These past years, a series of activities in results-based budgeting and evaluation in Latin America led to a collaboration between different Latin American institutions among which the Ministries of Planning of Uruguay, Colombia and Costa Rica and the Ministries of Finance of Peru and Paraguay. This collaboration is evaluation-oriented and aims at public policy improvement. This article provides an overview of the collaboration between these countries and looks at how it is linked to local evaluation supply and demand using the South-South cooperation model.
Different paths to the institutionalization of evaluation

FROM 2014 to present, a series of activities in results-based budgeting and evaluation have been developed by Latin American Ministries of Finances and Planning involved in program budgeting. These have been under the umbrella of the regional program EUROsociAL, funded by the European Union and managed by an international consortium led by the Spanish agency, International and Ibero-American Foundation for Administration and Public Policies – (FIIAPP). Although evaluation was part of the process to improve budgeting tools and the planning process, activities to enhance capacities in the evaluation systems did not arise at the first stage, but later. However, evaluation was essential to the planning process and therefore eventually contributed to the formation of a collaborative group between these institutions. Participating institutions came from different countries, with Uruguay, Colombia and Costa Rica by way of their Ministries of Planning, whereas in the case of Peru and Paraguay, via their Ministries of Finance. In some cases the mandate for evaluation came directly from the Presidency of the Republic, whereas in other cases it was guided by the internal budgeting control. However, the overall group vision is anchored in public policy improvement and oriented to evaluation.

"After four years, evidence shows that the concept of institutionalization within the group can build a common ground and subsequent effectiveness in dealing with a wide variety of challenges".

A key aspect to understanding the collaboration between these countries is how support required from international cooperation is linked to local evaluation supply and demand; there was not a pre-conceptualized system of evaluation, or a model to be replicated, even though within the region there were clearly agencies in some countries which in theory could play a leading role. Each country has its own features, its strengths and challenges, and they are all in the process of developing their own systems of evaluation. Therefore, when coming to common assumptions about the theory of change in these systems, institutionalization was the only mechanism that could unite different approaches into a single purpose. In the context of different needs and stakeholders – from six countries...
plus the facilitating agency - the targets needed to be comprehensive enough to integrate common strategies and results.

After four years, evidence shows that the concept of institutionalization within the group can build a common ground and subsequent effectiveness in dealing with a wide variety of challenges. For example, in Paraguay, institutionalization means developing drivers-of-change within the public system to initiate the evaluation process. As a result of this process of improving capacities and facilitating evaluations in many areas of the government, the Paraguayan Ministry of Finances was recently applauded by the Inter-America Development Bank (IADB) for leading result-based budgeting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of their public programs.

In Costa Rica, whose system of evaluation is attached to the Presidency through the Ministry of Planning (MIDEPLAN), institutionalization is more about improving capacities to develop a national evaluation agenda as endorsed by the public sector and society; it also means to develop technical competencies in the public sector with the support of national and international experts. In Uruguay, the path to institutionalization comes through a process of capacity building which is extended to all Ministries and public agencies; it also creates evaluation standards to develop criteria for a systematic public approach, and a national evaluations catalogue where every public institution can share studies developed by them. For Colombia, with a more extended practice of evaluation from academia to public and private sectors, institutionalization means the use of evaluation to effectively make improvements in policies and programs. Lastly, in Ecuador, it means developing capacities in central institutions such as the planning secretary, or SENPLADES, in charge of developing a national State reform agenda.

By putting institutionalization as the priority objective and strategy, the Project has enabled a common perspective and promoted debate within the group.

"By putting institutionalization as the priority objective and strategy, the Project has enabled a common perspective and promoted debate within the group".

Frequent discussions allow each member to adapt timing/needs as needed with new ideas easily integrated, this is particularly helpful when addressing new administrations that often follow elections. Even if the political situation changes, which is natural in a multiyear context of cooperation, the technical staff related to evaluation, remains consistent, something not often assured in the public sector. Administrations can also benefit from this group in terms of empowerment, since it is important to be connected to an international and consolidated network of practitioners. However, this could be a challenge for other regions or countries where the stability of technical lines within the public sector are moderate or low.

Technical assistance, peer-to-peer learning and joint evaluations

What started out as a process has now become a project, still supported by the European Union, but under the modality of the South-South Cooperation Project, with the FIIAPP as facilitator and the group of six countries making annual joint strategy decisions for planned and future activities. This prior relationship was essential.
as helped to build trust among partners and consolidated a base for developing new activities in a more demanding framework. Since being formalized into a project, overall roles have not changed significantly, however group commitment has been strengthened with project developed management tools enriching the process, to include annual planning instruments, budgets, steering committee meetings, and others. Under the Project, three types of activities have been prioritized and initiated as of January 2017: technical assistance, peer-to-peer learning and joint evaluations.

Regarding technical assistance, each country can submit a list of demands to cover particular gaps in their systems or where international support can strengthen them. For instance, the Ministry of Planning in Uruguay has designed a plan to build national evaluation capacities in the public sector. With the support of the Project, it is expected that this plan will be reviewed and extended into additional phases to meet new demands. This experience would also be relevant to other countries where capacities are spread over different Ministries and agencies, and views and concepts on evaluation, even in the same system, could be different. It requires a harmonization of existent capacities, as well as the identification of strengths or weaknesses to be addressed.

Much work in the areas of peer-to-peer learning had already been developed within the group prior to the conceptualization of the Project. Most of these types of activities where in the form of workshops and study visits. For example, in July 2017, a workshop took place in Costa Rica to discuss and address the challenges around developing national evaluation agendas. This includes identifying the role of leaders in the definition of priorities, central and Ministry lines functions, and key stakeholder and society endorsements, such that study findings and recommendations can be applied. For the South-South Cooperation Project, having a country specific national evaluation agenda becomes a key step to facilitate planning and coordination activities as well as a useful tool to identify issues which would be relevant for all participants.

"For the South-South Cooperation Project, having a country specific national evaluation agenda becomes a key step to facilitate planning and coordination activities as well as a useful tool to identify issues which would be relevant for all participants".

As a result of this, in 2017, gender equality was identified as a key area for support since it was a priority for many of the member’s national agendas, to include policy evaluation, programs or projects. Another area of interest was climate change adaptation policies. This year, the group will begin the evaluation of risk prevention systems in Colombia and Ecuador, given the vulnerability of both countries to earthquakes, floods and other disasters. Similar problems and policies can also be found in other countries, with evaluation is being used to help develop approaches and indicators that can be used at the regional level.

In September of 2017, the Project initiated Costa Rica’s Gender Policy Joint Evaluation, which has evolved in different phases since 2010. The evaluation is managed by FIIAPP and the six countries, and is being developed by the Latin America Faculty of Social Sciences – FLACSO, a regional academic institution selected through competitive bidding. The previous
evaluation of the Colombian Gender Policy serves as a strong basis for the design of the Costa Rican policy, with lessons shared between the two countries and comparisons used to explain different hypothesis. This evaluation goes hand-in-hand with a peer-to-peer learning activity held in Colombia in January 2018, with the support of their National Planning Department, DNP - SINERGIA, where technicians and gender experts of three planning institutions in Ecuador, Costa Rica and Uruguay, will meet to discuss and follow up on the implementation of evaluation.

The group also met in November 2017 in Madrid to discuss new strategies and scenarios for the upcoming years and annual activity planning. This meeting was important for the prioritization of activities and to discuss the strategy to involve other stakeholders. Some of these issues are discussed in the following section.

Connecting demand with supply: evaluation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

From the perspective of an international cooperation agency, the role of FIIAPP within the South-South Cooperation Project is to connect partner country demands with supply as found in international agendas and practices, syncing them to existing public expertise. In past international meetings on evaluation, particularly the National Evaluation Capacities (NEC) conference held by the UNDP in Istanbul in November 2017, and the Latin American Congress on Evaluation organized by RELAC and IDEAS and held in Guanajuato in December 2017, all participants and institutions highlighted the need to develop systems to monitor policies and programs in order to meet the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Goals. This new agenda carries specific challenges for many Latin American countries as relates to evaluation in order to meet their international commitments. For some institutions, with consolidated systems of evaluation, monitoring and evaluating SDGs can represent an opportunity to review practices and rules that have already been implemented in their countries. For example, in the case of Mexico, who already hosts a multidimensional approach to poverty at the federal level, it includes a significant number of SDGs in their policies, programs and projects. However, for other countries, there is a challenge to establishing new M&E systems, developing baselines and indicators, and collecting data for each goal, as well as monitoring its relationships between goals. These imply the need to engage all Ministry lines and institutions in a coordinated effort to manage a holistic approach to the 2030 Agenda. In addition, meeting demands will require a set of activities ranging from technical assistance to peer-to-peer learning to either build or improve systems. This in itself creates great challenges as some of the capacities required for monitoring and evaluating SDGs are quite new.

SDG 1, for example, calls for the eradication of extreme poverty and halving poverty in all its forms. Some of the indicators can likely be captured through existent systems but others need to be developed, such as the eradication of social exclusion or material deprivation, most particularly as they must be disaggregated by age and/or sex, in order to capture how successful policies generate income as well as promote access to basic needs or, “leaving no one behind”. SDG 2 seeks to end hunger and malnutrition and ensure access to sufficient safe and nutritious food. This requires the promotion of sustainable production systems, ensuring the food market and access to market information. It requires therefore, an evaluation of adverse impacts on agricultural production and be able to capture indicators such as farmland bird populations, the
level of nitrates in groundwater, the use of fertilizers and other sources of ammonia emissions, or estimate the rate of soil erosion by water. All or some of this represents relatively new ground for evaluations and specialists in the arena, especially when promoting public policy expertise.

SDG 3, which targets ensuring good health and well-being, requires focus in areas such as health lifestyles, which includes objectives and subjective measurements of well-being, determinants to health, causes of death and access to health care. This will require innovative approaches ranging from traditional indicators such as life expectancy, or smoking prevalence, to new indicators such as self-perception of health, obesity rate and others which are not available in some countries. The same can be said for water, with quality and efficiency as new indicators that go beyond traditional forms of water measure, or employment that can include long unemployment rates. For the case of education or gender equality, relevant indicators on gender-based violence need to be developed, and gender gaps in employment, education and leadership positions should also be captured. In this vein, Ecuador will implement an evaluation on gender-based violence in 2018 with support of the Project. It is expected that the design of this evaluation will reflect on practices and dimensions developed by Colombia and Costa Rica in 2017 for the evaluation of similar gender policies.

In terms of reducing inequalities between and within countries, or on the subject of migrations and inclusion of new populations, there is wide room to develop new studies at the regional level in Latin America. Comparative perspectives on evaluation would be important to scaling up on conclusions as well as improving efficiency as, even though policies can be formally diverse, substantially there are many similarities. These include policies promoted through democratic institutions and adapted to international standards, while respecting government’s requirement to not abridge or limit citizen rights. Therefore, there is fertile ground for development in terms of joint evaluation around policies that promote institutional capacities and credibility, anti-corruption, justice and security. As example, in the fight against crime and the reduction of homicide rates, the Project is aware of the importance of reinforcing not only police, tribunal and court capacities, but also other institutions such as penitentiaries, so that they can improve and implement better rehabilitation programs for prisoners and effectively tackle the cycle of violence and recidivism.

The same can be said about sustainable transportation indicators such as public transport, Carbon-Dioxide emissions from new cars, and in the sub area of research and development on inner-city quality of life. These are all subjects where regional studies can be facilitated. Megalopolis such as Mexico (Federal District), or other cities in Brazil, Argentina or Colombia, would imply new challenges in terms of developing indicators for quality of life at the local level, sustainable transport and environmental impact. This will require insight and collaboration with local institutions for data access as to crime rates, population density rates, poor housing conditions, the number of habitant connected to wastewater treatment, the waste recycling and the concentration of particulate matter.

It is particularly relevant to mention in this article, what the Project envisages in terms of climate change mitigation and adaptation policies from the perspective of evaluation. According to the Paris Agreement adopted in 2015, each country determines, plans and regularly reports its own contribution to mitigate global warming, and this implies a coordination of activities between different agencies and Ministries that range from greenhouse gas emissions to renewable energies or
energy dependence. In this regard, there is need to connect researchers from academia, business, and technology as relates to implementation, presenting an excellent opportunity for international cooperation. Such an approach not only fits with the agenda but reduces a reliance on Ministry lines who are engaged in developing sectoral plans for climate change (i.e. energy, environment, or infrastructures agencies). In this case, it will be necessary to introduce central agencies and Ministries for planning and finances, who are charged with developing an evaluation agenda. Once climate change is integrated into national evaluation agendas, it will be more impactful to grow capacity at all levels and make an effective use of these studies and recommendations.

Demands for climate change evaluation will require a group of multidisciplinary experts, and represents a new role of international cooperation agencies in order to manage the complexity of projects and the interaction of practices, making experiences from other countries highly relevant. In Spain, a National Plan of Adaptation to Climate Change will be evaluated in the next two years, and a group of experts has already been put together to follow up on this evaluation plan. FIIAPP is part of this group and as a result, can integrate experiences from Latin America and other regions of the world, particularly in Africa. The South-South Cooperation Project is therefore a solid part of a global partnership for sustainable development. The Project highlights the how to do since the what to do is clearly adopted by member countries in their evaluation agendas in accordance to their international commitments. A coordinated effort in measuring SDGs in this group could also bring about a new practice in monitoring and evaluating the 2030 Agenda, as well as an opportunity to collaborate with other regions of the world.
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Building regional infrastructures is one of the pillars of regional integration in West Africa. To this effect, several projects and programmes are being initiated while others are currently being designed. However, only few evaluations of the impacts of such projects and programmes are made available, which leads to capitalization constraints. The first evaluation demands should come from regional/subregional economic communities (RECs) and regional/subregional development banks (RDBs). Shortage of evaluations is attributable not to negligence, but rather to the fact that the formulation of demands for complex evaluations is gradual. Regarding such demand, its maturing process under way includes (i) the kick-start of a better institutionalization of the evaluation function at the regional level, (ii) the regional design of a knowledge map in order to assess the most relevant evaluation issues, (iii) systematic development of five-year rolling impact evaluation plans to describe the potential demand for medium-term impact evaluations, and (iv) the implementation of regional mechanisms for sustainable financing of impact evaluations.
Introduction

In West Africa, integration is supported by investments in regional infrastructures. This approach is being promoted since the creation of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in 1975 and of the West African Development Bank in 1973. Yet, evaluations of the impacts of such infrastructures on national and regional economic performance, the population’s well-being and business productivity are scarce. For the moment, this type of impact evaluation is slowly being called for by regional institutions financing development and economic integration, including those of West Africa. For instance, in the past five years, the Investment and Development Bank of the Economic Community of West African States and the Commission of West African Economic and Monetary Union (WAEMU) are still to conduct evaluations of the impacts of regional infrastructures; but they have already launched brainstorming on the issue. While the BOAD has already assessed the impacts of seven national projects of irrigation schemes, it has not yet done the same regarding regional infrastructure programmes. So, there is almost no evaluation demand for regional infrastructure programmes and projects.

One of the major concerns is to know why the current number of evaluation demands for regional infrastructure projects/programmes is close to zero, whereas the lessons thereof are likely to tremendously help speed up integration. Here, we highlight in particular
some factors explaining the very low level of impact evaluation demands for regional infrastructure projects and programmes, and at the same time, we look optimistically at the actions under way that aim at reversing the trend in the years to come.

Our approach is structured around six (6) points, namely: (i) who has to initiate the formulation of demand? (ii) the formulation process of demand, (iii) the start of an improved institutionalization of the evaluation function, (iv) the establishment of a knowledge map to assess the most relevant evaluation issues, (v) the systematic design of five-year impact evaluation plans and of stakeholder engagement and evidence uptake plans, and (vi) the implementation of mechanisms for a sustainable funding of impact evaluations.

The core challenge of evaluating regional development infrastructure impacts: Who has to initiate the formulation of demand?

The first evaluation demands should come from the West African institutions in charge of regional integration such as regional economic communities (RECs) and regional development banks (RDBs). While these institutions are aware of such responsibility, for now they have not yet ordered the evaluation of impacts caused by the extant regional infrastructures through their projects and programmes. This lack of evaluation is not due to negligence, but rather because the demand for this type of evaluation, which is complex, is formulated gradually.

It should be noted that the demand for impact evaluation is not made ex nihilo, as it requires a maturing process that is as important as both the evaluation itself and the use of lessons from prior evaluations. Much has been done to promote impact evaluation. Efforts include the organization, since 2003, of sensitization meetings and trainings within the WAEMU, with the support of the International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie), in collaboration with the African Development Bank (AfDB) or the BOAD; the organization as of 2012 of other meetings by The Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab (J-PAL), with the support of the The World Bank and other development partners; and the Benin Open Days for Evaluation (JBE). These events were important to sensitize people and launch capacity building activities. That notwithstanding, the maturing process for regional infrastructure project/programme impact evaluation demand was not sufficiently emphasized on such occasions. Workshops, training sessions and platforms set to this effect are scarce, and each regional institution seeks ways and means of building its demand. Given the peculiarities of regional projects and programmes, it is necessary to formulate the demand for assessing their impacts as a joint action. Indeed, regional infrastructures are built as a result of multi-stakeholder partnerships—with a great deal of countries, donors and civil society organizations, inter alia—and this makes it complex to attribute the results obtained to a single entity. Formulating evaluation demand as a joint action is therefore a best-practice option, but it is actually challenging to coordinating multiple views on the acquisition of evaluation information. A solution may consist in implementing a structural approach for the formulation of impact evaluation demands, and in minimizing the use of results. Particular focus should be on the various steps in the process of building demand for the
Proposing a demand building approach for the evaluation of regional infrastructure projects/programmes

Evaluation demand originates from the evaluation issue. More specifically, the issues such as those of "causality" (Morra Imas and Rist 2009) induce the matter of impact evaluation. But before turning one or more issues into an actual impact evaluation demand, a process has to be deployed. While there is no unanimity about the steps of this process, some actions can be taken to help structure the impact evaluation. As a series of actions leading to evaluation demand, the process could make it easier to analyse the crash points that curb the emergence of a high impact evaluation demand.

Our approach is built around four points: (i) the kick-start of a better institutionalisation of the evaluation function at the regional level, (ii) the design of a knowledge map in order to assess the most relevant evaluation issues, (iii) the systematic development of five-year rolling impact evaluation plans to describe the potential demand for medium-term impact evaluations, and (iv) the implementation of regional mechanisms to finance impact evaluations in a sustainable manner. Figure 1 shows the imbricated structured of such actions, which are better developed hereinafter.

Kick-start of the institutionalization of the evaluation function

Though it is not a sufficient requirement, the kick-start of the institutionalization of the evaluation function is necessary as a pillar for the evaluation activities. This is why the RDBs and some RECs of West Africa have been working to build the capacities of their organizational evaluation units. Since 2012, the BOAD, the WAEMU Commission and its Investment and Development Bank have set or reinforced their evaluation functions and the dedicated structures. This comes in line with their willingness to structure and address evaluation issues. However, with regard to regional infrastructure projects, the structuring process of impact evaluation issues should not devolve upon a single institution. Here, a joint action is necessary, like for the design of regional infrastructure programmes. In this regard, it should be recalled that the development of WAEMU infrastructure programmes—including the Programme of Community Actions for Infrastructures and Road Transport (PACITR), the Regional Economic Programme (REP), and the Regional Initiative for Sustainable Power (IRED)—was jointly carried out by the Community’s institutions, such as the BOAD, the WAEMU Commission, the...
Central Bank of West African States (CBWAS) and other external partners to the WAEMU. Equally, the ECOWAS Commission, the WAEMU Commission, the Investment and Development Bank, the BOAD and other external stakeholders to the Union were involved in the design of the ECOWAS Community Programme for Development. More efforts are needed to maintain this collaborative spirit in the design of impact evaluation demands. Measures are under way to give a regional perspective to the process of building impact evaluation demand, which will be guided by the RDBs and the RECs. In this light, it is expected that the institutionalization of the evaluation function will be reinforced and sustained at the regional level, through institutionalized evaluation coordination platforms.

**Design of a knowledge map to assess the most relevant issues**

It is complex to identify and sequence impact evaluation issues, as several national and regional actors have to be considered while the knowledge to be developed, sustained or discarded has to be sorted. Therefore, it is not easy to find out a convergence of evaluation needs and to coordinate applicants' engagement. This is why it is important to build an approach to unveil the knowledge needed. In this regard, the knowledge map⁴ may be useful, since it may help identify critical knowledge areas and sequence them according to their "criticity rate".⁵

A lack of impact evaluation knowledge map contributes to weakening the consistency and relevance of an impact evaluation demand, especially for regional infrastructure projects and programmes. Designing knowledge maps are likely to efficiently help not only to structure impact evaluation issues, depending on the desired knowledge categories, but also to build a consensual evaluation plan.

The institutions in charge of regional integration could join their efforts to develop a knowledge map that can induce relevant exchanges and insights for useful impact evaluation assignments. With the implementation of the West Africa Capacity Building and Impact Evaluation programme (WACIE) in WAEMU Member States, and in partnership with 3ie, the BOAD and the WAEMU Commission, a knowledge map will hopefully be initiated in the coming years.

**Systematic development of five-year rolling impact evaluation plans to describe the potential demand for medium-term impact evaluations**

The five-year rolling impact evaluation plans are used for planning the achievement of impact evaluations on a five-year period in order to systematically answer a set of questions that can enrich strategic and tactic knowledge. So far there is a scarcity of medium-term planning of impact evaluations for regional infrastructure projects and programmes in the WAEMU and the ECOWAS. The fact that impact evaluations are not considered when formulating regional infrastructure programmes may partially explain this situation. Until recently, impact evaluations were considered as a non-compulsory appendix to the implementation of infrastructure projects and programmes. It was therefore planned and implemented only at the end of the programme and depending on the availability of resources or on the instructions of technical and financial experts working for regional stakeholders. It looked more like a need for accountability or
Implementing a sustainable evaluation plan and taking advantage of its planning role also enhances the formulation of the Stakeholder Engagement and Evidence Uptake Plan (SEEP®). The SEEP is an upstream process in relation to the formulation of evaluation issues, and it helps to integrate evidence from impact evaluations. The procedure for developing the SEEPs compels the various stakeholders in the evaluation process to guarantee the effective use of evidence from impact evaluations, for a better quality of future projects and programmes.

Insofar as this in-depth study targets the political and economic context where impact evaluations, risks and mitigation actions for the use of evidence take place, it contributes to highlighting the appetite for evaluation issues and to measuring the anticipated usefulness of impact evaluations. Thus, the evaluation plan and the SEEP help to unveil the preferences of the various stakeholders and to establish coherence between demand and usefulness.

So far a few regional infrastructure programme impact evaluations in West Africa have benefited from a Stakeholder Engagement and Evidence Uptake Plan. This is partially attributed to the fact that structured platforms integrating a SEEP and that are able to disclose the preferences of potential applicants for impact evaluations at the supranational level hardly exist. Nevertheless, these tools will hopefully be more and more used in the future, as the RECs and the RDGs of West Africa are reinforcing their collaboration.

**Implementation of mechanisms for sustainable financing of impact evaluations**

To evaluate the impacts of regional infrastructure projects and programmes, an adequate budget is necessary. The lack of a stable mechanism to provide and allocate financial resources highly undermines evaluation demand. Important multilateral development institutions have solved this problem by putting in place automatic mechanisms in order to set a minimum budget for evaluations. Within the WAEMU and ECOWAS, the RECs and RDGs are still lacking automatic budget allocation mechanisms to finance impact evaluations. As a result, there is a reduced number of impact evaluation demands. Brainstorming is under way in the WAEMU to explore adapted solutions to the context of both the Member States and the community institutions.

Availability and stability of financial resources for evaluation plan implementation is a major challenge when it comes to increasing demand for impact evaluations for regional infrastructure projects and programmes. It is therefore important to solve this problem when designing such projects and programmes and to integrate specific budgets for impact evaluations in the financing plans. However, while the accounts of project/programme managers are being closed following implementation, the disbursement of funds for impact evaluation is not always achieved. Therefore, implementing mechanisms to remove such a stress becomes critical.
Conclusion

Building regional infrastructures is one of the pillars of regional integration in West Africa. To this effect, several projects and programmes are being initiated while others are currently designed. Only a few impact evaluations for these actions are available. Yet, the prospects for capitalisation require an assessment of the efficiency of regional infrastructures, for an improved implementation of integration policies. The first evaluation demands should come from the West African institutions in charge of regional integration, namely the RECs and the RDBs. While these institutions are aware of such responsibility, they have not yet explicitly ordered the evaluation of impacts caused by the regional infrastructures through their projects and programmes.

This lack of evaluation is not due to negligence, but rather to the type of evaluation, which is complex and needs a gradually formulated demand. It should be noted that the demand for impact evaluation is not made ex nihilo, but it requires a maturing process that is as significant as both the evaluation itself and the use of lessons from prior evaluations. The maturing process under way includes (i) the kick-start of a better institutionalization of the evaluation function at the regional level, (ii) the regional design of a knowledge map in order to assess the most relevant evaluation issues, (iii) a systematic development of five-year rolling impact evaluation plans to describe the potential demand for medium-term impact evaluations, and (iv) the implementation of regional mechanisms for a sustainable financing of impact evaluations.

Endnotes

1 The focus is on supranational, regional and subregional communities.

2 This includes subregional development banks and subregional economic communities.


4 The knowledge map is a knowledge management system that enables organizations to manage their knowledge assets so as to determine, following an in-depth analysis, the knowledge to be developed, sustained or discarded. It is a decision-making tool (Aubertin et al., 2003).

5 “Knowledge criticality” refers to the level of risk taken by the organization when the knowledge concerned is not partially or totally mastered within the organization (Michèle ORBAN, 2013).

6 The SEEP is based on the approach by the International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie).
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National M&E systems are critical in monitoring and evaluating the implementation of national development plans and the SDGs. These national evaluation systems need to be strengthened for more efficiency. This article shares the lessons learned from Ethiopia and Tanzania in strengthening their national evaluation systems, an initiative supported by the Finnish Government and the African Development Bank.
For the past 5 years, the Independent Development Evaluation (IDEV) of the African Development Bank (or, the Bank) has been actively engaged in developing the evaluation capacity of African governments, parliamentarians, and other regional institutions. One of IDEV’s strategic objectives is to promote an evaluation culture in the Bank and Regional Member Countries (RMCS), and encourage a focus on development results, learning and continuous quality improvement. The Bank’s evaluation capacity development (ECD) support to RMCS includes strengthening national evaluation systems, establishing regional networks and communities of practice, establishing evaluation platforms, and much more. These initiatives are in collaboration with other development partners.

Given this is the last year of implementing the project on Strengthening National Evaluation Systems (SNES) in Africa, I wanted to share some of the key lessons that we have learned.

The SNES initiative is a partnership between IDEV and the Finnish Government started in 2014 and providing ECD support to Ethiopia and Tanzania in strengthening their National Monitoring and Evaluation Systems (NMES), which are crucial for accountability, drawing lessons, good governance and improving development outcomes of public investment programs. In several countries, the development of a sound evaluation system has been the focal point of strengthening performance-based budgeting and evidence-based decision-making.

In concentrating on catalytic activities, the project supports four key areas: 1) formulation of a country owned National Evaluation Strategy; 2) development of a National Evaluation Policy and an institutional framework for evaluation; 3) strengthening skills for planning, managing and implementing complex evaluation projects; and 4) implementing an advocacy program to stimulate demand for high quality evaluations.

The overall IDEV approach to capacity development is holistic, incorporating individual, institutional and enabling environments. These catalytic activities are intended to move both countries towards having robust evaluation systems.

The challenges

The scale of capacity development support needed on the continent to improve national evaluation systems is immense. The

---

**Jayne Musumba, IDEV, African Development Bank**

**Development effectiveness in Africa not only depends on the operations of development partners, but also on those of African governments.**
Lessons for Strengthening a National Evaluation System

AfDB President Akinwumi Adesina (center).

challenges are formidable. Case studies conducted by CLEAR in 2012 highlight the various challenges - which cut across all African countries - in building national evaluation systems. The key hurdles include: a lack of national policy frameworks for monitoring and evaluation (M&E); a low level of M&E professionalization; inadequate professional capacity for M&E; underdeveloped Internet infrastructure; low quality of data; and uneven utilization of data. These challenges are still valid even in the era of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), where countries face four ongoing and interrelated challenges: developing an NEP; building enough individual evaluation capacity; ensuring institutions and processes are in place; and adequately engaging partners. These challenges are dynamic and affect both the supply of and demand for relevant and useful evidence that can inform national plans and policies (IIED Briefing).

The motivation

National M&E systems are critical in monitoring and evaluating the implementation of national development plans and the SDGs. The drive for Ethiopia and Tanzania is no different. There are five key lessons that we have learned to date. They may seem obvious in implementing any capacity development initiative, but it is worth sharing the experience of Ethiopia and Tanzania in their respective context.

Political will and ownership

From preliminary discussions with key stakeholders, the demand for evaluation is primarily coming from development partners whose program or project designs require an evaluation at the end of the program or project. But, this culture is slowly changing.
In both countries, the political will is there, starting from the executive to the implementing ministries, agencies and officers. Since the inception of the project, both countries have undergone general elections, meaning changes of administration. In the case of Tanzania, it brought significant changes, in particular the loss of the original lead national implementing partner, the President’s Delivery Bureau (PDB) - which has since been disbanded - and its replacement by the Planning Commission of Tanzania in the Ministry of Finance. However, this did not lead to the discontinuity of SNES project. Therefore, a key lesson learned is to ensure the right institution takes the lead.

Ownership starts with how demand for the project is identified. The country has to be ready to own the process. Both Ethiopia and Tanzania had evaluation experience to build-on which was critically important for their appreciation of an NMES. But although the implementation of a national development plan is a key motivation, ownership is also rooted in a country-owned NMES system that recognizes the importance of both the supply of and demand for M&E information, as well as political factors and an enabling environment that will allow an NMES to grow within a country. Our experience to date shows a need to also strengthen ownership within the countries through continuous engagement with national partners, going beyond the central evaluation units to include other government ministries and agencies as well as other local players such as research and training institutions, civil society organizations, etc. They all have a stake at the improvement of the NMES.

Where to Start – the diagnostics

The two countries took a different approach on how they wanted to start the implementation of the SNES initiative. In Ethiopia, we conducted two diagnostic assessments of the national M&E system at both the federal level in 2014, and at the regional level in 2016. Both exercises provided a better understanding of the system in regard to its strengths, capacity gaps, challenges and opportunities for the national M&E system. In addition, both assessments provided inputs and recommendations for the development of their National Evaluation Policy approved by Council of Ministers in 2017. This is one of the greatest achievements of the project thus far. In Tanzania, they opted to build on the “Big Results Now”, or BRN, methodology led by PDB. This is a methodology adopted from the Malaysia’s Big Fast Results. Given the success of BRN’s first year of implementation, the SNES project was to provide support in extending the new M&E methodology across the government beyond the six national key results areas (agriculture, education, energy, resource mobilization, transport and water), bringing Tanzania back on track in her ambition of making the Tanzania Development Vision 2025 a reality. In retrospect, a full diagnostic or needs assessment at the beginning would have been useful in learning more about the system. In reality, the much needed information about the national M&E system came much later in the scoping mission in 2017.

The use of champions

Find your champions early. These are individuals and institutions who have a keen interest in improving the national evaluation system. The challenge to the lead institutions is to ensure they have the right instruments, processes and incentives in keeping the champions fully engaged. In addition, the lead institutions need to have clarity on how best to use their champions. In both countries, there were periods where it seemed nothing was happening, there was a risk to sustaining the interest and affiliation of the various stakeholders of the system. With hindsight, establishing a Community of Practice, connecting the various M&E professionals, agencies, etc. could have kept this interest and enthusiasm going. Indeed, there were some missed opportunities as this had not been done earlier.
Learning by doing

In addition to trainings, it is imperative to provide opportunities to “learn by doing” through fostering peer learning. This requires greater commitment from the respective individuals and institutions receiving the learning as well as the organization providing the experiences/learning. This must also be cognizant of the transient nature of civil servants, moving from one ministry or government agency to another, which remains a challenge.

I had the opportunity of participating in both the initial diagnostic assessment at the federal level in Ethiopia and primary discussions with the various stakeholders in the national M&E system in Tanzania. It was observed that some sector ministries had strong or weak M&E functions in both countries, which provided an opportunity for peer learning within the country and between the two countries. For example, M&E in Tanzania’s health sector was very strong and they had established creative partnerships in data collection, analysis, and dissemination. To its side, M&E in the Ethiopian education sector was equally strong. Knowledge exchange exercises between these sectors in the two countries would have been helpful. But this learning did not stop only with the two countries, indeed both countries also expressed the desire of learning from other countries such as Singapore, Malaysia, Korea, etc., therefore, looking for experiences beyond the continent.

Partnerships

Establish partnership very early in the process. To further support these two countries and additional ones from the continent, requires tremendous resources—financial, human and technical. To meet this need, we are reaching out to other development partners at national, regional and global levels. As a lesson, it is important to ensure that these systems are strengthened and sustainable, therefore partnerships with the following actors is
critical: government, civil society, donors, research, academia, private sector, etc. Each has a contribution to make. For example, in skills development, support is needed in tailoring country training for evaluators and decision makers. With peer-to-peer mutual support, employing twinning and south-south cooperation arrangements is key. And with joint evaluations, providing hands-on experience, or learning by doing, is helpful.

Donor partners can also play a stronger role in building evaluation capacity in governments, in particular as donors undertake their program evaluations. In this process, donors could incorporate building evaluation capacity in the conducting of their evaluations.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the demand for similar evaluation capacity development support is real. One or two organizations cannot address this demand alone for the continent. It requires more commitment and resources to build national evaluation systems. What is important is to ensure that countries are in the driver’s seat, owning and leading the process, knowing where to start (i.e. having a good understanding of a national evaluation system), identifying your champions, fostering learning, and building effective partnerships.
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IDEV visits the Asian Development Bank to benchmark the AfDB’s work in PPPs and compare its sanctions processes.

IDEV is conducting an evaluation of the Bank’s utilization of PPP mechanisms for the 2006-2016 period. The evaluation includes, as one of its main building blocks, a benchmarking exercise of the AfDB with selected Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs) including the Asian Development Bank (AsDB). At the same time, IDEV is conducting a comparative review of sanctions practices across International Financial Institutions.

IDEV conducts 12 field visits across 5 countries to evaluate the Bank’s quality assurance across the project cycle

As part of an evaluation of the Bank’s quality assurance across the project cycle, IDEV evaluators conducted country case study visits to Senegal, Morocco, Cameroon, Kenya and Zimbabwe, from March to May 2018. The evaluators reviewed 25 projects through interviews with key stakeholders at the Bank, government counterparts, executing agencies and development partners.

In this context, in March 2018, the department undertook at mission to the AsDB in the Philippines, as part of its work on these two evaluations.

In Manila, IDEV participated in several discussions with key staff at the AsDB dealing with PPP activities and sanctions practices. The mission was an opportunity to share lessons and knowledge, as well as identify good practices at the AsDB for future strategic and operational guidance at the AfDB.

The mission included 12 field visits to active projects, such as a visit to a rural electrification project in Morocco, a rice project in Senegal, an outer ring road transportation project in Kenya, a water and...
IDEV visits Mauritius for the Bank’s country strategy and programme over the period 2009–2018

As part of the on-going evaluation of the Bank’s country strategy and programme in Mauritius over the period 2009–2018, IDEV evaluators undertook a data collection mission to Mauritius from 16 to 27 April 2018. The objective of the mission was to collect qualitative and quantitative information to assess the development results of the Bank’s intervention in Mauritius over the last decade, including projects, technical assistance, analytical works, policy dialogue, advisory services and donor coordination.

During the evaluation period, the Bank’s total approvals amounted to UA 618 (USD 874) million. In line with the High 5s, the Bank’s portfolio in Mauritius includes the “Saint Louis Power Station redevelopment project”, which is a high quality power station with a 60,000–200,000 hr (around 25 years) expected life. The new power station aims to have positive environmental impact by reducing noise and air pollution (see picture below).

All the information and documents collected during the mission will feed into various component reports. The Team will prepare three sector reports that will feed into a technical report expected by end of June 2018.

The Evaluation of Quality Assurance across the Project Cycle covers around 300 Bank projects looking at quality at entry as well as at supervision and exit. The objectives of the evaluation are:

- To explore and derive knowledge on known challenges with respect to the quality of the Bank’s portfolio,
- To address broader issues across the project cycle, including the contribution of the quality assurance chain to learning and development effectiveness; and
- To support the implementation of the DBDm and the High 5s, providing an independent view and bringing forward lessons.

The IDEV evaluation and the lessons learnt will support the Bank’s ADF-14 commitments to improve the quality of project design, supervision and the performance of operations, as well as to ensure the Bank operates as a learning organization.
Powering Africa through Interconnection: Project cluster evaluation

The evaluation of AfDB-funded power interconnection projects covers a cluster of energy sector operations approved by the Bank during the period 1999–2013. The selection of power interconnection was driven by the fact that it can significantly contribute to regional integration and help reduce the cost of electricity generation, thereby improving the overall energy supply in Africa. During the period under study, the Bank approved 48 projects related to power interconnection, amounting to UA 822 million. The cluster evaluation covers 6 of these (5 completed and 1 ongoing project), representing 25% of total energy operations approved by the Bank during the 1999–2013 period and a net amount of UA 196 million.

The cluster evaluation was intended to provide inputs to the independent evaluation of the Bank’s assistance in the energy sector as well as the overall Comprehensive Evaluation of the Bank’s Development Results (CEDR). In addition, the evaluation aimed to help Management in strengthening the implementation of the Bank’s 2011 energy sector policy and the 2014 regional integration policy and strategy, by providing insightful results (findings, lessons learnt and recommendations).

The evaluation examined the standard evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, as well as the main project success or failure factors. It also contributed to the CEDR questions of whether the Bank has made a difference in Africa, whether it is maximizing its value as a development partner, and whether it is learning from what it is doing. Lastly, it evaluates a group of projects implemented in different contexts drawing on different sources of information (such as desk reviews, consultation with key stakeholders, and field visits), and using both qualitative and quantitative analytical methods.

Spurring local socio-economic development through rural electrification: Project cluster evaluation

This cluster evaluation assesses the effectiveness of 6 out of the 18 rural electrification investment projects funded by the African Development Bank between 1999 and 2013, amounting to about USD 290 million. The projects cover five countries: Benin, Ethiopia, the Gambia, Mozambique and Tunisia. The selection of rural electrification as one of the evaluation themes is due to the fact that it has a pronounced impact on the majority of Africans living in rural and sub-urban areas.

The goal of this evaluation is to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of completed rural electrification projects to draw key lessons from what worked, and what did not work. In addition to informing the design and implementation of future projects, this evaluation also adds to the ongoing independent evaluation of the Bank’s assistance in the energy sector as well as the overall Comprehensive Evaluation of the Bank’s Development Results completed in 2016. Additionally, it aims to help the implementation of the Bank’s New deal on Energy for Africa by providing lessons learnt. Being intended as a learning product, the report does not contain recommendations.

Lessons learnt:

Lesson #1: Lack of critical risk analysis and adequate risk mitigation measures can contribute to substantial implementation delays and inefficiencies.

Lesson #2: Integration between rural electrification and other rural development projects (irrigation, agriculture, water supply, health, education, microcredit, etc.) is critical to better outcomes.

Lesson #3: Focusing rural electrification on geographical rather than household coverage can bring electricity closer to rural households but cannot ensure universal access unless issues of affordability to the rural poor are addressed.

Lesson #4: Appropriate tariffs and subsidies are critical to the financial viability of electricity utilities and to sustaining rural electrification benefits.

Lesson #5: Strong political support, including an initial investment subsidy and adequate institutional framework, is necessary to sustain project results.


An IDEV Project Cluster Evaluation
Spurring Local Socio-Economic Development Through Rural Electrification
Cluster Evaluation Report
March 2018
The AfDB’s support for agricultural value chains development: Lessons for the Feed Africa Strategy

In 2017, IDEV undertook an evaluation of the Bank’s support for agricultural value chains development (AVCD), assessing the agricultural portfolio during the period 2005–2016, amounting to approximately UA 3.1 billion. The objectives of the evaluation were to: i) assess the relevance, inclusiveness, effectiveness, and sustainability of the Bank’s support to value chains development; and ii) provide lessons and recommendations for the implementation and design of agricultural value chains interventions associated with the Feed Africa Strategy.

Evaluation findings

- The evaluation found that agricultural value chains development has been a growing and evolving approach for the Bank, and is the cornerstone of the current Feed Africa Strategy. The evaluation also identified five fundamentals and five enablers for AVCD interventions.

- The five fundamentals include: (1) careful context-specific value chain analysis to ensure value-added along the Value Chain (VC); (2) inclusiveness for poor farmers, women, youth and other vulnerable groups in both participation and benefits sharing; (3) flexibility and responsiveness to changing contexts and market needs; (4) focus primarily on profitability and efficiency of the value chain; and (5) apply strategies to ensure the sustainability of outcomes.

- The five enabling factors that are context-specific to ensure the success of AVCD include: (1) availability of appropriate infrastructure and technology; (2) conducive policy and regulatory environment pertaining to the targeted VC; (3) availability of appropriate business support services to strengthen the skills of VC actors; (4) access to finance for VC actors to make required investments to achieve increased profitability; and (5) private sector engagement and working relationships among VC actors. In addition, while the key enablers for AVCD are evident throughout the Bank’s interventions, the evaluation indicates an opportunity to strengthening the VC fundamentals.

Evaluation recommendations

The evaluation proposed the following six main recommendations to strengthen the Bank’s approach to AVCD for the Feed Africa Strategy:

#1 Build a coherent and consistent approach to AVCD across Bank operations

#2 Build AVCD analytical and implementation capabilities.

#3 Focus AVCD interventions on adding value and achieving sustainable impact.

#4 Work with partners, especially the private sector, to strengthen strategic and operational approaches to AVCD.

#5 Take affirmative actions to ensure inclusiveness.

#6 Strengthen policy dialogue to enhance a conducive AVCD environment.

Strengthening agricultural value chains to feed Africa: Project cluster evaluation

This report presents the key findings from the evaluation of a cluster of 9 agricultural value chain interventions by the African Development Bank over the period 2005–2016. The nine case studies were conducted as inputs to the formative evaluation titled "AfDB Support for Agricultural Value Chains Development: Lessons for the Feed Africa Strategy."

Lessons learnt

Lesson #1: Insufficient analysis in AVCD project designs constrains achievement of outcomes and impact, while comprehensive VC analysis guides implementation and responsiveness to changes in markets and contexts.

Lesson #2: AVCD interventions that focus heavily on increases in commodity production without sufficiently considering the efficiency of the production system and the value chain as a whole, will incur net financial and economic losses.

Lesson #3: Experience from the case studies shows that effective AVCD interventions require realistic planning that takes into account appropriateness of scope in terms of the time required for contributory activities to mature, the VC actors chosen for support, the scale of activities responsive to the market demand, and sequencing of activities.

Lesson #4: Deliberate, concerted and targeted efforts at all stages of AVCD design and implementation are essential to ensure inclusiveness. Processes that ensure participation, and mechanisms for equitable benefit sharing, enable meaningful inclusiveness.

Lesson #5: Sustained benefit from AVCD interventions requires a comprehensive package of support that ensures partnerships with the private sector, the government and other development actors.

Comparative study of Board processes, procedures and practices

IDEV conducted a comparative study of Board processes, procedures, practices across International Financial Institutions (IFIs), and the extent to which they could contribute to the effectiveness and efficiency of the Board of Directors in fulfilling its mandate. The primary objective was to draw lessons and good practices emerging from other IFIs for consideration by the AfDB’s Board of Directors. The study covers corporate governance, accountability, Board operations, and support to the Board.

Some of the findings include:

- The AfDB’s Board of Directors is similar and in line with others in terms of the stated objectives of corporate governance, in the institutional and organizational structure, and in the language spelling out the general and specific roles and responsibilities of oversight.

- There were differences between Boards in the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation of processes, procedures and practices and the day-to-day operation of organizational structures.

- All organizations’ Boards and managements struggle to varying degrees with finding the appropriate balance between providing oversight over strategy, risk and results, and engaging in more executive, transactional activities and decisions.

- Well-functioning Board committees are important to the Bank. Committee work reduces the burden on the full Board, and allows it to focus on critical issues and provide oversight over strategy, risk and results. It is important to strengthen Committees to provide clear and timely inputs to full Board discussions.

- Greater delegation to Management requires the ability to track Management commitments and results.

- It is important to build morale and a shared understanding of the opportunities and challenges among Executive Directors as officers of the organization, who otherwise represent different shareholder interests.

- Building social capital, the basis for trust and confidence among Executive Directors, and between the Board and Management, is vital for effectiveness and efficiency of corporate governance.

The study was well received by the AfDB Board of Directors, which, under the auspices of the Dean, is preparing an action plan as a follow-up.

Addressing regional integration challenges in Central Africa

In March 2018, IDEV presented to the AfDB Board the findings of an independent evaluation of the regional integration strategy and operations of the AfDB, 2011-2016. The evaluation assessed: (a) the relevance and consistency of the Bank’s strategy for fostering regional integration in Central Africa; and (b) the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the Bank’s multinational operations (MOs) in that region. It discussed the key factors leading to MOs’ low performance with respect to the performance of the Bank and that of countries and regional organizations.

Recommendations

From the main findings, IDEV made the following recommendations:

1. Address grand challenges of Central Africa with a commensurate tailored approach. The region has a multitude of development challenges that have to be met through a combination of efforts at the national and regional levels.

2. Move from a Regional Integration Strategy Paper (RISP) to an indicative operational program.

3. Undertake a more active dissemination of the Central Africa regional integration program.

4. Improve policy dialogue and leadership. It is essential to conduct policy dialogue at the highest level to increase the level of commitment and ownership by the policy and decision makers in countries and regions.

5. Consider more realistic business planning than is currently the case. All the RISPs had an extension of two years.

6. Continue supporting capacity building. The Bank should help clarify the division of labor between ECCAS and their specialized agencies.

IDEV participates in Evaluation Cooperation Group meeting

On 31 May and 1 June, IDEV participated in the twice-yearly meeting of the Evaluation Cooperation Group. Hosted and chaired by the Independent Evaluation Department of the Asian Development Bank, the meeting discussed topics including additionality, private sector evaluations, the ongoing review of the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, and external evaluation. During the thematic session on “Evaluation and Audit”, IDEV shared its recent experience of having been audited by the AfDB’s internal audit department. The ECG meeting was preceded on 30 May by a joint meeting with the MDB working group on Managing for Development Results on “Improving Results Measurement and Management”. ECG members also participated in a panel discussion open to all AsDB staff and chaired by AsDB President Takehiko Nakao on “Assessing Performance – Boosting Results in MDBs”.

Development Evaluation Week 2018: Strengthening Development Impact

The Independent Development Evaluation (IDEV) of the African Development Bank (AfDB) will host its 2018 edition of Development Evaluation Week on 05-07 September 2018 in Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire. Under the theme “Strengthening Development Impact”, this year’s knowledge sharing forum will focus on the contribution evaluation can make to achieving greater development outcomes through learning from the past. The main objective is to facilitate a reflection on the contribution of development evaluation to the implementation of the key priority areas under the African Union’s Agenda 2063. The centrality of evaluation and learning from results (either positive or negative) will be interrogated from diverse perspectives around topics such as agricultural value chains, public-private partnerships for infrastructure development, and processes such as harvesting knowledge from evaluations, strengthening evaluation capacities, and establishing strategic partnerships to promote evaluation, among others.

First Quarter 2018: Building supply and demand for evaluation in Africa (Volume 1)

Evaluation plays a critical role in the effective implementation of good governance structures in Africa, in promoting accountability, learning, development effectiveness, and sustained and rapid economic growth. Yet the supply of and demand for evaluation is still relatively low in most African countries. In this edition of Evaluation Matters, we look at the issues that need to be addressed in building the supply and demand of evaluation in the continent.


Fourth Quarter 2017: Evaluation as a driver of reform in IFIs

What is the added value of independent evaluation focused not on projects and programs but on organizations themselves? Does it help organizations deliver more and better? Does evaluation evidence have any impact on the way development organizations are managing themselves? In this edition of Evaluation Matters, find the answers to all these questions and many more.


Third Quarter 2017: Evaluation in the era of the SDGs

This issue of Evaluation Matters is dedicated to evaluating the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It discusses the consequences of the paradigm shift from the MDGs to the SDGs and what the world of evaluation should do differently in this new era. Evaluation is acknowledged in Agenda 2030 as crucial to the follow-up and review processes for SDG progress, and evaluators can, and should, make a real difference to SDG achievements by helping point in the right direction for investment efforts.


Second Quarter 2017: The Comprehensive Evaluation of Development Results: Behind the Scenes

This edition of eVALUation Matters focuses on the CEDR exercise – a consultative, iterative-process which prioritized the engagement and involvement of all key stakeholders throughout the exercise in order to mitigate the effects of the key challenges involved in such a complicated undertaking. The publication synthesizes viewpoints and reflections by drawing on the extant literature on complex evaluations, field challenges, and teamwork, while at the same time incorporating rich empirical material, anecdotal vignettes, and personal stories from the field, to highlight the CEDR experience in all its complexity and diversity. Each article provides a further snapshot of the dynamics of a complex evaluation.
