Table 14. Questions Raised and Corresponding Answers (Preparing and Managing Evaluations)

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
From Attendify: How do you go about managing amendments in the TOR during evaluation implementation (e.g., change in methodology, supplementary budget cost adjustments) due to unforeseen events not considered in the Evaluation Plan?	**Ms. Co, UNDP:** Amendments in the TOR. Very tricky question, but they do happen. In the case of UNDP, as long as we can justify the reason for the amendment, we can do so. Usually, we have to obtain, of course, inputs from the ERG. The Evaluation Manager will reach out to the Evaluation Commissioner, and the Evaluation Commissioner to the budget holder and the other members of the ERG, explaining the need to expand the methodology which would trigger an amendment in the TOR. There have also been cases where TORs have to be extended at no-cost because, for example, the Peer Reviewer that you got saw some important revisions that have to be done to the study to improve either its feasibility or quality, and you would want that to be integrated, but their contract is ending.
	So, you have to manage, of course, the expectations of the Evaluation Team. But if you were able to explain to them the rationale for a no-cost extension, they would agree to it if the reason is founded. And you can go on with that. That is also why you have to invest a lot in the planning and inception phase. You have to lock-in that methodology at the beginning. And we put in so much effort in the QA process in the beginning so that any changes can be avoided.
A. Marquez, NEDA Region X: In the preparation of Terms of Reference, one of our difficulties is how to rate consultants; how much are we going to indicate in the TOR. Is there a standard rate?	**Ms. Co, UNDP:** Ma'am you are not alone. I struggle with that too. In the case of UNDP, we have the Evaluation Resource Center that has a portal. There you can see average evaluation costs per country per evaluation study. So you can have an idea on the range of rates. But it's not really a perfect indicator of cost requirements. That's why it's important to break it down. But if the key problem is the manday cost of consultant, what you can do is do a market research of what

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
	is available. Perhaps, ask guidance from other Evaluation Managers who managed similar evaluations and how much it cost them. From years of experience in doing studies, you will also build an idea of how much your man-day cost will be. You can also do some preliminary research. Perhaps talk to an affiliate university and ask, if you need a Psychologist for this evaluation study, how much the cost range will be per man-day. But you will also be confronted how many man-days is required to do the study. Sometimes you are lucky because you allocated so many mandays, even if the cost is not enough for the man-day rate, because you added so many man-days it will just equal back. Because they probably charge more but they need less days to produce the assignment. It is also good that we have this M&E Community. If you can reach out to other M&E Practitioners and professionals, they would be able to give you advice on market rates for evaluation firms, or for evaluators.

From Attendify: How do we discuss risk-sharing and when is the best time to discuss risk-sharing once the risks have been identified especially for the high-cost evaluations? For example, for projects with high environmental risks, you might anticipate resistance from communities which may affect both project implementation and the evaluation activities. The contractors particularly carry the responsibility and costs. How are these being discussed in the contract development and management? How do you share risk and the mitigation accountabilities, among others?	**Ms. Co, UNDP:** In the Evaluation Plan phase, that's where you also identify risks and your mitigating actions. You can ask members of the ERG as Evaluation Manager to input to this risk log because there might be some risks that we don't see that are relevant to them. And also, have the discussion on risk sharing mechanisms. In the case of social-environmental risks, those can be avoided. If you already know that it would cause delays because you have perhaps done an initial discussion with the community to be evaluated, then perhaps the management response to that would be not to proceed with including that area in the coverage of the evaluation. Explore other areas that have similar characteristics as that area in terms of environmental risks so as not to affect the implementation of the evaluation study. That is why, again, the ERG is important because they can be allies in sharing risk mitigating measures.

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
From Attendify: 1. What do you see as challenges of government agencies in procurement if it goes into managing evaluations? I know UNDP is governed by different procurement rules. Government is also governed by a set of rules, and it's one of the gray areas. Do you have some insights to share? 2. Did you have any experience where the final output was not compliant to the TOR? In which case, how do you make the contractors or suppliers accountable?	**Ms. Co, UNDP:** For your first question, I might not be able to give the best advice because of my lack of experience in government procurement. And I know that many of you here in the room really experienaced challenges in procurement of services specifically. But I will share examples on how we do it in UNDP. In UNDP, we can set a roster. For example, if we need a roster of data science firms, we already prequalified them knowing that these are the list of evaluations we are going to conduct in the Evaluation Agenda. We already pre-qualified the firm so that by the time that the TOR is ready, we can tap that roster and skip the long evaluation period for contracts because we've already done it before hand. Unlike government, we don't publish the ABC, we do not indicate how much the budget is for evaluation study. Usually, I find that it allows evaluators to be more truthful in their costing of the service because

	they are not aiming to be close a certain threshold. For example, you costed P1 million, but it will only cost them P500,000 they will give you a P900,000 bid because that is under the threshold. *Ms. Co requested the assistance of Mr. Francis Capistrano as former Project Coordinator for the Strategic M&E Project to provide more insights on the public procurement question.* **Mr. Francis Capistrano, UNDP:** First of all, I am no expert on procurement; I just have a love-hate relationship with procurement. With regard to procurement for evaluations, we included an Annex in the draft NEPF guidelines guide notes on how to procure. Yes, government procurement rules and procedures are tricky. I wouldn't say that the UNDP procurement procedures are very flexible. But oftentimes, the difference lies in the way the offices interpret the rules. It is very helpful to go back to what is actually said in the guidelines. If

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
	your procurement officer is saying something that is not there, you can contest that. My advice is: go back to what the rules say. It is also useful to call GPPB office if in doubt. I just want to note on what Mai said about roster of firms: Pre-qualified rosters are not necessarily sanctioned by the GPPB IRR. The best the BAC can do is to do a market research and have a directory of firms and consultants that your procurement people will call. About ABC: I will disagree with Mai. If don't publish ABC, you get very wide variation of bids. What is important is the underlying assumption of the bid that translates to cost. On Question 2: Fire the consultant. **Ms. Co, UNDP:** As much as possible we want to avoid the situation where we have to fire a consultant because you've spent so much time and effort, and you've already spent the money on data collection. That is why in the QA of inception report

	(methodology, data collection), it already gives you an idea of the output of the exercise. But there has been a case with UNDP before where we had to cut the contract of the consultant because we gave them the opportunity to make revisions based on our comments but it wasn't at par with our standards. That's where Relationship Management comes in, to explain. If it is grounded and we have the facts, and we were able to explain it properly they would accept the contract termination.
ED Salazar, SEPO, House of Senate: 1. Can you explain further the different purposes of evaluation under the Evaluation Plan? This is a common area of difficulty among emerging evaluators. 2. Monitoring of recommendations of evaluation should not fall under the utilization phase. It should be emphasized that results of evaluation should feed into the next planning stage.	**Ms. Co, UNDP:** On the rationale. Primarily, evaluations are learning tools. That is why you want to conduct an evaluation and invest resources into it because you want to learn what works, what doesn't work; you want to make adjustments to your program, project or policy. Other reason for conducting evaluation is setting criteria, second to main objective of evaluation. What we are trying to say is we have to be more explicit on what we want to learn, and what we are going to use

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
	the evaluation for. That should form the "why" part of the evaluation plan. For the management responses, duly noted. We placed monitoring of recommendations under Utilization Phase because we noted the timing of activity. Management responses can only be conducted after recommendations have been produced from the evaluation study, which is stage three. I fully agree with you that it should not be seen as an end in itself. The reason why we respond to recommendations is we wanted to feed into a future action plan. A future action plan that can either influence the design or implementation of an ongoing project, or the design of a new one. There is also an action plan with budget implications. If certain activities need to be implemented that are not in the design or required to rectify based in the evaluation. Then resources will be required for that and needs to be in the Budget
	Call in succeeding year, and then evaluation will provide good basis or rationale for an in increase in funding requirements.
Pamela Diaz-Manalo, CPBRD, House of Representatives: What are your proprietary arrangements for commissioned evaluation studies?	*Ms. Co called on Mr. Capistrano to give his insights* **Mr. Capistrano, UNDP:** The rule in government is also the rule in UNDP: All evaluations commissioned are owned by the contractor. In the case of UNDP, UNDP is the owner but there is a provision in the contract that transfers ownership to NEDA. But there is an issue from the academe that they want to co-share. Co-sharing to publish is something to think about to encourage researchers from academe to participate. By default, IPR is owned by those who commissioned the study. But it doesn't prevent you from data sharing and right sharing arrangements. Once shared, it is part of the public domain. **Ms. Co, UNDP:** Yes, agree. And it is also one of the things that we back up. Because the more widely available

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
	your evaluations are, the more useful they will be to stakeholders. That is why, the government Evaluation Portal has an objective: to publish, make publicly available the evaluation studies contracted under the NEPF. They will publish there the TOR and the evaluation study, as well as policy briefs and policy notes and many communications … The data will not be published, you have to request for data and justify its use. All UNDP report and recommendations, TORs are published at erc.undp.org, but the data are not shared if not requested. I find it useful as an Evaluation Manager because it is a source of inspiration for TORs and in crafting questions.
Francis Balitaan, DOLE: 1. In cases where actual programs or projects were implemented not in accordance with the design as indicated in the Theory of Change, how do you manage the expectations as to what can be measured?	**Ms. Co, UNDP:** That is why TOC is important to M&E. It can document the changes in the design or actual implementation of the program. When you create a program, of course TOC should be identified. This is how inputs will lead to outputs, to outcomes and achievement of desirable impact.
2. So papasok siya sa concept ng evaluability kung hindi na-update ang program in terms of TOC? (If program is not updated in terms of TOC, can it be considered as an evaluability issue?)	Then after 2 years of implementation, you find out that some components of the TOC are not applicable, could not be implemented on the ground. So you have to change it. It is a good practice to document changes in your theories. If you are the Project/ Program Manager, this is where you will be able to document who the new partners are or removed during project implementation. If you will not update your TOC, evaluators will only be able to refer to the original TOC, which may not be the reality now. So it is a good practice to prepare a revised design and to update the TOC based on changing context. Parang mas monitoring and Project Management concern ang pag-update ng TOC tapos yung documentation ng changes ng TOC. Para kapag prinesent na ninyo yun sa Evaluation Plan, closer to reality na basically yung Theory mo. Tapos yun na ang gagawan ng indicators na i-a-assess ng evaluators, hindi na yung original TOC. (Updating of TOC and documentation of changes in TOC is more of a monitoring and Project Management concern. If undertaken, the updated TOC will be closer to reality when presented in the Evaluation Plan.

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
	It shall then be the basis for developing indicators which will be assessed by evaluators.) If you want to talk about it later, I'm available. And if the group has other questions, you can reach me via Attendify. I will answer them
From Attendify: How do evaluators deal with frustrations, if there is any, if their evaluation results are not realized or dismissed by officials especially for high-budget programs or projects?	**Ms. Co, UNDP:** As a former evaluator, it is heart-breaking. Because sometimes we go into contracts, more than the financial reward, is that because we really invested in using our knowledge and expertise to the agency who commissioned us. It gives us more purpose for doing evaluations, knowing that evaluation results were found to be useful. And if you want to keep evaluators from doing evaluations, show them that what they are doing is useful. It is important for evaluators to know that the management response will be to implement (the recommendations) in the end, because that will really make them more mindful to provide recommendations that are actually relevant. Because they will know that their recommendations will be acted on.

B.5.4 Break-out Session 4: Gender and Evaluation

4th Topic: Gender and Evaluation: Why it should always matter.
Facilitator: Ms. Rosalyn Mesina, Programme Manager, We Empower Asia, UN Women
Moderator: Erina Oroba, NEDA
Documenter: Ruby Ann Manalo, UNDP

Discussion Points

- The facilitator discussed three main points during the presentation: 1) importance of monitoring & evaluation, 2) importance of gender in monitoring & evaluation, and 3) how to do a gender responsive monitoring & evaluation.
- The format of the whole learning session was in a form of question and answer, where the facilitator asks from time to time inputs or thoughts of participants during the session. Most questions from participants were also addressed and discussed during the presentation.
- What is the importance of considering gender in M&E? "Because there is no gender neutral intervention…" To this, the facilitator asked the participants to provide examples of what they think are gender neutral interventions. Participants identified infrastructure and health related interventions as such but were challenged by the facilitator to think further.
- Gender, as a cross cutting issue, needs to be in place in every development programme agenda -this ensures proper targeting of beneficiaries.
- It is important to always consider gender at the start of program designing - always ensure that key disaggregation of profiles.
- One participant from the NEDA Regional Office V commented during plenary presentation that while there are available gender data among different organizations

and government offices, important information on gender is lost during analysis. This is primarily because most implementers have no sufficient level of understanding or awareness how to make sense of the gender data.

- The facilitator provided specific pointers on how to do gender responsive M&E in terms of: design process and approach, data collection, tools development, tools administration/facilitation, and data collation and analysis.

- Design process and approach:

  - Program implementers need to understand why a certain program or intervention is implemented – why?
  - Identify who are involved – quantitative or qualitative M&E (mixed method is better) – numbers won't mean much without a narrative complementation.
  - How will the data be collected? – understand that women have needs to be considered (e.g. toilet/latrine use among the community or a population).

- Tools administration/facilitation:

  - Be informed of sensitivities to literacy level, context, situation, needs of participants;
  - Assurance of confidentiality and purpose of the study;
  - Ensure that every voice is heard / response registered;
  - Data collection should be targeted based on the objectives of the intervention.

- Data collation and data analysis:

  - Ensure that there are no gaps in data and target respondents; if unclear or unsure with the data, find time to go back and clarify.
  - Women respondents would not provide on-point information (or totoong nararamdaman) during the interview – important to consider constant follow throughs or "diskarte" tactic on how to do these.
  - Understand power relationships between men and women in the community subject for the evaluation – this impacts the way we make sense of the data we collected for analysis.
  - The Data analyst should be also a gender aware person.
  - Ensure to share and validate findings incorporate feedback from participants if and when necessary.

- Final note:

  - Gender responsive and sensitive M&E allows us to assess and monitor progress towards gender equality.
  - Good tools and approaches are easy to develop but the commitment to do it should always be there.
  - Crucial to be reflective in the process and allow for adjustments to happen if and when needed.
  - Gender responsive M&E enables shared commitment and participation of men, women, and all other stakeholders.
  - Gender lens and child lens should not be separated.

Table 15. Questions Raised and Corresponding Answers (Gender and Evaluation)

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
Marlon Custodio, DepEd: For a big agency like DepEd, how can we properly allocate the at least 5% GAD requirement of COA to GAD-related interventions?	**Ms. Mesina:** You may highlight importance of GAD related work whether can be directly or indirectly attributed to the intervention. The budget may be allocated thru gender-related costs such as review of policy or other activities/works that may be attributed to GAD.

	For example, review of textbooks, sensitizing teachers on how to navigate "call-off" issues between boys and girls. DepEd actually has lots of opportunities to utilize the fund. Again, this may also be through review of policies, modules, trainings/ seminars, not necessarily creating a new project or program.
NEDA Region V: There is also challenge of recruiting men in the office with the required competencies, with the objective to be more gender-balanced.	**Ms. Mesina:** I agree that this is also a human resource issue, who could deliver what needs to be delivered? But we need not be gender-blind on the recruitment process. HR programming and development work can be a good platform for creating a gender-balanced team.
Rupert Mangilit, UNDP: This can also be remedied by providing basic needs of girls or women in schools, clinics (e.g. readily-available feminine napkins in girls' CR, or pain remedy medications in clinics for girls experiencing dysmenorrhea). Really, there are a lot of practical solutions on how the government and different organizations can make use of their	**Ms. Mesina:** I agree and thank you for those wonderful suggestions. These are only some of the ways on how we can make use of the GAD budget. And it is also better if they are practical as this directly benefits our stakeholders.

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
resources to address the needs of girls within their respective target groups/ clients.	

After the breakout sessions, Ms. Quijano once again, welcomed the participants in the Grand Ballroom of the hotel for the synthesis and closing program. She gave her observations on the just-concluded sessions based on the participants' posts in the Attendify. In addition, she also announced the following: (i) instructions on the filling-up of the Evaluation Form, (ii) mechanics for rating the overall activity and the speakers through the Attendify, and (iii) updating of participants' profile in the Attendify facilitate networking after the event. After all the announcements, Ms. Quijano then gave the instructions for the panel Q-and-A on Building communities of learners and practitioners.

B.6 Experiences on Building Communities of Learners and Practitioners

Ms. Quijano gave the participants a few moments to browse the panelist*s' profile in the Attendify and think of/send in questions they might want to ask in terms of building a community of practice. The panelists comprised of individuals representing government agencies and professional M&E Groups who shared their respective experiences in organizing and sustaining learning groups or communities for a robust M&E practice.

This plenary session allowed for a stocktaking of opportunities and challenges that come up with building a community that can take the M&E practice forward. In particular, the session sought the answer to the question: How can we build and reinforce communities of practice towards maintaining and sustaining the "We in M&E" perspective? Members of the panel include the following M&E practitioners:

- Ms. Cynthia Lagasca, Planning Officer, Department of Social Welfare and Development;

- Ms. Mariel Bayangos, Chief, Policy and Research Development Planning Service, Department of Education;
- Mr. Sonny Africa, Executive Director, Ibon Foundation, Reality for Aid;
- Dr. Enrique Lozari, President of Pilipinas Monitoring and Evaluation Society;
- Ms. Kate Lupangco, Co-Founder of Effective Altruism Philippines;
- Mr. Roi Avena, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, UNFPA (United Nations Fund For Poverty Alleviation).

Ms. Quijano explained that the objective of the plenary discussion is to understand what the panelists' organizations are doing in terms of building a community of practice for monitoring and evaluation professionals, in promoting the use of evidence and promoting this culture of thinking of what the results are of the things that we do.

Table 16. Questions Raised and Corresponding Answers (Experiences on Building Communities of Learners and Practitioners)

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
Ms. Quijano: What is DSWD doing to promote this community of people who would look into evidence of the DSWD?	**Ms. Lagasca, DSWD:** The DSWD has a number of results-based management policies that were issued in the last one and a half year. On ensuring the community of practice within the agency, DSWD has institutionalized spaces for a community of practice to thrive through, among others, the formation of a technical working group composed of evaluators, and overseers of planning, monitoring, and evaluation processes within the agency. It has also instilled a culture of learning by doing by allowing provincial and regional offices to conduct program and performance review and evaluation.
Ms. Quijano: Who are being engaged by DSWD and who can use the results?	**Ms. Lagasca:** DSWD has a unit called the Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluation technical team. It also has a technical working group that serves as an advisory group on evaluation and research studies. In line with the ease of doing business, DSWD has likewise established a research protocol that reduced the number of days for approving the requests for gathering data by internal and external Research and Evaluation proponents.In the planning, monetary budgeting and evaluation system of the department, DSWD has mainstreamed and institutionalized the Results-Based Management (RBM), in particular the use of the results framework.

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
Ms. Quijano: Does anyone in the panel would like to share what they are doing?	**Ms. Bayangos, DepEd:** Over the last three years DepEd has initiated programs anda projects in support to the current administration. The Department is looking at the core areas in terms of their strategic goals first on improving access and on improving quality education. One important aspect also is modernizing governance wherein over the last three years DepEd has focused on improving its systems processes and standards in terms of developing policies, doing research, conducting monitoring and evaluation and then at the same time improving our planning and budgeting processes. We are seeking for the approval of a basic education monitoring and evaluation framework, which would actually encapsulate the various commitments of DepEd not only to the national government but also our global commitment in terms of the SDGs. It will basically identify indicators for the agency where
	our policies and programs would be framed. It would also guide DepEd's planning process in terms of engaging its stakeholders as a community of practice. Currently DepEd is strengthening its efforts around building a culture of evidence. For one, we have Research o'clock, a bimonthly forum not only to encourage DepEd employees to conduct research and present the findings, but also to engage external partners in sharing their evidence through policy dialogue. DepEd also has a research portal where it archives all the research outputs for education sector. These research outputs were all conducted by the teachers themselves. Beginning 2015, DepEd has provided funding support for all teachers conducting action research to better inform its policies and programs. Since 2015, we have at least 3,000 research outputs conducted by our teachers. Of course, if we are looking at capacitating 900,000 teachers, 3,000 is a small number. We still

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
	need to reach many. But we can say it is a good start for teachers to build evidence and a good way of understanding how DepEd programs and policies are being implemented and understood at the classroom level. We are also collaborating with external partners so they can also look at other research areas of concerns at the national level and put them together with the action research that they are conducting. To further support the teachers in their research, DepEd will secure subscriptions to journals. **Mr. Africa, Ibon Foundation:** From yesterday's plenary the forum has talked about an M&E ecosystem. From what I can recall from high school, biodiversity is an important element for the functioning of ecosystems. Biodiversity means there's an abundance of species with their individual characteristics interacting to give dynamism to the ecosystem. I wanted to pick up on that
	analogy of the ecosystem. I wanted to sort of pick up on that analogy of the ecosystem and speak from a certain perspective, to highlight something that I think is a big problem. In the last couple of days, the forum talked a lot about toolkits, how to sharpen M&E and how to do things better. What seems to be lacking in the discussion is how to use the tools. The reason why I want to pick up on the ecosystem analogies is because there's a troubling trend right now with the CSOs not just in the Philippines but in the rest of the world. While the forum speaks about the "We in M&E", I'd like to highlight a governance aspect that there's actually an "Us in M&E", meaning if you're not with us, you're against us. A lot of M&E will not function if civil society is not given a role in it. A disturbing trend happening globally and not just in the Philippines is that CSOs are being shut out and civil society space has been shrinking. The last comprehensive study about civil society space surveyed 195 countries and about 111 have seen either civil

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
	society space closed entirely, and another nineteen countries have seen their space shrinking, which means that civil society organizations are functioning in an environment of fear and violence, or they're not allowed to participate in the whole range of governance processes because of a tightening of regulatory restrictions. It's an important point that I want to highlight in relation to how Ibon Foundation or Reality Aid functions because that shifting of civil society space is really alarming. Because of this trend the core belief that information is power just gets thrown out the window. Unfortunately, since information is power, not being informed means decreasing power. In ecosystems there's always a constant process of disruption, and an ecosystem for it to be dynamic there should be constant disruption happening. A lot of CSOs and NGOs in particular do take a political stance because they look at their analysis

	and evaluation of the programs from their political, economic and social perspectives.
Ms. Quijano to Mr. Africa: Have you discussed the issue among your fellow CSOs, or have you got any advice on how to change this type of environment?	**Mr. Africa:** Yes we have discussed it and at many levels. Just earlier this year in April, there was a huge civil society summit in Belgrade where they talked about exactly the shrinking of civil society space. It is happening globally in India, Hungary, Turkey, even in Brazil because rightist governaments have come to power and they're imposing their view of the national interest unilaterally on the whole population.
Ms. Quijano: What strategies are you using to overcome this troubling trend?	**Mr. Africa:** At the local context, Ibon Foundation has received quite a lot of official hostility on their analysis of the employment situation earlier this year. The Presidential Spokesperson didn't like it and accused Ibon Foundation of fabricating data even if their data actually came from the Philippine Statistics Agency. If a person has an assertion, it should be backed up with evidence. No one has a perfect knowledge and added

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
	that precisely it's the point about having a diverse ecosystem as there is no monopoly of knowledge. Shutting out civil society will not create a diverse lush ecosystem but a barren desert that would not be good for the SDGs or long-term development of the country.
Taking off from the discussion about ecosystem, Ms. Quijano asked Mr. Lozari about the role of the Pilipinas Monitoring and Evaluation Society in the M&E ecosystem.	**Mr. Lozari, PMES:** The Pilipinas Monitoring and Evaluation Society is a group of individuals who are engaged in monitoring and evaluation. Picking up on the ecosystem analogy, the role of the PMES is to ensure there is an exchange of information and knowledge among all these different species so they can learn and put into practice the different approaches and different experiences in M&E. There are different approaches and different experiences in different evaluation and monitoring and evaluation engagements. So, what the PMES is doing is to exchange information like what are the ideal processes to follow given a certain situation. However, we cannot exchange information with regard to results and data because of proprietary issues. PMES is basically a community of practice. For a community of practice to thrive, the members need to have that demand and not just for the organization to push and just spoon feed them on what tools that they need to have. In other words, the members themselves need to have that need to learn how to evaluate. I am very happy to see that a lot of people are trying harder to give evaluation more importance.
Ms. Quijano: What specific activities do they do to create that certain demand?	**Mr. Lozari:** PMES has a lot of activities We have foundational workshops intended to level off on the basic understanding of M&E processes and principles. They also have formal and informal ways of exchanging information. We have brown bag meetings for formal discussions while informally they exchange information through online group chats.

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
Ms. Quijano: What is the role of Effective Altruism in the M&E ecosystem?	**Ms. Lupangco:** Effective Altruism is a community that uses evidence and reasoning in determining how we can do the most good. The organization wants to encourage individuals to take an action in maximizing their efforts and resources. Our role in the M&E ecosystem is trying to be more allied with agencies and nonprofit organization to relay the projects to individuals. In addition, we also want individuals to increase their capacity and their knowledge in terms of how to use data and how we can help others as well.
Ms. Quijano: Does Effective Altruism have certain activities that contribute to that objective?	**Ms. Lupangco:** We organize some events and invite some nonprofit organization to discuss their projects which include monitoring and evaluation process. Moreover, Effective Altruism also conducts workshops on rationality, improving design thinking and how we can explore other aspects in helping others.
Ms. Quijano: With UNFPA as one of the organizations that integrate and embed M&E in its processes, what are the types of strategies or activities UNFPA do in sustaining a community of practice, which can be the agencies or the CSOs that UNFPA work with?	**Mr. Avena, UNFPA:** When I joined UNFPA about eight years ago, the international organization is being assessed by Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries in terms of results culture and UNFPA scored very low. That was even when more than half of country offices in the region actually had M&E specialists. What UNFPA did was to gather the different M&E specialists of each country at the regional level to think about how to crack the problem of instilling a results culture in UNFPA in every country office, in every regional office, as well as in the headquarters at that time. Less than half of country offices actually had M&E specialists so there was a strong push from the top. And during those meetings, they gathered the M&E officers on a regional basis to get a crack of this problem. During those regional meetings, they talked about the issues such as what the bottlenecks are in terms of becoming a results-

	based organization. While there was a push from the top but over time, the grouping of the M&E specialists really evolved. I am proud to say that from the same assessment that was done in 2018, UNFPA already scored very high. From the eyes of those who matter to us, since UNFPA also rely on donor resources, they believe that UNFPA is now level three stage of results culture. **Mr. Africa:** At the local context, Ibon Foundation has received quite a lot of official hostility on their analysis of the employment situation earlier this year. The Presidential Spokesperson didn't like it and accused Ibon Foundation of fabricating data even if their data actually came from the Philippine Statistics Agency. If a person has an assertion, it should be backed up with evidence. No one has a perfect knowledge and added that precisely it's the point about having a diverse ecosystem as there is no monopoly of knowledge. Shutting out civil society will not create a diverse lush ecosystem but a barren

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
	desert that would not be good for the SDGs or long-term development of the country.
Ms. Quijano: How can one create the demand for results culture without necessarily getting pressures from anywhere else?	**Mr. Avena:** From there, we built a system where M&E focals could constantly interact M&E specialists for help through webinars, WhatsApp, and face-to-face meetings. That's basically the oxygen that fed and sustained our community of practice in the region. I am proud to say that from the same assessment that was done in 2018, UNFPA already scored very high. We have other platforms such as meeting each other face to face annually, but we also communicate through webinars, WhatsApp, hangouts, etc. The community of practice is not really a formal one.
Ms. Quijano: What future direction does he think M&E should strive to?	**Mr. Lozari:** The fact that our members stayed is a clear indication that there's huge future in M&E. The creation of the National Evaluation Policy Framework is a very welcome

	development also for the PMES as it signifies the government's readiness in evaluating programs that it has implemented. We are looking forward to the development of the evaluation agenda of the different organizations. What we wouldn't want to happen is that the list of programs in the evaluation agenda would fall in that category of evaluation for evaluation's sake. Further, what we really want to see is that the evaluations are done because there is a need for information. If money, time and effort should be spent to conduct the evaluation, it has to be for a specific purpose and that purpose has to feed into what the government agencies are doing. It is therefore important to develop an evaluation agenda in the near future. **Mr. Avena:** In the case of UNFPA, from 2011 to 2019, for example, there was a significant increase in the number of countries that actually created positions for core M&E units. It helps that there is an organization that spearheads the formation of

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
	community of practice. The human resource capacity is the most important ingredient on top of data systems and policies.
Ms. Quijano: How do you envision the general public to participate in the M&E of the future?	**Mr. Avena, UNFPA:** It's important to sharpen the M&E tools and the cities are the ones setting the gold standard and investing huge amount of money. Even our cities despite the millions of pesos needed to conduct a proper RCT, they're not actually perfect, apart from any ethical considerations about who is the control group. Even though it's actually structured, it's not foolproof. Evaluators can be so invested in a tool or in a system that increased their tendency to be sucked into that system. If M&E practitioners are not always skeptical about that, the inertia of possibly imperfect tool has the tendency to keep on going. Inadvertent misinformation could also be dangerous. It's very important to test the M&E practitioners' tools, evaluations and conclusions with the public. It's not about asking the mob but more like

	getting their various views. M&E stakeholders, especially in the last two days, are building up a huge ecosystem and investing a lot into it. All the more that there should be a corresponding effort to make sure other people are commenting about the M&E ecosystem, because we don't want a self-contained, hermetically-sealed, we're fooling ourselves ecosystem. M&E practitioners should communicate not just the results of their evaluation and see if they jive to the best interest of the public but also their methods. In the case of the 4Ps when it was assessed in 2018, the public experienced shock and awe.
Ms. Quijano: What other possible venues other than the M&E Network Forum, more informal perhaps, for both M&E practitioners and NGOs can collaborate and share resources?	**Mr. Lozari:** As a result of the 7th M&E Forum there was a community of practice that has been formed already. In fact, the community of practice already held its first meeting. **Ms. Lupangco:** In terms of the community itself, Effective Altruism has events where it invites different agencies involved in monitoring and evaluation to relay their projects to the community itself.

Questions/Issues/Clarifications	Response
Ms. Quijano: Is there a greater group or community of learners for M&E that we can subscribe to, in order to keep track of new developments and updates on M&E in the Philippines?	**Mr. Avena:** There is a Yahoo group called M&ENews which can be a source of updated information with regard to M&E. **Mr. Africa:** The M&E Forum is a good venue for M&E sharing to gather the pockets of M&E practitioners' groups into one large venue. **Mr. Lozari:** There is a resource called Better Evaluation which can be very helpful for beginners. He stated that the PMES actually started from an M&E yahoo group. **Ms. Bayangos:** The M&E Forum was very helpful for them but DepEd also benefited a lot from having institutional partners such as IPA and 3iE. Our institutional partners helped them not only in building their capacity, but also looking at how they can better position the policies and other initiatives they are planning to do.

After the allotted time, Ms. Quijano thanked all the panelists and called on Dir. Corpus and Ms. Lui Jolongbayan to present the token of appreciation to the panelists.

B.7 Putting it All Together

To put it all together, Ms. Quijano shared the summary of insights from the Attendify. She excitedly informed the plenary that, based on data analytics, there are a total of 366 participants; who posted 13,752 times in the Attendify; 2,436 times where people liked, posted or commented in their Activity Stream; and 168 shared photos. The most active Attendify participant was recognized in plenary after the synthesis.

After the presentation on Attendify statistics, Ms. Quijano shared some key points gathered from the two breakout sessions, that is: (1) Spotlight on Recently concluded and ongoing evaluations, specifically involving the following studies: ARTA, PAMANA and ECCD, Nutrition, and Rural Road Network and LRT2; (2) M&E Systems and Tools, involving the following topics: Technology and Innovation, Big Data Analysis, and Participatory Community Processes and Tools in Monitoring. Prior to her presentation, she enjoined the plenary in recognizing the documenters.

In relation to the insights, Ms. Quijano expressed her belief that a rich discussion transpired during the breakout sessions. She emphasized that the insights she shared were just highlights. She also said she could not expound on the insights but noted that some are useful. Due to limited time, Ms. Qujano was not able to include in her presentation the insights on the last two sessions (i.e., Evaluation Tools and Strategies, and Experiences on Building Communities of Learners and Practitioners). She committed to upload it later in the Attendify. After the synthesis of insights, Ms. Quijano led the recognition of the "Most Active Attendify Participant". Ms. Katherine Cuevillas of DPWH accumulated the following: 40 posts, 37 likes, and 40 comments. When asked on her forum experience and leanings, Ms. Cuevillas replied: "I find the forum very informative. All the speakers are well-versed with regards to the topics they discussed. The M&E Forum is indeed vital to all the government agencies because it is a means of measuring the effectiveness and efficiency of the programs, policies and projects that we are implementing". After the sharing of learning session insights and recognition of most active forum participant, Ms. Quijano proceeded with the synthesis of the two-day activity. To put it all together, Ms. Quijano summarized the key messages through the framework "How do we practice We in M&E" taking into consideration that participants will be going back to their respective offices. As a take away from the two-day event, Ms. Quijano said that these four things resonated with her:

- **Communities.** The community must be a 'We', not just 'us'. Outside of this room, there is more to be done. There is a need to continue to grow as a community, of growing together, of growing the community that has influence outside the network, including other organizations and the general public. It is good to keep this community growing but also to keep it stronger. The Attendify is a good start because it will be operational for one year. All the resources can be accessed there, and if everyone updates their profile, people can keep connected together. It is a way to keep the conversation going.
- **Capacities.** Day 2 was about strengthening skills on M&E. A lot have been learned, from technical to strategies; others have "hugot" (witticism) about M&E because of the frustrations on doing M&E. These capacities need to be always worked on, how to better as M&E practitioners, how to be also critical in the work to be done to be more capacitated as M&E professionals.As a community, M&E network members bring different capacities into the table. Although M&E can be technical, there are different processes and ways that one can contribute in this ecosystem.
- **Coordination and connection.** There is a need to align, to talk with each other to make sure that what is done in this M&E ecosystem actually complements each other. There are opportunities to collaborate to make the work easier and make it more relevant for the people we serve.
- **Commitment.** Being in this community means being committed to the vision for M&E. This commitment should be something that is ingrained in all.

Taking off from the last element of the "We in M&E" Practice, Ms. Quijano facilitated the commitment-setting.

Commitment-Setting

Ms. Quijano requested everyone to stand up, hold hands or stand closely together, and recite the following general set of commitments aimed towards making the M&E community (the We in the "We in M&E") work together to make M&E practices more robust and inclusive to development for all. With a newfound enthusiasm and a stronger sense of oneness, the forum made the following commitments:

Declaration of Commitment

We, members of the M&E Network, commit to using our full capabilities in strengthening an inclusive and responsive practice of M&E in the Philippines.

We also commit to sustaining the WE perspective in M&E by collaborating closely with fellow colleagues in government and the rest of the M&E community.

Finally, we commit to promote the usability of evidence from M&E and ensure that this leads to the achievement of our development goals as a nation.

WE in M&E!

III. Closing Remarks

To formally conclude the forum, the moderator called on NEDA OIC-Undersecretary for Investment and Programming Group, Jonathan Uy.

Prior to his closing remarks, Usec Uy expressed his pleasure and high spirits despite a long day upon seeing the active participation of the M&E Forum delegates. Usec Uy initially read his prepared speech but decided to set it aside. He apologized to the NEDA staff who prepared his well-written speech, but he "grossly deviated from it" because it is not his practice to read from a speech, and he instead wished to capture the inputs he heard for the last two hours. Instead, he closed the activity by giving three key messages:

First, he shared the ANC News on the statement made by IMF that the Philippines are graduating to upper-middle income status in two years-time. The news was presented on a negative perspective, that is, it will mean lesser development assistance from development partners.

However, Usec Uy gave a positive perspective to this news: it means relying on the government's resources (i.e., the government will be putting in more money than development partners). From an M&E perspective, this is a challenge that will shift the focus to assessing how effectively we used our own resources. M&E is really an important framework in explaining to the people how the government has really been able to uplift their conditions.

The second point he made was more of a reaction to Mr. Africa's point about the "we" and "us". Usec Uy said "As a part of NEDA, when we say 'We' in M&E, it's stating that we share a collective body of knowledge and information on M&E that we can draw up own. And the 'us' there depends on our policy agenda. But it doesn't mean to say that we have to be divided. At least we are together in as far as the base data is concerned. The M&E Network is hopefully going to be able to appreciate the diversity, of appreciating the data but the data is true to itself and true to us. And I hope the M&E Network will be able to continue to make that kind of framework of evidence-based analysis: always contestable, debatable but at the end of the day, we are right with the data we have."

Finally, he referred to Sec. Pernia's opening remark:

"We still have 11 years to work on achieving the 2030 agenda for sustainable development of 'leaving no one behind'. We still have a long way to go to attain our collective aspiration of "Matatag, Maginhawa at Panatag na Buhay" for all Filipinos or Ambisyon 2040. This M&E Network is going to be one of those pillars that will enable us, if not on hindsight, at least looking forward on what needs to be done in order to attain these goals. Today we pledged to stand united to further strengthen Filipino capacity for evidence-based decision-making, to ensure that we are all headed towards the same direction. Let us continue to embody the 'We' in the practice of M&E".

Usec Uy ended by expressing his gratitude to everyone for participating in this year's forum, especially the UNDP for assisting NEDA in organizing this important event.

A same-day edit video presentation followed after Usec. Uy's closing message. The video featured the highlights of the two-day event. The 8th M&E Forum officially ended at 5:45pm, on 20 November 2019.

IV. Annexes

National Economic and Development Authority

The country's premier socioeconomic planning body

with Support from

Published by:
National Economic and Development Authority
12 St. Josemaria Escriva Drive, Ortigas Center
Pasig City, 1605 Philippines
(+632) 8631 0945 to 56
info@neda.gov.ph

www.neda.ph