common tools used in communities to monitor and assess hazards, namely: (i) Community Mapping, (ii) Tri-Dimensional Mapping, (iii) Community Early Warning System, (iv) Contingency/ Service Continuity Planning. The Probabilistic Hazard Mapping in an emerging tool for Participatory M&E.

- What are the challenges and opportunities in the use of these tools?

  - Overall, participatory tools promote community participation in the identification of hazards, determination of at-risk population and structures, and formulation of mobilization or contingency plans. The opportunities and challenges of each tool are summarized in Table 10.

- Dr. Luna's sharing can be summed up in the following lessons:

  - Let us provide people opportunities and windows for participation;
  - Acting as facilitators and co-learners;
  - Incorporation of capacity development for local communities;
  - M&E that benefits the people;
  - Document local practices (disaster studies);
  - Open data for greater access and use (free of use).

Table 10. Opportunities and Challenges of Tools for Monitoring Hazards and Disaster

M&E Tool/ Description	Opportunities	Challenges
1. Participatory Community Mapping	■ Two-dimensional, simple mapping ■ Incorporates community observation in determining impacts of climate change and monitoring direction	■ Availability of scaled/ accurate maps
2. Tri-Dimensional Community Mapping	■ Visual tool that: - Considers terrain/ elevations - Locates structures in the "map"	■ Too technical – depends on comprehension of community

M&E Tool/ Description	Opportunities	Challenges
	- Identifies hazards - Assesses at-risk structures - Allows identification of contingency plan	
3. Community Early Warning System	■ Integrated system of tool managed by communities; provides real-time early warnings ■ People-centered (disseminates information to communities) ■ Timely ■ Simple ■ Low-cost technology	■ Too technical – depends on comprehension of community
4. Disaster Contingency/ Service Continuity Planning	■ Analysis of hazards and risks ■ Better appreciation of types of situation requiring contingency plan ■ Prioritization of contingencies	■ Capacity of community for strategic thinking (different plans)
5. Probabilistic Hazard Mapping	■ Multi-scenario-based hazard mapping ■ Informs design of infrastructures	■ Too technical ■ Not yet widely used

Table 11. Questions Raised and Corresponding Answers
(Community and Participatory Tools in Monitoring Hazards)

Questions	Response
Dir. Gamboa, House of Representatives: What are your thoughts about the creation of Department of Disaster Resilience?	**Dr. Luna, UPCSWCD:** I am for it, and we are supporting it. As far as UPRI is concerned, we only have three concerns there: 1. The use of probabilistic assessment 2. The use of open data– government data related to disaster should not be sold. It should be made open because it saves lives. 3. We are promoting the involvement of the academe in DRR. Our concern is promotion of community-based, participation, and inclusive DRRM (gender, PWD, elderly, children involvement in disaster). Other organizations will have different concerns. These organizations are concerned only with the areas in which they should focus. I am for it because there will be greater focus. The issue there is actually the agencies that will be under that. That is for political.

B.5 Learning Session 2: Evaluation Tools and Strategies

The three (3) sessions under this focused on the tools and approaches and usefulness of evaluation assessments in developing evaluation policies and agenda, requirements and processes involved in crafting evaluation agenda, and governance arrangements for improving M&E practice, respectively.

Similarly, sub-group facilitators ensured that the session objectives are achieved, and additional questions from participants are addressed by the speaker. All the sessions followed the activity flow mentioned in the breakout session and learning session 1.

B.5.1 Break-out Session 1: Conducting Evaluability Assessments

1st Topic: Conducting Evaluability Assessments
Speaker: Nassreena Sampaco-Baddiri, Innovations for Poverty Action
Facilitators: Shey Jose, NEDA and Cathy Bucay, NEDA
Documenter: Kristina Angeli Lopez, UNDP

Discussion Points

- Ms. Baddiri started the presentation by making a clear distinction between monitoring and evaluation – monitoring which answers what are the data needed for day to day implementation, and evaluation that focuses on the program's design and planning: if the program is working or not.
- Starting from monitoring, a theory of change must be in place to guide implementers and evaluators throughout the project.
- She also said that in order to conduct monitoring and evaluation, a reliable, accurate, and timely data must be available. These data will then guide them in managing the program. It can also serve as a learning tool for the future of the program, and it can also hold specific people accountable when unanticipated things arise.
- Evaluation, on the other hand, answers research questions that are important and relevant on key decisions that can improve the program.
- Evaluation assessment is done to determine if a program is already ready for evaluation or not. She provided two things to consider if a program is ready for evaluation or not: a) if in principle, it is already evaluable, and b) if in practice – data, systems, and capacities are already in place and available.

  Since data is crucial in conducting evaluation, it is not advisable to just gather every data that you can have. Implementers and evaluators can apply the CART principle – credible, actionable, reliable, and transportable – when deciding on which data to keep.
- A specific type of evaluation, impact evaluation, is a highly precise but costly tool and there are three questions that you can ask yourself to determine if a program you are in can use this or not. First, is it strategic to evaluate this program?

  Is it feasible to conduct a rigorous evaluation of this program? And third, how will the evaluation results be integrated into decision making and who will use these results?

  Lastly, she encouraged engaging committed partners and co-implementers in the program from the beginning to the end to address existing knowledge gaps for a successful program monitoring and evaluation.

Table 12. Questions Raised and Corresponding Answers (Conducting Evaluability Assessments)

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
David Bunao, NEDA: First of all, thank you for the very informative presentation on m&E, highlighting the importance of data in conducting M&E. So my question is how we deal with response bias from survey respondents. For example, when we have a survey that's dealing with sensitive topics, let's say, HIV or corruption. And the respondents may intend to respond in what we call socially acceptable answer. Instead of their actual answer. So how do we deal with those problems? Thank you.	**Ms. Badiri, IPA:** Thank you, that's a good question. So I think, it's important, you know, when you're doing evaluation is to think about that at the beginning. Especially if it's a sensitive program, if it's HIV program or others. And so there are many techniques that you can use. There are different techniques. We just, I think this morning, presented our study on PAMANA. In conflict areas. Sometimes we opt not to ask the question but how do you ask it in a way that you can gather truthful responses. We did an experiment under PAMANA we can test whether people are answering or not, in a correct way. You actually can compare different answers as well. It's very similar to what you call risk randomization. I'm not sure if you've heard of that. Risk randomization. So for example you go to a household. We had a study on domestic violence for example. Alangan namang sabihin sayo nung wife na I'm being abused. Agad-agad. Na maraming tao. Di'ba, di nya sasabihin yun if there are other people in the area (Victims of domestic violence will not volunteer this information especially in public). So we ask a question and then we give them different options, and then we ask another question. Then give them different option and then we can compare the question whether this person is actually saying the most truthful answer or not. We can share some of this with you because I believe it is quite complex and it takes a long. There's actually a whole module on survey techniques regarding sensitive questions. Whether it's domestic violence or HIV, or even in conflict areas there are tools that you can actually use. But IPA, we're always testing the various ways you can ask questions. Even income. Simple question of asking people income has been very tricky. And we have an ongoing

Questions	Response
	income measure study right now because sometimes people are not as truthful in income. Especially also, and not because they don't want to say the truth but sometimes they just forget. Especially if you're dealing with ultra-poor. Because it's not top of mind. If you have someone who relies on daily wages, goes to the market to sell items, does other things in the afternoon, and then goes to household to do domestic work, marami syang iba-ibang (she performs several) jobs; how can he/she accurately say how much income he or she is spending? So we're trying to develop an income measurement tool to understand the best way to ask questions, so that at least we can get to the most accurate response as much as possible. And we can share that with you.
Wilson Suba, DOJ: Do you have a tool to make, like a matrix style tool or a score on the evaluation of a policy of the government? Do you have a certain tool that would help us	**Ms. Badiri:** Satellite imagery is not a crumb. Because it's quite a cake. I think there's so much wealth in satellite imagery. I do believe that the DBM has a design project that they're

in deciding whether to proceed with the impact evaluation? Any way you have scores and then that tool would return a score that would help us in deciding whether to proceed with the evaluation	already purchasing satellite imagery. So one thing is geospatial data, there are so many things you can do with it and the thing about geo-spatial data is it scales to the whole country, there's no barangay that's not on it because you have imagery of everywhere and its external data. You don't have to work within a particular agency that needs licensing for it. You just buy it. So focusing on geospatial datasets. So there's so many datasets that still need additional validation and be shared. For example, the health facility, it's still undergoing validation. I think school buildings, there are still school buildings that are not mapped, etc. so making this data open and available can really give a lot of insight s for any development sector.
Edel Ocampo, DBM: Year in, and year out, we go to the budget process. So, slowly in DBM, even as you present, we have different constructs of how we want to implement the policy. In establishing the M&E system of the government.	**Ms. Badiri:** This is an interesting conversation. Kasi, number 1, when you fill out the utilization forms ng DBM, di ba parang medyo logframe din naman yung ganon. (The DBM utilization forms are similar to logframe, right?) But I wonder how

Questions	Response
Based on the monitoring side, one possible area where we can apply the policy is on ensuring that an M&E plan with corresponding cost is incorporated in the proposed programs. Given that most of the programs are already budgeted and ongoing, should we require the relevant agencies to craft TOCs for all these programs? Do we require these agencies to undertake evaluability assessments prior to preparing their evaluation agenda, to ensure that TOC and data are available and implementation is on track? We need data/information on program performance as basis for providing funds. What factors should we consider to establish the M&E culture in budgeting?	people fill that out if you don't have the TOC. Parang matagal na, compliance lang ba? (It's being used for quite some time, is it just compliance?) **Ms. Dy, UNDP:** We have indicators in the PREXC, right? Each program, before they submit for their budget they should be able to at least answer to the indicators that they need to input in PREXC. So I mean coming from the lens of government programs, definitely what we put in the PREXC should reflect the TOC of the program. It would be a waste of time if these are not in sync. I am not sure if that is the practice, but I assume that if it is already in the PREXC), the indicators in PREXC should reflect the TOC and the overall plan of the government. All of our activities should respond to what the government is trying to do, right?
Ms. Kaye, DND: Listening to your presentation, I gathered that when doing evaluation, one should not just look at the evaluability of programs but rather on the entire evaluation process. That is, evaluation plan and indicators should also be established at the start. Government should start looking on how to improve the process. Capacity building of government agencies is also important. But the challenge is on how we do the planning; this is a critical phase. To ensure that evaluation plans are properly prepared (and not just for compliance), I hope NEDA and DBM considers closely working with us for a holistic approach to collaboratively foster "development for all" or "leaving no one behind".	**Ms. Badiri:** I really appreciate your comments. I think, that's really the goal. How can we change people's lives with the programs that we're running. And I think as we discussed earlier, maganda ngang tanungin parang (it would be good to ask) is TOC possible for every program? Maybe that should be a requirement I think. To have a TOC for every program. And sometime, you can also understand that maybe some agencies may not be able to develop the TOC. Baka may lack of capacity, or lack of personnel, and when we're running TOC, we actually run TOC workshops also, and sometimes binabalik-balikan kasi iniimbita yung nasa (we do refresher courses for the) regional officers who appeared to have a different interpretation of the program. So it is very important to think about how do you establish a TOC that cuts across all levels, and is uniformly understood. That's how you can make change. We should act in sync in order for the program to achieve what it's supposed to achieve. In terms of doing randomized evaluations for programs in conflict-affected areas like PAMANA, there are many ways to do randomized control trials. We usually present this in an

Questions	Response
	hour-long presentation. We were not able to integrate it due to limited time allocated for the presentation. What we do in the past is we do phase-in approach. So you can phase in by one community. But it doesn't mean that they won't get it. It's just that there will be certain delays in receiving specific program. There are other ways to do it. I think that's the main lesson. If you really want to do evaluation, there are many ways to do an evaluation. Specifically, to this context that you have, if it's a conflict area, if it's a sensitive question, there are many survey techniques that you can use that have been used in different context to get the truthful answer you want. At the same time, in terms of capacity building, that's also something that we can collaborate on. So UNDP. We are in the final stages of M&E Evaluation assessment project where we're going to do capacity building, theory of change workshops, learning prioritization, and one-on-one with

	select government agencies. But this is just the start, I hope. So I think there are already some agencies that were lined up with NEDA and UNDP for that. So I think that's the plan, to involve a lot of government partners and agencies that are interested to build capacity in this. And mostly, in some of our research projects also, for example with DSWD, capacity building is incorporated as a component. During fieldwork, we bring the evaluation team so they can learn how to train the surveyors. We involve them in developing the questionnaire and the modules we involve them in questionnaire and module development session. The great thing is these are all accessible now in the government. Because this is something that NEDA is also prioritizing. That's great news and you can approach us anytime because we can share with you our resources.

Questions	Response
Sa experience nyo ma'am, how long is your evaluability assessment?	**Ms. Badiri:** Usually, six months is already feasible for us to do evaluability assessment and impact evaluation. In terms of the tools, I think you could start with the CART principles. Because CART principle is very straight forward. That could be a tool you can use. Should you want to move to the next step and decide to do evaluation, you look at the sample size, if it's feasible, like are data available. CART principles will tell you that. In terms of capacity building, monitoring should be done in-house (i.e., agency does monitoring). And a lot of capacity building activities we're doing focusing on monitoring is really building the capacity of government staff to be able to monitor using CART principles, developing an M&E system and basing that out of the TOC. Because the foundation of all these things is really the TOC. So once you have the TOC you can develop an

	M&E system for that. And that's the number one capacity building that people request from us. But we also do an evaluation type of capacity building because we also have embedded lapse. This had been piloted and implemented in other countries so we're hoping to do this in the Philippines also. Embedded lapse is a co-implementer of randomized evaluations. IPA and the government. In Peru, this was done with the Ministry of Education. We did synchronized implementation of randomized evaluations but we called them embedded lapse because evaluation only took a short time. Sometimes only admin data are needed so that's something that can be used when you have the capacity of people to do that. It's a very short term activity that can be undertaken together with the agencies. But I agree, sometimes full blown impact evaluation which takes like three or five years requires a lot of time and

Questions	Response
	expertise. Sometimes it's also better to do it with a separate organization because you also have to take into consideration the capacity of the facilitator, or other competing work. That's really a kind of work that involves partnership. I think it depends on the need and at the same time, the programs, there are things you can do.

B.5.2 Break-out Session 2: Crafting and Developing Evaluation Agenda

2nd Topic: Crafting and Developing Evaluation Agenda
Speakers: Ms. Meg Battle and Ms. Aya Silva, IDinsight
Facilitators: Marco Cayosa, NEDA and Kathleen Virtusio, NEDA
Documenter: Rainier Requinala, UNDP

Discussion Points

- Mr. Marco Cayosa, Economic Development Specialist 1, Project Management Staff, NEDA, introduced the resource persons of the breakout session, Ms. Meg Battle and Ms. Aya Silva.

- Ms. Meg Battle started her presentation by asking who in the audience are from the government sector. This is to level off expectations so that she wouldn't be telling things that the break out session participants may already know or conversely miss out on the relevant information they may need

  She also asked who in the audience have worked on developing or using an evaluation agenda in their department in the past. She noted that only one person hadn't based on the show of hands. Finally, she asked who among the audience have been involved in designing or using the results of an evaluation for programs in their department. About half of the people in the room raised their hands.

- Ms. Battle provided the background on who they are and what they do in IDinsight. She briefly talked about the objectives of the workshop and discussed what is meant to define the evaluation agenda. She also talked about how to prioritize activities for an evaluation agenda. She acknowledged that there are so many different programs in the participants' respective departments and choosing which ones are the most essential to monitor and evaluate is actually a really difficult task because it could be that they could carry out numerous monitoring and evaluation activities for every single project that they have. In this case, prioritization is essential because conducting evaluation is not only costly but it's quite labor intensive as well.

- Lastly, Ms. Battle talked about using the appropriate evaluation tool. She added that just saying you want to evaluate a program is an important first step but there's a huge range of tools that one can use to measure and assess projects. The breakout session will talk about some of the tools that are available and the types of questions they can answer and how they can be used.

- IDinsight is a global advisory, data analytics, and research organization that partners with policymakers, NGOs, governments, funders, businesses or basically anyone working in development, who wants to understand how to generate and use evidence for decision making. In practical terms, IDInsight does monitoring and evaluation work, but with an eye towards informing decisions.

Ms. Battle stressed that informed decisions are really important for them as they see that monitoring and evaluation and the evidence that can come out of it is important for accountability, for assessing projects and for documenting what's happened. Just as important and in a more forward looking way, is that the evidence can be used to really improve policy and ultimately improve lives.

- IDinsight was founded in 2011 and has been working around the world across development sectors. IDInsight has primarily been working in India in Sub Saharan Africa but has also been working in Southeast Asia for several years now. In the Philippines, they are working closely with UNICEF with investing in women and is about to kick-off a partnership with UNDP and NEDA very soon. Currently, they are working very closely with Department of Health (DOH) and World Health Organization (WHO). IDinsight has experience across sectors and are able to pull in researchers for any type of development. This means that they are able to really focus on measurement.

- Ms. Battle's presentation aimed to:

  - Understand the purpose and functionality of an evaluation agenda;
  - Understand how to prioritize potential evaluation activities;
  - Learn about various evaluation tools to identify which is appropriate for evaluation activities.

On Evaluation Agenda

- Based on the evaluation guidelines that are being drafted, an evaluation agenda lists the programs and projects that will be evaluated throughout the Philippine Development Plan (PDP) and the Philippine Investment Plan (PIP) periods, including their timeline, type of evaluation, estimated cost and source of funding. It is a rolling six-year plan, which is periodically updated. Ms. Silva commented that it's a very high-level guide to where the government agencies will be focusing their agenda and their evaluation activities, and it's the first step of actually doing evaluation. She remarked that the idea is that the evaluation agenda serves as the starting point or the roadmap to where the evaluation activities will be developed.

- The draft evaluation guidelines set out what types of criteria a government agency might want to consider in prioritizing the programs or projects to focus on. It is meant to be a guide but broadly the idea is that an agency should focus on projects and programs that are really important. The draft evaluation guidelines emphasized that they should be aligned with the PDP, PIP and the SDGs. Ms. Silva commented that as per the evaluation guidelines very big projects are really important to be evaluated. Aside from strategic importance and size of investments other considerations include beneficiary coverage, implementation time span, innovation, emergency and humanitarian programs, financing through ODA or PPP. On the other hand, in terms of support and demand on the government side the key considerations in developing an evaluation agenda are legal mandate, inter-agency coordination, suggestions from stakeholders, Mandate from President & NEDA, International commitments and existing resource commitments.

On Prioritizing Potential Evaluation Activities

- Ms. Silva discussed prioritizing what evaluation activities go into the evaluation agenda. She shared their experience with a project they did with NITI, a government think tank in India where they were engaged with them in a learning partnership (i.e., a long-term open-ended program where IDInsight helps their government department to think through evaluations and what to focus on). IDinsight helped NITI and the Indian Ministry of Agriculture think about their agriculture programs. The mandate of the agriculture team was to support an increase in farmers' incomes by improving agricultural productivity through reduced farmer expenditure and/or increased revenue generation. Filtering of the most important process is a multi-step process that involves a series of discussions that started with key stakeholders, then with sectoral experts, and a primary and secondary data analysis with the NITI. The identified priorities which started with a long list that includes fertilizers, public-private partnership, irrigation, market access, government expenditure and mechanization was narrowed down to fertilizer as the topmost priority after the process of prioritization. Ms. Silva emphasized that there is no one way to do it.

- As part of the breakout session activity, Ms. Battle instructed the participants to:

    - List down 5 programs/projects in your agency
    - Rate them (High/Medium/Low) in terms of:

        - Alignment with Department mission, including innovation and ability to improve lives;
        - Alignment with PDP and other international commitments (such as SDGs and Paris Climate Accord);
        - Scale, including budget and number of beneficiaries;

- After a few minutes of discussion with colleagues, some of the groups shared their outputs. Mr. Emiljohn C. Sentillas, Department of Education, noted that all their identified programs ranked high in terms of the first two criteria because they are related to the goals of the division and aligned with the PDP.

  For the third criteria however, there were differences in the scale as some programs have higher budgets (2 million vs. billions). In summary, he noted that in terms of importance, everything is high, but in terms of the scale, there's a difference.

- Ms. Battle commented that it's important to look at the potential of a program in spite of it being at a small-scale level. This is especially true for pilot programs which can start small but has the potential of scaling up. She cited the program that IDInsight pilot tested with UNICEF in only fifty schools. She said that the research question for IDInsight was should this program be scaled nationally?

- AD David shared the outputs of the NEDA group. Five priority programs were identified 1) the Subic Clark railway project, 2) the Metro Cebu, 3) South Luzon Expressway, 4) Roxas City bypass and 5) North South commuter railway. The projects range from PhP 628 billion to PhP 19 million. In terms of coverage, the South Luzon Expressway and the North Luzon commuter railway both got high rankings because they are both implemented at the national level and the cost is very high (PhP 628 billion). The other three got medium rankings because they are just at the regional levels.

- Ms. Silva commented that it really matters which criteria to use and therefore it's important to recognize what the context of the Department or the agency is and what might be used for prioritizing.

- Ms. Silva shared their own experience on what are the important considerations in prioritizing programs and projects, as follows:

    - The first consideration is to have "the end in mind", meaning what is the programmatic or policy decision that you want to influence. She commented that this is really important as evaluations take up resources and therefore they should be really useful and informs a particular decision or decisions. She emphasized that from the very beginning, evaluators already know what these decisions are. What are they trying to influence? And can the things that they are trying to influence actually be interlinked?

- Once it is clear what decision needs to be made, the next step is to understand what the knowledge gap is, and what needs to be answered. In other words, what questions do you have that if you know the answer to that, then you can make a decision.
- Finally, after knowing what the questions are, then the next step is to identify and determine whether these questions are answerable by monitoring and evaluation tools.

- Ms. Silva illustrated the process by giving an example of a handwashing project of the Department of Education by implementing behavioral nudges for children to actually wash their hands habitually. The department wants to pilot this project, and at this stage wants information on recommending whether it's to scale the program nationwide. In this case the policy decision is to decide whether to scale the program or not. She explained that the question to ask in this case is "if I want to scale this or not as a decision maker what would I need to understand?" She stated that as a decision maker one would want to understand whether the program is actually improving the behavior of kids or not compared to not having the program at all. In other words, by implementing the program, will kids actually wash their hands more? Is it worth that investment in resources to roll out all of these programs?

- Ms. Battle asked the breakout session participants to do a second activity which is about identifying a policy or program decision that the government agencies want to influence.

  - From the five programs identified earlier, choose two programs that you are most interested in.

  - What decisions do you have the power to influence with evidence? She gave an example of a program that you might not have the power to influence and narrated the following scenario:

    "For example, there's a program that's got really bad publicity in the last few years, the public doesn't turn against it. People are not excited about it. And there's no political will to continue this program. Even if you had a really good study that shows that the program was achieving its objectives, people perceive that it's poorly managed, and are really unhappy with it. And so there's really no chance that it's going to be moving forward. In that case, investing money to it might not be a great decision, unless you felt really, really confident that it was working and you wanted to try to make the case for that. But maybe in that case, political will is already turned against the program, and it feels like it's not a great investment of resources. On the flip side, maybe there's a program that people love. It's been running for 30 years, people strongly associate this program with your department or with an NGO that's working in the same communities where you are, right? It's relatively low cost. Maybe you don't feel super confident that it's achieving everything that it set out to, but it's running and there will be so much backlash and it will be so difficult to stop running this program, if you would find that it's not working well, it's unlikely to change."

- Ms. Battle pointed out that the aforementioned scenarios are examples of policy decisions that would be really difficult to implement. On the other hand, she cited a program that could be implemented such as IDInsight's partnership with UNICEF on hand washing. She remarked that it's a program that they are really interested in and would like to know more. There's a hope that it could be scaled up, but they need a strong evidence to make the case to DEPED that nationally it is something that they should take up. She noted that they can't make that case until they have strong evidence from the Philippines.

  She stated that it's a good example of a program that could be influenced. She cited a few other examples of decisions that evaluation teams can potentially influence. This includes: (i) whether or not to continue a program; (ii) whether or not to scale a program; (iii) how to improve an existing program; (iv) which beneficiaries to target; (v) choosing among service delivery options; (vi) whether to fund a new or ongoing program; (vii) what to recommend to Congress about a new or existing program, among others.

- The following are the sharing on the second activity:

  - A participant from the Department of National Defense shared that their concern is about the transformation of former combatants to regular civilians, so the decision to inform is how to make the program more effective. Ms. Battle remarked that the aforementioned program was really about getting into the question of improving the sustained program.

  - A participant from the housing sector shared that their regular program (resettlement program) providing roof for each beneficiary or each informal sector family in the country need to be improved by cascading their newly formulated national resettlement policy framework and they need to localize these down to the local government units. She added that it's a high priority program for the department.

  - AD David reported that the two projects they picked were the North South railway and the Subic Clark railroad projects because of the potential for scaling up. The former can extend up to Tuguegarao City while the latter can reach Mariveles, Bataan. The potential to improve mobility in the area is also great. The decision that they wanted to inform is to scale up the programs.

- Ms. Battle noted that the aforementioned examples were great and demonstrate various cases of informing decisions such as what should be the argument to Congress, what the impacts of existing programs are, and also how to improve existing programs and make sure that they're meeting their objectives.

On Various Evaluation Tools:

- As discussed by Ms. Battle, the different approaches and ways of generating evidence include anecdotes, evidence review, monitoring and impact evaluation. With regard to anecdotes, Ms. Battle shared that sometimes they've gone and seen a program and heard from people in the field including people who are implementing the program and people who are beneficiaries of the program, and they say, I love this, it's really healthy, and this program is really improving my access to healthcare.

  Others would say, the roads are so much better now that we have this new policy. She noted that in some cases, these anecdotal evidences could be sufficient already to inform a programmatic or a policy decision.

- There are different levels of rigor and different inputs necessary for the different approaches. There is a trade-off between the level of rigor and the effort and resources necessary to carry out different types of evaluation activities Anecdotes are low on time and resources, but also since it is usually done through informal and unstructured way, they may not be enough to make a robust policy recommendation in some cases. On the other end of the scale, impact evaluations tend to take more time and resources but they also tend to bring a lot more rigor when you decide to deliver appropriate analysis.

- Impact evaluation is not always the best monitoring tool to use. Sometimes an impact evaluation can actually be more time and labor intensive and in some cases, it might not answer the questions that you have. To illustrate, Ms. Battle cited for example the answer of DND of helping former combatants become civilians. She asked, can impact evaluation answer his question of how to improve the program? Impact evaluation will tell you if the program is achieving its objectives, but it won't actually answer the question, how can we improve this program to make it stronger? Ms. Batlle explained that so often IDInsight's work when working with government departments, is to help them think through what do they actually need to know and then figure out what's the right tool to address the knowledge gap. The question to ask is "What's the right tool from the M&E toolbox that can actually address your questions in the most rigorous but also the most efficient way possible?"

- Ms. Batlle advised the breakout session attendees that evaluations can be thought of and conceived of in the beginning of a program. She added that even more importantly, evidence can be used through the lifecycle of the program to improve it and that there's a role for evidence in every step of the way.

On Theory of Change:

- Ms. Battle proceeded to discuss the theory of change, what it is, and how it fits into designing, assessing, scaling, refining and scaling the program.

- At the beginning, a needs assessment can be really essential. As government agencies design the program, they should try to understand what's going on in the communities where they work and how can they help. Then as they try to improve the program they have experiment on it. At this point, monitoring and process evaluations do not do much good.

  Only when the program is really running well, and they feel confident in operations is the time that they think about impact evaluations, and also cost effectiveness.

- Compared to a log frame, a theory of change is a stylized, much more flexible, and probably a much more convoluted version of a log frame.

  It's basically a map that shows all the stuff from inputs and activities all the way to the intended impact of a program. A theory of change shows all the causal links. It can show how one intended output can actually go back and reinforce some of the baseline activities and it shows how impacts can reinforce each other.

- Ms. Battle shared that based on their experience with partners when doing the theory of change, as they map everything all the way, scrub the activities to the outputs to the outcomes and eventually the impact of the program, they might have disagreements. This is not because they're not well informed or they don't understand the program but because individuals have their own ways of thinking about the pathways to achieving the impact that they want. Ms. Battle noted that it's important to understand the essential steps between first activity that program implementers do and the intended impact they have, so they know what to be testing along the way.

- Ms. Battle showed an example of a theory of change that IDInsight has worked on with the DOH and universal healthcare team.

  She noted that leaders will actually be implementing the universal health care programs in their provinces and cities.

  She explained that what IDinsight did is to map all the pathways from the inputs from DOH to the work that needs to be done at each province and city, to the work that will happen with healthcare providers and hospitals and clinics and community health workers, and then to the experience that patients will have.

  She narrated that they spent a whole day doing the theory of change and had many working sessions after an ongoing process. She noted that the goal of the theory of change was to help us understand what steps do we they need to check once program monitoring starts.

  Ms. Battle explained the Theory of Change diagram they did for DOH. She said that the first inputs from DOH were drafting policies and just putting together the IRR then these are causally linked to improved patient outcomes, people are healthier, and they're more financially stable than they were before because now they're not spending so much money and going into deep debt for basic medical expenses. She explained that If they just go ahead and measure only the medical expenses and patient outcomes, they will find out that there's no impact and no breakdown from the IRR all the way to patient outcomes. She remarked that putting together the map allowed them to understand where they need and what they need to measure.

It also helped them determine what do they expect to see changing and where do they expect to see movement every quarter so that DOH can track the UHC integration happening as they intend.

- Ms. Battle said that the Theory of Change is an interesting tool; it's the only one that IDinsight uses for almost every event that it has. Having the map is such an important reference point, not just for designing monitoring and evaluation activities but also for programmatic leaders to understand what the steps of the program are, and how can they be learning and implementing their program effectively.

- The Theory of Change is similar to logic model, but probably more complicated. In a logic model everything is moving from left to right but in theory of change there could be positive feedback loops that are built into a program design that might not be effectively captured in the logic model.

  To illustrate she cited the DOH project example: when we see that medical providers are paid on time from PhilHealth rather than having to wait many more months to get paid, it will increase their trust in the system.

- Dir. Corpus cited that there are complex theories of change where there's a lot of coordination involved and sometimes there are several agencies delivering on a single outcome. They have their own ToCs and they have their own perspectives in the way they do activities or projects. She said that sometimes they converged somewhere but there is a need to analyze their contributions along the way. Ms. Battle commented that one of the reasons they like theory of change is that it's very flexible.

  It can accommodate having many different stakeholders, many different inputs and many different actors who are contributing to the program implementation or whose activities are key assumptions in the success of a program.

- The types of questions that a Theory of Change could answer are as follows:

  - How was the program designed to achieve its intended impact?
  - What are the major causal pathways underlying the program?
  - What are the critical assumptions that will determine whether the program is successful?
  - What are the major risks to the success of the program?

- Examples of the decisions that can be informed with the use of Theory of Change are as follows:

  - how to create a high-level program strategy;
  - how to create a program monitoring and evaluation (M&E) strategy and framework;
  - and which key M&E activities to conduct.

On Theory of Change:

- A needs assessment sheds light on the program's context and the problems facing the target population. The intention of a needs assessment is to understand the context of the beneficiaries, e.g., what's happening on the ground.

  It also aims to determine the target population's characteristics, needs and challenges and if they are creating barriers and constraints that the program managers didn't anticipate before.

- Ms. Silva cited an example of a needs assessment they conducted which is in India, where the Indian government has already implemented and build up that digital ID. She narrated that at that time that they conducted the needs assessment there's a large debate between people who were very much against the digital ID system and people who were highly supportive of it.

  She added there were a lot of anecdotes, a lot of stories, there's media coverage, but not really a lot of evidence and data on what people's experiences were actually like. With this, IDinsight conducted a needs assessment in three states in India with a survey on nearly 3000 households to understand from their perspective how they've been using the digital ID and what challenges have they encountered.

- The questions that a needs assessment can answer are as follows:

  - What needs, problems, or constraints does the target population face?

  - What actors are already addressing these needs? Are these approaches sufficient? Why or why not?

  - Who should I target my program to?

  - How should I reach the target population?

- The decisions that a needs assessment can inform are as follows:

  - Identifying the target population

  - Which interventions are most relevant to the target population's needs

  - For existing programs, what improvements can be made to program design

On Process Evaluation:

- Process evaluation is usually undertaken by someone external for a short amount of time and is separate from ongoing monitoring of a program. It's really designed to look specifically at questions about how the program is being implemented and whether or not it's being implemented as intended. Process evaluation will help one identify the key assumptions that we're making and check their validity.

- Ms. Battle emphasized her point by asking a series of questions, as follows: If we're running a school-based program are our teachers being trained properly? Did the teachers actually show up to the training?

  Did the training actually address what it was meant to address?; Did they learn what they were meant to learn in that training? When they went back, did they have the money and the resources they needed to implement that program?

  She remarked that the teachers can be trained all day but if they don't have the tools that they need when they go back to school, it doesn't matter how well-trained they are.

- Process evaluations are typically embedded in impact evaluations. The reason for this is that if you do an impact evaluation, and at the end you find that there's no impact, then there's maybe two possibilities at a high level.

  One is that this program was implemented perfectly, or it was implemented really well, but actually doesn't work. There's some key flaw in the design of the program.

  But the other possibility is that the program was not implemented as planned. For example, it's a school-based program and teachers didn't have the resources they need.

  Ms. Battle remarked that process evaluation alongside impact evaluation can also really help answer key questions when program outcomes didn't go as intended.

- Ms. Battle showed one example of

a process evaluation they did in Zambia, which is a farm to market alliance's agricultural extension program. IDinsight conducted a process evaluation to examine the implementation of Farm to Market Alliance's training programs on post-harvest handling and storage practices.

They observed trainings, conducted interviews with staff, and surveyed farmers to understand farmer adoption of postharvest handling and storage practices. She explained that they didn't look at if the changing agricultural outputs were changing household income but instead focused on how the program is being implemented.

- The types of questions that a process evaluation can answer are as follows:
  - Is the program running as planned? If not, what are the deviations?
  - What are the factors that contribute to the success and challenges of program implementation?
  - How does implementation vary across contexts?
  - Are resources being used efficiently?
- The kind of decisions that a process evaluation can inform are as follows:
  - How to make changes to program design in order to address implementation gaps or use resources more efficiently?
  - How to choose between different versions of program implementation?
  - Whether to continue, scale-down, or scale-up the program?
  - What to track more closely in a monitoring system?

On Impact Evaluation:

- This topic was handled by Ms. Silva.

- An impact evaluation measures the causal effect of a program on the outcomes it intends to change. In other words, making sure that the outcomes are attributed to this specific program.

  Impact evaluation also establishes the size of a program's effects on outcomes of interest, through comparison with the counterfactual (what would have happened in the absence of the program).

  It also helps identify which versions of a program are most effective at achieving impact. Moreover, it requires expertise on statistics and research methods to conduct (experimental and quasi-experimental approaches), operational control of implementation, resources, and ideally at the start of implementation.
- Impact evaluations can be costly not just because of resources but also it is more extensive that it requires some operational controls. For example, if a randomized control trial is implemented, and the intervention is done to a randomly selected group and then another randomly selected group does not get intervention, then the evaluators have to make sure from the very beginning that they are able to do that and that the implementing partner is amenable to that experimentation.

  Ms. Silva remarked that to really establish the causal impact, impact evaluators have to think about that at the very beginning because it's important to get a baseline and it's important to be able to establish your treatment and control groups.

  She added that if the impact evaluators will just come towards the end of the project duration, they will just realize that they have no reliable data and there's no way for them to reliably conclude they have a rigorously established data.
- The handwashing program was cited as an example of impact evaluation. Even if the ultimate

goal was to improve health by reducing waterborne diseases, and can be most accurately measured by monitoring the transmission of bacteria, it might not necessarily be practical to look at that because

it is very difficult to establish. A more practical approach is to look at intermediate outcomes, and so in the case of the handwashing program, the handwashing rates is already enough to inform a decision.

Ms. Silva explained that they were not looking at policy outcomes, but just intermediate ones, especially if that feels like enough to be able to make a decision on scale.

- The types of questions that an impact evaluation could answer are as follows:
    - How big of an effect does the program have on the outcomes of interest?
    - Which elements of the program drive changes in outcomes?
    - Which version of the program or service delivery channel is more effective?
    - Should the program be scaled up in its current form?
- The kind of decisions that an impact evaluation could answer are as follows:
    - Whether to scale up or terminate the program in its current form?
    - Whether to make changes to program design?
    - Which version of the program to expand or scale-up?
    - Funding decisions (for example, for results-based financing or pay-for-success).

On Monitoring Systems:

- A monitoring system regularly collects, synthesizes and shares data about a program's performance. It collects data that are critical to a program's ongoing performance management. It also helps indicate where program implementation is going well and where improvements are needed.

  Moreover, it ensures that program data can be shared with a range of stakeholders via data visualizations on monitoring system dashboards.
- A monitoring system is typically something that is used for performance management, and usually administered by the implementers themselves. Oftentimes, program managers might contact somebody to help them design and develop the monitoring system and then train their staff on how to use it.

  A strong monitoring system should be something that program managers can actually run and use for their own decision making internally, without requiring a research partner supporting them. This is the reason why it'd be really appealing for long term programs to track and monitor success.
- The types of questions that monitoring systems can answer are as follows:
    - What are the key indicators of program success? How is the program performing on these?
    - Is the program running as planned?
    - Are resources being used effectively? What is the cost of the program per beneficiary?
    - Which version of the program is most effective at delivering services?
- The kinds of decisions that monitoring systems can inform are as follows:
    - Whether to make changes to program operations?
    - How to allocate resources effectively?
    - How to hold program implementers accountable for ongoing performance?

On Cost-effectiveness analysis:

- A cost-effectiveness analysis

compares the effect of a program to the cost of the program. It allows evaluators to understand a program's impact per dollar spent. It also helps indicate whether funds are being used effectively, and whether different versions of a program produce more impact for the same cost. Moreover, it requires analysis of both impact evaluation data and cost data.

- The main idea of cost-effective analysis could be gleaned from an example of what IDInsight did in conducting a cost-effectiveness analysis of an insecticide-treated bed net distribution program in Zambia.

  Basically, IDinsight conducted a cost-effectiveness analysis comparing a community distribution point approach to a door-to-door distribution approach. It analyzed impact and cost data and found that the cost per death averted was significantly lower for the community distribution approach. It was worthwhile to go with a cheaper option if it was achieving the same outcome.

- The types of questions that cost-effectiveness can answer are as follows:

  - What is the cost per unit of impact (change in outcome attributable to the program)?
  - What will it cost to scale the program?
  - How does the program compare to other programs' cost effectiveness?

- The kinds of decisions that cost-effectiveness can inform are as follows:

  - Which version of a program to scale-up?
  - How to allocate resources more effectively to different elements of a program?
  - Whether a program can be sustainably funded?
  - Which cost-related tradeoffs are appropriate?

Table 13. Questions Raised and Corresponding Answers (Crafting and Developing Evaluation Agenda)

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
AD David: In terms of developing the evaluation agenda, is there a need to factor-in the vulnerability of that particular project, in terms of prioritizing or finalizing the list and also the timing?	**Ms. Silva, ID Insight:** It can vary depending on the requirements in the NEPF. It's an iterative process where an evaluation agenda can be set initially, then look into each program a little bit more, then do an evaluation assessment. The process is not quite linear and it's hard to figure out all the details at the very beginning. Sometimes program managers need to go through the whole process of doing a theory of change and then do an evaluation assessment to determine what you can actually do with the data that you already have.
Ms. Dina Pasagui, Congressional Policy and Budget Research Department: Aside from sitting with the implementers in crafting the evaluation agenda, at what stage of the evaluation process can we come in?	**Ms. Badiri:** I am not quite familiar with the exact mandate of your research team and how it interacts with NEDA and other agencies. Perhaps you can help in prioritizing programs, especially ones that have policy implications and if there are policy decisions from the legislative side that you think are

really important to be answered in a rigorous way.

Ms. Battle, ID Insight: The research team can also help in interpreting results. Sometimes you don't need to run a full study on the programs as there may be strong evidence that already exists. This way, the research arm of the House of Congress could also help assess the suitability of that evidence or developing context.

Another thing that you can do is when the results of evaluation studies come out and the results are maybe a little ambiguous, you can help assess what are the key points to be taken away and make sure that it doesn't get watered down (i.e. lose the nuances) and the policy implications are carried through.

On behalf of their team, Ms. Battle stated that she was really grateful for everyone's participation and questions. She offered that if there are more questions, they can be reached through their email addresses. She thanked the organizers and NEDA for inviting them and for letting them share some of their experience with the breakout session participants.

B.5.3 Break-out Session 3: Preparing and Managing Evaluations

3rd Topic: Preparing and Managing Evaluations
Speaker: Ms. Marian Theresia Valera Co, UNDP
Facilitators: William Ku, NEDA and Jan Corrado, NEDA
Documenter: Maria Ligaya Laura Morales, UNDP

Discussion Points

- Evaluation is composed of four phases, namely: (1) Initiation, (2) Preparation, (3) Implementation, and (4) Utilization. Throughout the evaluation, Quality Assurance (QA) should be undertaken.

- Quality assurance involves the regular review of Agenda, Evaluation Plan, Terms of Reference, Inception Report submitted by the consultants and the draft and final reports, and the utilization of results. The primary objective of QA is ensuring that the evaluation and its products are of high quality because it will be used in decision-making.

- The Initiation Phase involves crafting of an Evaluation Agenda, and an Evaluation Plan (or "Baby TOR"). Evaluation Agenda covers the agency evaluation priorities for a 6-year period while the Evaluation Plan is specific to a program or project. The planned evaluation completion date should be specified in the Evaluation Agenda.

- As mandated by the National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF), the agenda should be aligned with the PDP (output or outcome level), PIP, and SDGs. The Evaluation Agenda should be reviewed annually to ensure relevance to organization's priorities.

  In order for the evaluation to be useful and relevant, all stakeholders should be engaged/consulted in the crafting of Evaluation Agenda.

- Impact evaluation is more costly than Process Evaluation. In UNDP,

- the cost of evaluation studies is indicated during the design phase of the project. Based on UNDP Corporate Guidance, at least 3% can be allocated for M&E or at least 1% for evaluations.

- Agencies have a lot of programs and projects with limited people to manage evaluation and limited budget. Thus, the need to prioritize the evaluation agenda based on development priorities and available support and demand. Criteria for the selection of Evaluation Agenda based on the two categories were provided by Ms. Co.

- An Evaluation Plan answers the following questions: Why, What, Who, How, When, and Resources needed. In preparing the Evaluation Plan, key stakeholders should be identified. Stakeholders include the users of data. Evaluation questions should be identified at the onset to allow future evaluators to identify if they have the skills or capabilities to answer the evaluation questions. Evaluation questions should be crafted guided by the criteria of Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability and Impact. Key evaluation questions should be reviewed by every member of the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) with inputs from key officials of the agency.

- As the primary person in charge of QA, it would be good for Evaluation Managers to be trained in data methodologies to determine the right methodology and appropriate data to be collected.

- Evaluation Assessments should be done before proceeding with the actual evaluation. The checklist will help evaluators decide if the cost of doing the evaluation with the attendant risks is worth doing.

- During the planning stage, data requirements should already be identified to ensure feasibility of methodologies (e.g., impact evaluation). In the case of impact evaluation, the design should already include "control" and "treatment" groups.

- The Preparation Phase involves the organization of Evaluation Reference Group (ERG), development of Terms of Reference (TOR) and procurement of evaluation consultants, whether individual or firm. Cost items and resource considerations were explained by the speaker.

- Disaggregation of data collection is crucial because it allows one to adhere to the principle of "leaving no one behind".

- Implementation is the meat of the evaluation. It includes inception planning (or levelling off with stakeholders on the evaluation design and how the proposal of evaluators answer the questions in the evaluation plan), data gathering and analysis, and preparation and submission of report.

- The Governance Arrangements in the implementation of evaluations involve five (5) key players with specific roles:

  - **Evaluation Oversight (Senior level officers or a Management Committee)** – approval of agency plan and evaluation budget; ensures relevance to needs/priorities.

  - **Evaluation Commissioner (Project Management Office or Unit)** – co-chair of ERG; involved in project implementation; provides technical oversight; quality assurance; prepares management response.

  - **Evaluation Manager (M&E unit, M&E staff, M&E Focals)** – not directly involved in project implementation; but are responsible for finalizing evaluation plan and provide inputs to evaluation questions; contract management; explains TOR; QA of evaluation product (e.g., soundness or sufficiency of methodology); facilitate access to key informants and data; consolidates ERG comments to draft reports; follow-through of management response; ensure evaluation is translated into communication product.

- **Evaluation Reference Group** – provides input to the TOR, provides data and serves as key informants, reviews key evaluation products, and prepares management response to key evaluation recommendations.

- **Peer Reviewers** – independent and anonymous reviewers of quality of the evaluation reports in terms of methodology, correctness of findings and usefulness of the recommendations.

■ GPPB can be a technical assistance provider on procurement concerns.

■ Evaluators, as independent individuals, have the option of not accepting Management recommendations/responses for as long as they can provide justifiable reasons.

■ The following Governance Mechanisms can improve M&E practice:

- Legal mandate to do evaluations;

- Evaluation agenda/evaluation study should be endorsed by senior officers (Buy-in of senior officers);

- Inter-agency convergence and coordination (all phases of evaluation);

- Planning and Management of Evaluation. Evaluation should be guided by an:

  1. **Evaluation Agenda** – six year period specific to an agency;

  2. **Evaluation Plan** – specific to a program or project; should be subjected to input of stakeholders;

  3. **Risk management plan/ strategies** - anticipate risks so they can be resolved;

- Doing market research to identify available expertise; exploring partnership with academes/ universities;

- Space evaluation milestones to give reviewers ample time to give quality reviews of the products;

- Allocate sufficient budget during the Design phase; Reaching out to specialists to assess cost of professional services, if needed;

- Quality assurance of evaluation deliverables to minimize problems to be encountered.

■ The Utilization Phase is usually forgotten. Ms. Co emphasized utilization of evaluation results is equally, if not the most important phase of the evaluation. This phase involves the development of key management responses to the recommendations, or resolve issues during evaluation; communication of results to stakeholders; and, preparing for future evaluations, especially in the case of a multi-phased evaluation or in cases where certain recommendations require further study.

■ In order for evaluations to be useful, results should be available at least two to three months before their intended use. A publicly available portal for evaluation studies/outputs should also be established.

■ Ms. Co formally ended her session by citing an example on how to program evaluations designed to generate inputs for the Budget Call.