

Global Mapping of the Status of National Evaluation Policies 2021

Report

Conducted and published by the Global Parliamentarians Forum
for Evaluation

Authored by Dr. Barbara Rosenstein and Asela Kalugampitiya

November 2021

Foreword

The Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation is a collaborative movement of international parliamentarians, committed to improving policy outcomes and social accountability. The goal of GPFE is to create enabling environments for nationally owned, transparent, systematic, and standardized evaluation processes. Through capacity building, knowledge sharing and advocacy, the GPFE supports and empowers parliamentarians to deliver evidence-based policy that helps achieve good governance, sustainable development, and social equity. In achieving the objective of GPFE which is to support parliaments and governments to institutionalize evaluation, the Forum has conducted another comprehensive study to update the NEPs.

The Global Mapping of National Evaluation Policies was first started in 2013 by the Parliamentarians Forum with support from EvalPartners. The 2013 report was well received by many international organizations, parliamentarians and VOPEs. The findings of the report were used for advocacy and planning for NEPs at country level. The Parliamentarians Forum again with support from EvalPartners, conducted the global mapping in 2015 which revealed several developments in NEPs in various countries. Both mapping reports were presented and discussed in many international evaluation conferences and analyzed findings in several books and publications. GPFE held regional consultations on NEPs in Asia, Africa and MENA regions based on the mapping studies.

As it is important to take stock of developments in NEPs, GPFE decided to conduct the global mapping again this year. The objective of the study is to provide information on the status of national evaluation policies and systems by country, which will be used for advocacy initiatives where there are no such systems. It is noteworthy to see there are many developments in NEPs in many countries and more countries have endorsed NEP compared to the past. The findings of the mapping will be certainly used by GPFE for supporting Parliamentarians and working with VOPEs on NEPs.

Acknowledgement

The Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation takes this opportunity to thank all the VOPEs, individuals and organizations for providing information for the study. GPFE acknowledges the authors of the global mapping: Barbara Rosenstein and Asela Kalugampitiya for their dedication and hard work in conducting the study and authoring the report. Furthermore, GPFE is also thankful to EvalPartners and International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation for supporting the global mapping study.

We are also thankful to Madhuka Liyanagamage for designing the cover page and formatting of the report.

Suggested citation:

Rosenstein & Kalugampitiya (2021), Global Mapping on Status of National Evaluation Policies – Report, The Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation, Colombo, Sri Lanka.

Contact for use of content, further information or publication of any contents

Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation

Email: gpf.evaluation@gmail.com

Website: www.gpffe.org

Chair: Kabir Hashim

kabbahh@gmail.com

Coordinator: Asela Kalugampitiya

aselakalugampitiya@yahoo.ie

Table of Contents

Foreword.....	iv
Acknowledgement.....	v
List of Tables.....	vii
Acronyms.....	viii
Executive Summary.....	ix
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Background.....	2
3. Methodology.....	4
4. Limitations of the study.....	7
5. Findings.....	8
5.1. Status of NEPs.....	8
5.2. Administrators of NEP and Sectors where evaluation is practiced.....	22
5.3. Sectors in which the evaluation function is prevalent.....	23
6. Conclusions.....	25
6.1. Focus on capacity building and enabling environment.....	25
6.2. Different forms of evaluation.....	25
6.3. Government programs and polices vs. donor driven programs and projects.....	26
7. Challenges, Lesson Learnt & Suggestions.....	27
7.1. Challenges concerning NEPs.....	27
7.2. Lessons learned from the research.....	28
7.3. Suggestions.....	28
References.....	30
Appendices.....	33
Appendix A: Letter sent to VOPEs and other contacts.....	33
Appendix B: VOPE contacts who provided information for the research.....	34
Government Policy Evaluations Act (2020.1.7).....	35
Appendix C: Countries other resources (65).....	39
Appendix D: Countries for which no current information was available (14).....	44
Appendix E: Administrating or Coordinating Bodies by Country for those with and without a policy (102).....	45

List of Tables

Table 1: Sources of data	6
Table 2: Definitions of NEP in the three studies	7
Table 3: Definitions	9
Table 4: Countries in which there is a legislated, approved, or regulated policy in the constitution, by law, or by decree (35)	11
Table 5: Countries with NEP Pending Approval (10)	17
Table 6: Countries with no NEP with widespread and routine evaluation practice (22)..	19
Table 7: Countries where states have a policy, but no national policy (4)	20
Table 8: Comparison of the three Mappings	22
Table 9: Distribution of Administrative and coordination bodies responsible for the evaluation function	22
Table 10: Countries with a sectorial policy (7)	24
Table 11: Countries for which information came from VOPEs (48)	34
Table 12: Countries from which information came from other resource (65)	39
Table 13: Countries for which no current information was available (14)	44
Table 14: Administrating or Coordinating Bodies for Evaluation Function by Country for those with and without an NEP (102)	45

Acronyms

ADB	Asian Development Bank
APEA	Asia Pacific Evaluation Association
CPBRD	Congressional Policy and Budget Research Department
DEval	German Institute for Development Evaluation
ERWATCH	European Commission Platform on Research and Innovation policies and systems
EvalMENA	Evaluators Network of the Middle East and North Africa region
EU	European Union
GPFE	Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation
IPDET	International Program for Development Evaluation Training
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MES	Monitoring and Evaluation System
NEP	National Evaluation Policy
NEPF	National Evaluation Policy Framework
NGO	Non-government Organization
NIMES	National Integrated M&E Strategy
NPM	New public management
OECD/DAC	Organization for Co-operation in Development/Development Assistance Committee
OGP	Open Government Partnership
PFDE	The Parliamentarians Forum on Development Evaluation in South Asia
PMS	Performance management system
RBM	Results-based management
RIA	Regulation Impact Assessment
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SEPO	Senate Economic Planning Office
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNPDP	United Nations Development Program
VOPE	Voluntary Organization for Professional Evaluation
WB	The World Bank
WFP	World Food Program

Executive Summary

National Evaluation Policies (NEPs) are developing throughout the world as a means of ensuring good and inclusive government policies and programs. In 2013 and 2015 Parliamentarians Forum for Development Evaluation in South Asia (PFDE) with support from EvalPartners issued studies of the status of NEPs. These reports were used as a basis for discussions about NEPs as well as in formulating NEPs in several countries. The purpose of the present mapping report is to provide current information about the status of NEPs in countries around the globe. It aims to enhance those discussions and supply more information to serve as a basis for NEPs development and implementation.

The methodology used for the study included a desk review of the available literature on NEPs, a thorough internet search for information on NEPs by country, a short questionnaire sent to Voluntary Organizations for Professional Evaluation (VOPEs) and other evaluation professionals, government officials and stakeholders. Triangulation was used to confirm and strengthen the self-reported responses. All links to policies and documents were double checked for availability and relevance.

The questions were sent to 132 VOPEs, 19 were returned for incorrect addresses, and 48 responded with information. Information on 65 countries was collected from Internet sites, professional literature, and other correspondence. A total of 113 countries are included in the study.

The research found an increase in NEPs from 2013 to 2021. In 2013 there were 20 countries with an NEP and in 2021 there are 35. Furthermore, 10 countries are currently awaiting legislative approval of their policies. Countries that were developing policies in 2013 and 2015, have actualized them by 2021. Countries that did not have an NEP in 2013 and 2015 but were practicing evaluation routinely have, initiated NEPs in 2021.

NEPs vary from country to country to suit the context. Like the previous studies, this study found 21 countries that routinely conduct evaluation with no NEP. Several countries have sectorial evaluation requirements but no NEP. In others, specific states that have statewide policies but no NEP. Some countries have an NEP and in addition, have sectorial policies.

KEY FINDINGS

- 35 COUNTRIES HAVE AN NEP
- 21 COUNTRIES WITH NO NEP CONDUCT EVALUATIONS ROUTINELY
- 10 COUNTRIES ARE AWAITING LEGISLATION
- 7 COUNTRIES HAVE SECTORIAL EVALUATION POLICIES
- 4 COUNTRIES HAVE STATE EVALUATION POLICIES

ADMINISTRATIVE BODY

- 21% Specific Ministry
- 19% Ministry of Planning and Development
- 17% Executive

The evaluation function is administered or coordinated by a variety of government departments. The research found that 21% of the countries surveyed designate specific ministries or departments for carrying out evaluations, while 19% assigned the administration and coordination to the Ministry of Planning and Development. The Executive (President, or Cabinet) was the coordinating body in 17% of the countries. The remaining countries were spread

equally among the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Audit Office, the Ministry of Economic Planning, and separate ministries for each sector.

Along with this increase in the development, approval, and legislation of NEPs, there has been a trend to focus attention on capacity building, not only for evaluators, but for stakeholders as well. In addition, countries are working on National Evaluation Policy Frameworks (NEPFs) as precursors to NEPs.

Evaluation frameworks and policies are developing and being formalized around the world. Knowledge about such policies increases with experience in the field. The major challenges remain - quality, use and follow-up of the evaluations conducted because of the NEPF or the NEP. Like in the previous studies, context plays an important role in the development and implementation of an NEP. Governments change, political personalities replace each other and the situation on the ground is in flux. Thus, NEPs should be well integrated into the functioning of governments to ensure sustainability. Resembling evaluation itself, NEPs are an iterative process and should be flexible and adaptive to the circumstances on the ground.

Mapping the Status of National Evaluation Policies

1. Introduction

The present study updates the information gathered in the 2013 and 2015 studies of the Status of National Evaluation Policies (NEPs) around the world. The first part of the report begins with a discussion of the rationale for this updated report and is followed by a brief background of recent developments in the field of worldwide evaluation. The second section explains the methodology used in the research. The findings section consists of detailed tables of the status of NEPs in countries where accurate documentation could be found. The report concludes with challenges, lessons learned and suggestions.

In the beginning of the 2010s, interest in NEPs was growing and worldwide information was not available. Studies were conducted and reported, but nothing on a global scale was attempted. The Parliamentarians Forum on Development Evaluation in South Asia (PFDE) and EvalPartners initiated two seminal mapping reports, one in 2013 and the second in 2015. These reports have been cited in forums, conferences, and the evaluation literature since publication. However, there have been changes and developments in the field since 2015 and it is important for the information on NEPs to be as current and accurate as possible. A short list of places where the reports were referenced or used as a basis for discussion appears below:

Towards a baseline study: Insights on National Evaluation Capacities in 43 Countries [NEC Base study](#)

Proceedings from National Evaluation Capacity conferences, 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015, 2017, 2019 [NEC proceedings](#)

National evaluation policies for sustainable and equitable development How to integrate gender equality and social equity in national evaluation policies and systems. Ed. Marco Segone Authors Michael Bamberger, Marco Segone and Shravanti Reddy. [Segone, Bamberger, Reddy](#)

The 2013 report was presented at the 11th EES Biennial Conference: *Evaluation for an Equitable Society: Independence, Partnership, Participation*, in Dublin in October 2014 and at the 4th International Conference on National Evaluation Capacities (NEC), which took place in Bangkok on 26-30 October 2015.

The 2015 report has received over 890 reads on the ResearchGate website.¹

¹ [Researchgate NEP Report 2015](#)

2. Background

Seven years have passed since the 2015 study. PDFE has grown into the Global Parliamentary Forum for Evaluation (GPFE), which was launched on 25th November 2015 at the Parliament of Nepal. One of the missions of GPFE is to advocate for NEPs and evaluation systems. Advocating involves providing parliamentarians with information about existing NEPs, new developments, and experiences from the field.

Several developments have pushed evaluation and evaluation policy to the forefront. The most influential of all has been the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) proposed by the UN in 2015. With only nine years left to achieve the SDGs, the UN Secretary General has called on all sectors of society and people everywhere to mobilize for a Decade of Action to deliver the SDGs. In 2019 the UNDP, Independent Evaluation Office held a conference entitled *Leaving No one behind: Evaluation for 2030*.² The conference theme included national evaluation capacities. The audience agreed that building an evaluation culture is a “job for us all.” Participants confirmed that “national evaluation capacities” means more than individual capacity of evaluators; it also means institutional capacity. A presentation from Botswana illustrated that strengthening a Monitoring and Evaluation System (MES) *is not an event, but a process that requires commitment from all stakeholders*. Evaluation culture and capacities were emphasized.

In line with the increased interest in capacity, two major events have taken place. One is the creation of the National Evaluation Capacity Index (INEC)³ in 2018. This initiative, led by the German Institute for Development Evaluation (DEval) and the World Food Program (WFP) representing a wide group of governmental and non-governmental institutions, is developing the first assessment on National Capacities on Evaluation in nine countries of Latin America and the Caribbean. It strives to build evaluation capacity in the region with an emphasis on participatory evaluation.

These developments point to another trend in the evaluation field – Regional Voluntary Organization of Professional Evaluators. The growth of RNENs and associations has promoted evaluation capacity building and development of NEPs by combining the forces of single VOPEs. The ability of regional organizations to lobby for improvements has created a platform for discussions about NEPs as demonstrated at the 7th General Assembly and Evaluation Conference of EvalMENA⁴ in 2018 entitled *National Evaluation Policies in the MENA Region: Institutional Framework and Process and Processes at National and Sub-National Levels*.

In 2021 a conference jointly organized by the Congressional Policy and Budget Research Department (CPBRD), in partnership with the Senate Economic Planning

² [NEC 2019](#)

³ [EvalParticipativa](#)

⁴ Evaluators Network of the Middle East and North Africa region

Office (SEPO) and the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF)-Philippines provides further evidence of the potential of regional organizations.⁵ The Asian Pacific Evaluation Association (APEA) is following up with a regional dialogue on NEPS in December 2021.⁶

Given the crucial role that evaluation plays in accelerating the achievement of the SDGs, the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) Evaluation Office, the EvalYouth Global Network and the GPFE joined forces to launch the Eval4Action campaign.⁷ The Eval4Action campaign suggests a mapping of countries that have developed evaluation policies and monitoring evaluation systems as a valuable starting point to inform strategy in promoting systematic use of evaluation evidence to inform public policymaking presses and improve public service delivery. A further development is the EvalAgenda2020⁸, whose vision is to promote (1) the enabling environment for evaluation, (2) institutional capacities, (3) individual capacities for evaluation, and (4) inter-linkages among these first three dimensions.

The influence of the European Union and its requirements for evaluation has spread among countries that receive grants and aid from the EU.⁹ According to Ana Diogi, *the EU is ...fueling the awareness and demand for better policies and use of public funds; training opportunities across Europe, such as IPDET, and several online courses may reduce the learning curve for several emergent and young evaluators.*¹⁰ Several countries in the same study, *The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe*, (Eds. Reinhard Stockmann, Wolfgang Meyer, Lena Taube, 2020), have written that they use evaluation only in EU projects related to the Structural Funds and Cohesion Policy¹¹ (Romania, and the United Kingdom) and others have said that they apply the EU and SDG requirements to their local programs (Greece, Italy, Poland) as well.

A recent review of the United Nations system reiterates the importance of human resources development, including training, the exchange of experience and expertise, knowledge transfer and technical assistance for capacity-building, which involves strengthening institutional capacities, including planning, management, monitoring and evaluation capacities.¹² National Evaluation Capacity Readiness Assessment efforts are taking place as a prerequisite for an NEP in Ethiopia, Iceland, Nepal, and Tajikistan. Regional support to standardized training of trainers could widen the pool of trained

⁵ [Policy Brief - Senate of the Philippines](#)

⁶ [Asia Pacific Regional Evaluation Strategy](#)

⁷ [Decade for Action](#)

⁸ [ExecutiveSummary.pdf \(evalpartners.org\)](#)

⁹ [Evaluation Matters the Evaluation Policy for EU Development co-operation](#)

¹⁰ Diogi, Ana (2020) In Reinhard Stockmann · Wolfgang Meyer · Lena Taube Editors *The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe*. P. 346.

¹¹ [Cohesion Policy 2021-2027](#)

¹² [United Nations Digital Library](#) p.9, #31 p. 10 #32

evaluators.¹³ Furthermore, in the health sector, the project, National Evaluation Platform took place in Mali, Malawi, Mozambique, and Tanzania from 2014-2016.¹⁴

A seemingly natural progression from capacity building is certification. Canada has a well-established certification system¹⁵ that reflects the complexities of such a venture. Other countries including Japan and Sri Lanka are moving in this direction as well.

Another development is the fast-growing Open Government Partnership¹⁶, which now has over 78 country members¹⁷ committed to the idea that an open government is more accessible, more responsive, and more accountable to citizens, and that improving the relationship between people and their government has long-term, exponential benefits for everyone.

The burgeoning interest and activity concerning NEPs and NEPFs is impressive and encompassing. The methodology used for this mapping study reflects the breadth of the developments.

3. Methodology

The present mapping exercise attempted to include as many countries and NEPs as possible within the two-month time limit available. It is based on a desk review, an internet search, and communication with VOPEs and other stakeholders. Given the difficulty of traveling during the COVID era, no face-to-face interviews were conducted like in the first two reports and conference attendance was limited to those available on Zoom.

The desk review consisted of retrieving and reading previous research concerned with NEPs to gain a broad understanding of the field. The publications of the OECD, UNDP, UNICEF, WB and other professional journals and relevant literature were helpful resources. Several recent articles shed light on the situation in Africa. The recent publication of *The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe*, (2020) Eds. Reinhard Stockmann, Wolfgang Meyer, and Lena Taube was valuable in collecting information concerning the 16 European countries covered in the book. In addition, a recent study of 5 years of evaluation in Norway provided a retrospective view of Norwegian evaluation practice and use.¹⁸

¹³[Review of National Evaluation Systems and Capacities.....Asia-Pacific Region](#)

¹⁴[National Evaluation Platform: Tanzania](#)

¹⁵[Canadian Evaluation System](#)

¹⁶[Opengovpartnership accountability/](#)

¹⁷[Opengovpartnership About](#)

¹⁸[Evaluation in Norway: A 25-year Assessment](#) Askim, Jostein, Doving, Eric and Johnsen, Age (2021). *Evaluation in Norway: A 25-Year Assessment Accepted for publication in Scandinavian Journal of Public Administration*.

Contacts were drawn from the IOCE database¹⁹ of VOPEs, Regional VOPEs, and from personal connections with evaluators and stakeholders in the field. The questions were sent to 132 VOPEs, 49 were returned for incorrect addresses, and 48 responded with information. Thus, email contact was successful with 83 addresses with a response rate of 58%.

It was important to keep the communication simple and not overburden respondents with a long list of questions. Many informants provided additional information and references. In some cases, other colleagues joined in, and a virtual discussion ensued. In many cases the letter was resent with a personal note. Several responses required follow-up questions. The respondents were forthcoming and happy to participate in the study. The questions appear below. The letter is included in Appendix A.

1. Does your country have an NEP?
2. Is there a document declaring it? legislating it? decreeing it? If so, what is the link to it?
3. Who administers the policy? Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Planning and Development, the Cabinet, the Office of the President? Others?
4. Does it cover all govt. ministries and departments?
5. Or is there a separate policy for each sector?
6. If there is no formal policy, how is evaluation conducted in your country?

The report is based on the responses of the 48 countries that responded combined with information from the internet, the literature and personal communications²⁰ on 65 other countries, making a total of 113 countries. Data was collected from 190 pdf files on the countries included in the study. Triangulation of the responses, internet information and the literature was conducted to verify the responses, which consisted of self-reporting in many cases. Most responses included links to government documents and other resources. The internet search was complicated by the natural fact that some countries maintain websites in the language of the country. In such cases the search was conducted via translation software: translating "evaluation policy" into the language of the country and translating the website back into English. Although time-consuming, this technique unearthed valuable information. Another difficulty arose with sites uploading slowly. It was often necessary wait a long time for the site to upload. See Table 1 for a distribution of the sources of the data collection. Detailed lists of countries and sources of information can be found in the Appendix E.

¹⁹ [IOCE VOPE directory](#)

²⁰ A zoom discussion with Prof. Wolfgang Meyer and the draft copy of the conclusions of the forthcoming second volume in the series on the Americas was graciously shared and the information was invaluable.

Table 1: Sources of data

Data source	No. Countries
Contacted	132
VOPE responses	48
Information from Internet sites, professional literature, and other correspondence	65
Total included in the study	113

Once the data was collected and analyzed, categories emerged. This challenging process was complicated because the categories were not clear cut. The definition of NEP is as vague as it had been in the previous mappings. Does a policy have to be legislated to be a policy? Can it be a policy if it is regulated but not legislated? Is it a policy if it is approved, but not legislated? These questions arose and made it difficult to define the status of NEP categorically. In its recent publication, *A Study on the Status of National Evaluation Policies and Systems in Asia Pacific Region 2021*, the Asia Pacific Evaluation Association proposed the following definitions:

Integration of Evaluation in Constitution - evaluation function, policy, norms, use, etc. has been integrated into the country's constitution either from the start or through an amendment of the constitution.

National Evaluation Policy - any principle, rule or standard used to guide the government's decisions and actions in planning, conducting, reporting, or using evaluation, or any policy, which may be legislated, decreed, formally announced, or directed by the national government.

Evaluation Act/ Bill - an act/ bill which focuses on the evaluation function, policy, norms, use, institutions, etc. and lays down guidelines for the same at the national government level (central government level in a federal system).²¹

These definitions are valid in theory. However, when confronted with the facts on the ground, the distinctions are not so clear. In addition, the growing appearance of Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA) or Analysis has further blurred the lines. Are RIAs evaluation? Do regulatory policies

DILEMMAS DEFINING NEP
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does a policy have to be legislated to be a policy? • Can it be a policy if it is regulated but not legislated? • Is it a policy if it is approved, but not legislated? • Are RIAs evaluation? Do regulatory policies effect evaluation practice? • If there are regulations and standards in place, does that amount to a policy?

²¹ [A Study on the Status of NEP and Systems in Asia Pacific Region 2021](#)

effect evaluation practice? If there are regulations and standards in place, does that amount to a policy like in Peru? According to EvalPeru, the Peruvian VOPE, a regulation is not an NEP. The findings reflect these complications.

In the previous reports the definition adjusted to the situation and the understanding of NEPs at the time. In 2013 NEPs were viewed as a process with a clear ending – legislation. However, the road to legislation is long as witnessed by Sri Lanka and the Philippines. An NEP can be approved by the cabinet, but not yet made into a law. The 2015 report viewed the development of NEPs and included varying degrees of development in the definition. The present report views NEPs as being either legislated, approved, or regulated in the constitution, by law, or by decree. Table 2 presents the definitions used by the three studies, 2013, 2015 and 2021.

Table 2: Definitions of NEP in the three studies

2013	2015	2021
<i>A legislated policy that serves as a basis for evaluation across government agencies.</i>	<i>A policy that is in the process of developing or evolving that is officially recognized by the government.</i>	<i>A policy that is legislated, approved, or regulated in the constitution, by law, or by decree.</i>

While it is interesting to compare the three studies, it is important to bear in mind that internet technology has improved greatly since 2013. Today, translations are readily available, and websites are more complete. The two previous reports included face-to-face interviews, which on the one hand enriched the reports, yet on the other confused the data. Conflicting reports were common. Interviewees did not always agree on the status of NEP in their countries.

Lists of the data collection appear in the Appendix B and C according to the source of the information: VOPE contacts, internet search and evaluation literature.

4. Limitations of the study

Like with all extensive research there were limitations to this study, the most serious of which has been the time frame. The research and the writing had to be completed in two months. Under normal circumstances this short time span does not allow enough time for respondents to complete the questions thoroughly, requiring repeated emails for clarifications. In addition, September and October are evaluation conference months. Thus, many colleagues who would have answered the questions did not have the time and requested extensions which would have been passed the deadline of the research itself. Furthermore, a third of the addresses were returned as incorrect.

Despite these obstacles there was a 58% response rate, which far above the average of 33%.²²

Moreover, the research was complicated by the fact that the status of NEPs is fluid. For example, Russia has legislated several acts or resolutions that appear to support an NEP, but the government has recently cancelled these resolutions with the intentions of revising them in 2022. So, the resolutions are in effect until 2022. In addition, the definition of evaluation is not consistent with other global definitions. Evaluation in Russia is closer to performance measurement or assessment. However, some government departments require evaluation of their programs. According to Natalia Kosheleva²³, they call it *strategic audit and performance audit, though except for the name, this is evaluation*. Thus, it was decided to include Russia in those countries that do not have an NEP but conduct evaluation within the government.

Another limitation has been the changing definitions of NEPs in the three studies as mentioned above. The three studies could not be compared on all counts since the definitions varied. Where possible, comparisons were made.

5. Findings

The research covered 113 countries and provided a wealth of information concerning evaluation practice and policies worldwide. The status of NEPs and the information across countries varied immensely. Through categorization and analysis, the following topics emerged:

1. The definition and status of NEPs,
2. The administrators of those policies,
3. The sectors in which the evaluation function is prevalent

5.1. Status of NEPs

Clearly, defining a national evaluation policy has not gotten easier since the first mapping in 2013. Countries include evaluation requirements in the law, for example Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Japan, Korea, and the USA. Some state evaluation requirements by decree like Algeria and Azerbaijan. Others provide guidelines but have no policy like Lebanon and the UK. Others have a legislated policy but no guidelines like the Kyrgyz Republic. Some NEPs are approved, but not legislated like Sri Lanka and the Philippines. Others are legislated, but not applied broadly like Serbia. There are some countries that have clear regulations that include evaluation, but are regulations and neither policies, nor laws like New Zealand and Thailand. A few countries do not have an NEP but do have states with statewide evaluation policies, Australia, India, and Pakistan for instance. Still others have an NEP for specific sectors, as in Fiji,

²² [Average Survey Response Rate 2021 Benchmark](#)

²³ Personal correspondence.

Luxembourg, and Poland. Although the data draw a complicated picture of NEPs, they indicate that there is a growing commitment to incorporate evaluation into the decision-making and policy implementation on the part of the countries in the study. Tables 5 and 6 list the countries according to their NEP status. These categories, which emerged from the research are listed below in table 3.

Table 3: Definitions

Status	Definition
Listed in Table 5 - Countries with an NEP	
National Evaluation Policy in law	Policy that has been made into a law
National Evaluation Policy	Policy approved by the executive or legislative
National Evaluation Policy by decree	Policy is stated in an official decree
Listed in Table 6 Countries Pending legislation	
National Evaluation Policy that is pending legislation	An Act or a Bill that is awaiting legislative approval to become a law
Listed in Table 7 Countries with no NEP with widespread and routine evaluation practice	
National Evaluation System	Central system recognized by evaluators and stakeholders
Evaluation practice	Evaluation is practiced routinely and in many if not all sectors
Regulatory guidelines	Regulations that apply to evaluation, but are not laws

In this study countries with the first three criteria are listed together. Those pending approval are listed in a separate table and those practicing evaluation routinely with a Monitoring and Evaluation System (MES) or an RIA are listed in a different table.

Whereas the 2015 report found 27 countries with legislated NEPs, this report found 35. Seven countries that were evolving or developing NEPs in 2015 now have approved NEPs – Benin, Brazil, Costa Rica, Ghana, Malaysia, Sri Lanka and Zimbabwe. Sri Lanka and the Philippines have cabinet approval and are awaiting legislation. Kenya’s revised NEP has been approved by the National Development Implementation Technical Committee and is awaiting Cabinet approval. In 2015 there were several countries that were categorized as evolving or developing NEPs. Some of those countries are now awaiting legislative approval of national evaluation policy frameworks (NEPF) or NEPs that they have developed – Argentina, Bhutan, Botswana, India, Nigeria, Trinidad and Tobago (not included in the 2015 report), and Vietnam (not included in the 2015 report). The research identified 20 countries that practice evaluation routinely, but do not have an NEP. M&E is an integral part of their government policies and institutions. The findings indicated a trend to focus on capacity building and creating an evaluation

enabling environment within the country while advocating for a NEP (Argentina, Ethiopia, Sri Lanka, and the Philippines).

Countries with legislated, approved, or regulated NEPs are listed in Table 5. Below. These countries have official recognition of their evaluation practice and policies. In the table, the country is listed, then the kind of policy, the date, links to that policy and finally the language in which the documents are written.

Table 4: Countries in which there is a legislated, approved, or regulated policy in the constitution, by law, or by decree (35)

Country	Type of NEP	Year of policy	Link to Policy or information about Policy	Language
1. Algeria	Decree	2021	Recueil des textes législatifs et réglementaires relatifs au CNES 1968-2021 . Articles 17,25, 28, 40, 42, 44, 46, 61 Included in the decree concerning the composition and function of the National Economic, Social, and Environmental Council.	French
2. Azerbaijan	Decree	2016 Decree No. 879 of April 20, 2016	Azerbaijan Room A Monitoring and Evaluation Process Center for Analysis of Economic Reforms and Communications Azerbaijan 2016	English
3. Benin		2019	Politique Nationale d'Evaluation 2012-2021 République du Benin	French/ English
4. Bolivia	Law #777	2016	Economic and Social Development Plan 2016-2020 p.178 VIII Political, Social and Economic Analysis Unit - Bolivia	Spanish/ English
5. Brazil	Constitution	March 2021 amended articles 37 & 165	Circular in relation to Article 10.6 Regulation Decree The Constitutional Amendment 109, approved in March 2021, amended Articles 37 and 165 of the Constitution, giving the evaluation of public policies constitutional status.	Portuguese
6. Canada	Policy Directive	2016	Government of Canada Policy on Results The 2016 directive replaces Directive on the Evaluation Function 2009 and Standard on the Evaluation for the Government of Canada 2009.	English

7. Colombia	Legalized System Political Constitution Document 2688 Law 152 of 1994 Law 812 of 2003 Law 1151 of 2007	1991, Article 343 1994 2003 2007	Departamento Nacional de Planeacion	Spanish
8. Costa Rica	Article 11 of the Constitution, Law 5525, 8131	2018	Constitution of Costa Rica.constituteproject	Spanish
9. Djibouti Republic of	Decree No. 2019-278	2019	Decree establishing a mechanism for M&E Republic of Djibouti	French
10 Estonia	the Rules of the Government of the Republic	2011, 2012, 2021	Regulations of the Government of the Republic	Estonian, Russian, English
11. France French/ English	Constitution	2008	Constitution of France Article 24 and 47.2	

12	Ghana	Approved	May 21, 2019,	Ghanaian Draft National Monitoring and Evaluation Policy 2019	English
13	Indonesia	Constitution With the Joint Approval of the parliament of the republic of Indonesia and the president of the republic of Indonesia.	2007 2012	Law of the Republic of Indonesia Article 506, 507	Indonesian
14	Ireland	Code - legislated	2013 updated 2019 updated 2021	The Public Spending Code	English/ Gaeilge
15	Japan	Act #86	2001 amended 2021	Govt Policy Evaluations Act (NO. 86 of 2001) Government Policy Evaluations Act(2020.1.7)	Japanese
16					
17	Korea, the Republic of	Act – legislated	2001 Act, revise 2006, 2017	Overview of government work evaluation Korea's Government Performance Evaluation System and ...	Korean

18	Kyrgyz Republic	Law	2014, 2019 Decree of the Jogorku Kenesh dated November 20, 2019 No. 3362-VI	Concept for the application of assessment tools	Russian, Kyrgyz
19	Latvia	Law	2014	Legal Acts of the Republic of Latvia Section 5 #7	Latvian, Russian, English
20	Malaysia	Directives	2004. 2005, updated 2012	Federal Government circular #3 "Guideline on Program Development Evaluation" 2005	English
21	Mexico	Constitution	1917 final reformed 2021	CONSTITUCIÓN POLÍTICA DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS MEXICANOS Paragraphs - DOF 07-05-2008. DOF 03-18-1980. Refurbished DOF 07-04-2000, 12-10-2011, DOF 05-06-2013 , DOF 29-01-2016, DOF 26-03-2019, DECREE by which the National Council for the Evaluation of Social Development Policy is regulated	Spanish
22	Mongolia	Approved	2020	Cabinet Secretariat Monitoring, Evaluation, and Internal Audit Department Resolutions 206, 216, 217, 218 of 2020 approved by the Minister of Mongolia and the Head of the Cabinet Secretariat	Mongolian, English
23	Nepal	Constitution	2015	Constitution of Nepal	English

	Executive Order	2018	Articles 54, 293, 220 (7)	
24	The Netherlands Government Accounts Act	2016 APPLICABLE SINCE 2018	Government Account Act 2016	English
25	New Zealand RIA whole government	2017, 2020	Cabinet's Impact Analysis Requirement at a glance Financial Systems and Economic Growth: An Evaluation Framework for Policy (WP 04/17) (treasury.govt.nz) Evaluation Operational Policy 2020	English
26	Niger Decree N2019-502/PRN/MP	2019	Draft Evaluation Policy Republic of Niger Nigeria NEP.	English
27	The Philippines NEPF approved	2015 Pending legislation since 2015	NEPF the Philippines Act establishing RNNEP An Act establishing a Results Based National Evaluation Policy (RBNEP-Bill)- Pending in the Senate Committee (2020) -An Act establishing a National Evaluation Policy - Pending in the Senate Committee (2019)	English
28	Serbia Law	2018	Law on the planning system of the Republic of Serbia	English
29	South Africa Constitution NEPF	1996 2010/2011	National Evaluation Policy Framework 2019.pdf (dpme.gov.za) Public Finance Management Act 1999 Constitution of the Republic of South Africa	English
30	Sri Lanka NEP Cabinet	June 15,	National Evaluation Policy of Sri Lanka – The Sri Lanka	English

	approval Awaiting legislation	2018	Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation (slpfe.org)	
31 Switzerland	Constitution	1999, amended 2021	Constitution of Switzerland Article 170	English
32 Togo	NEPF Approved	2018	Guide National de Suivi-évaluation Togo	French
33 Uganda	Legislated Act	2011	National Policy on Public Sector Monitoring and Evaluation Mandate Monitoring and Evaluation Office of the Prime Minister/	English
34 USA	Law	2019	Public Law 115-435 Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking	English
35 Zambia	NEP Approved	2019	National Monitoring and Evaluation policy Republic of Zambia	English
36 Zimbabwe	NEP Approved by the President and the cabinet	2015	Zimbabwean NMEP Government of Zimbabwe National Monitoring and Evaluation Policy	English

Nine of the countries that have been working actively in the field of evaluation and have developed NEPs or NEPFs are still awaiting legislative approval. These are listed below in Table 6. In the table, the country is listed, then the kind of policy, the date, links to that policy and finally the language in which the documents are written.

Table 5: Countries with NEP Pending Approval (10)

	Country	Type of NEP	Year of policy	Link to Policy or information about Policy	Language
1.	Argentina	Pending enactment of the Access to Public Information Law,	2020	Agencia Nacional de Evaluacion : el aporte de CIPPEC Pending enactment of the Access to Public Information Law, the creation of the Congressional Budget Office and the sanction of the Annual M&E Plan implemented by the Office of the Information, Evaluation and Monitoring System of Social Programmes (SIEMPRO) in the National Council for the Coordination of Social Policies (CNCPS)	Spanish
2.	Bhutan	Draft Development Evaluation Policy of Bhutan	submitted to the Cabinet 2017	Development Evaluation Policy of Bhutan 2017	English
3.	Botswana	Draft Policy	2009	NMES Botswana	English
4.	India	Draft Policy	2013	The Government Monitoring and Evaluation System in India : A Work in Progress (worldbank.org)	English
5.	Kenya	Revised Policy	Awaiting Cabinet approval	National Monitoring Evaluation Policy Monitoring & Evaluation Directorate - State Department for ...	English

6.	Nigeria	Draft Policy presented to the Minister of State, Budget and National Planning	2021	Agba receives draft NEP NEP 2017	English
7.	Philippines	Policy approved, awaiting congressional approval	2015, 2019	Act establishing RNNEP NEPF Philippines National Evaluation Portal Policy Brief - Senate of the Philippines	English
8.	Sri Lanka	NEP - Cabinet approved. Awaiting legislation	2018	National Evaluation Policy of Sri Lanka – The Sri Lanka Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation (slpfe.org)	English
9.	Trinidad & Tobago	National Performance Framework	2020	National Performance Framework	English
10.	Vietnam	Draft Vietnam Framework for Evaluation Policy and Standards	2017	Vn-FEPS- Based on Vietnam standard- En.pdf	English

A significant number of countries practice evaluation routinely without an NEP. Usually each Ministry has its own evaluation unit and its own evaluation requirements.

These countries are listed in Table 7 below. The country is listed and then information on the evaluation practice and function in that country.

Table 6: Countries with no NEP with widespread and routine evaluation practice (22)

No.	Country	Link or reference to information
1.	Austria	OECD Austria's results, evaluation, and learning
2.	Bangladesh	MED Policy Study Bangladesh
3.	Belgium	Pattyn, V. and Peuter, B. (2021). <i>The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe</i> . pp. 115-138
4.	Chile	Nacimiento de la Oficina de Planificación Nacional Evaluación y Revisión del Gasto
5.	Denmark	Evaluation in the Nordic Countries
6.	Ecuador	Ecuador's Constitution Article 85 and 227 Regulations of the Organic Code for Planning and Public Finance of Ecuador
7.	Finland	Evaluation in the Nordic Countries
8.	Germany	GIZ's evaluation policy Stockmann, R. and Meyer, W. (2020). <i>The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe</i> .p.167-198
9.	Iceland	Iceland Mid-term Review 2020 OECD
10.	India	Evaluate schemes for better outcomes Indian Development Review The Government Monitoring and Evaluation System in India : A Work in Progress (worldbank.org)
11.	Israel	National Institute for Testing and Evaluation Israel Jerusalem Institute for Policy Research National Insurance Evaluation of Projects
12.	Italy	Impact Assessment Office Melloni, E. (2020) <i>The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe</i> . pp. 273-302
13.	Lithuania	The Lithuanian Government's Policy of Regulatory ... - Sciendo Evidence Based Policy Making and Policy Evaluation at the ...
14.	Norway	Evaluation in Norway: A 25-year Assessment
15.	Nicaragua	Regional Observatory of Planning for Development Nicaragua Planning Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Nicaragua 2010 Nicaragua Sixth Year Annual Project Report
16.	Peru	Decreto Supremo No 029-2018-PCM Article 12, 27

17.	Russia	On the Approval of the Methodological Guidelines 2010 Order of the Government of the Russian Federation 2017 Order of the Government of the Russian Federation 2021
18.	Rwanda	Measure Evaluation Rwanda
19.	Singapore	Public Sector Outcomes Review (SPOR)
20.	Spain	National Institute of Public Administration Spain Evaluation Framework in Spain AEVAL Maria Bustelo (2020). The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe pp. 303-328
21.	United Kingdom	The Green Book Guidance on Appraisal and Evaluation UK Magenta Book 2020 Supplementary Guide
22.	Uruguay	Budget, Investment, Management and Evaluation Uruguay MIDES Evaluacion y monitoreo-National Evaluation Institution Uruguay Centro de Informacion Oficial Uruguay (Budget Transparency Portal Uruguay) Sustainable Dev. The case of Uruguay Uruguay's International Cooperation Policy

In some cases, separate states within a country have an NEP. These are listed below in Table 8 with the date of the policy and a link to that policy.

Table 7: Countries where states have a policy, but no national policy (4)

Country	Date	Link
Australia	2010	ACT Govt Evaluation Policy and Guidelines
Australia ACT (Australian Canberra Territories)		WA.gov.au Program evaluation
WA Western Australia	-	
India, Karnataka	Not available - Govern ment site cannot be reached	Evaluate schemes for better outcomes Indian Development Review

Pakistan, Jammu and Kashmir	Date not available	Planning & Development Pakistan Nutrition Strategy Azad & Kashmir
UK West of England combined Authority	2020	WECA M&E Framework

NEPs still vary from country to country. There are formalized and codified NEPs (Mexico, Colombia, Canada) and more flexible evaluation arrangements (Italy and Sweden). There are countries that have elaborate guidelines for evaluation like the U.K. but do not have a legislated policy. Others are revising legislated policies to suit the realities in the field (Mexico, South Africa). In other cases, policies have been formulated, but not implemented due to changes in government or other conditions in the country context. Some NEPs require so many evaluations that they cannot be read and used at the pace that they are being produced. Thus, the central purpose of requiring evaluation is lost. These challenges are discussed at length in *Using Evidence in Policy and Practice Lessons from Africa (2020)*, Eds. Ian Goldman and, Mine Pabari. Similarly, this issue arises in Japan. Thus, the Japanese government reviews the situation of evaluation every year according to Law No. 86, 2001. The latest review is the *Report on the Implementation of Policy Evaluation, etc. and the Reflection of the Results on Policy June 2021*.²⁴ Sometimes countries formulate a policy and then revise it in response to context as a work in progress for example in Estonia, Korea, and Mexico. The book *The Government Monitoring and Evaluation System in India: a work in progress (2013)*²⁵ reflects this well in the title. In many cases countries do not have an official, legislated evaluation policy, but evaluation is conducted in many, if not all, the government ministries as a matter of course (Australia, Israel, and Malawi). Models of successful systems are well established frameworks like in Canada, Colombia, Mexico, and South Africa.

It is encouraging to note that of the 22 countries listed as developing an NEP in the 2015 report, nine have progressed to either having a legislated NEP or needing legislation for an already approved policy: Benin, Ecuador, Ghana, Mongolia, Niger, Peru, the Philippines, and Trinidad and Tobago have an approved and legislated policy while Argentina, Nigeria, are awaiting legislation. Sri Lanka received Cabinet approval of her policy in 2015 and has been waiting for legislation since. The Philippines received approval in 2019 and has been waiting for legislation since then. Table 4 below shows a comparison of the three studies where comparison was possible.

²⁴ [Government Policy Evaluations Act](#)

²⁵ Mehrotra, S. (2013). *The Government Monitoring and Evaluation System in India: A work in progress*. ECD Working Paper Series, No. 28. Independent Evaluation Group, The World Bank Group Washington, DC 20433. www.worldbank.org/ieg/ecd

Table 8: Comparison of the three Mappings

Status	2013	2015	2021
Number of countries	115	109	113
Countries in which there is a legislated, approved, or regulated policy in the constitution, by law, or by decree.	20	14	35
Pending (not included in the 2013 and 2015 reports)	-	-	10
Well-developed evaluation practice with no NEP.	34	9	21
Countries with policies in specific sectors (not included in the 2013 report)	-	10	7
Countries in which a state has a policy, but no NEP (not included in the 2013 and 2015 reports)	-	-	4
Working on building evaluation capacity and NEP	23	42	22
No reliable or clear information available	38	44	14

5.2. Administrators of NEP and Sectors where evaluation is practiced

Countries with or without an NEP channel the processes of the evaluation function through a variety of administrative and coordinating bodies. An administrating body requests, allocates and checks the process of evaluation from beginning to end. A coordinating body coordinates among several departments that are responsible for evaluations or different aspects of evaluations. In some cases, more than one ministry is responsible for evaluations. In others, each ministry carries out its own evaluation according to its own needs. Many countries rely on several different bodies. Countries have different forms of government and different contexts. This is particularly true concerning administrative or coordinating bodies for the evaluation function. Table 9 below shows the distribution of evaluation practice in 102 countries across administrative bodies as far as can be determined from the research. Information on the missing eleven countries was not available. Table 14 in Appendix E contains further details.

Table 9: Distribution of Administrative and coordination bodies responsible for the evaluation function

Administrative body	Number of countries (108)
Specific ministries or department created for evaluation	23
Ministry of Planning and Development or subcommittee of	21
Executive/ President/ Cabinet	18
Ministry of Finance or subcommittee of	13
Separate Ministries for each sector	12
Ministry of Foreign Affairs	12
Audit Office	10
Ministry of Economic Planning	10

Examples of countries that have set up special evaluation departments of their own are Azerbaijan, Benin, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Japan, and Peru. Examples of Evaluation departments are" National Council for the Coordination of Social Policies (CNCPS) in Argentina, Gross National Happiness Commission Secretariat in Bhutan, Ministry of Social Development and Family in Chile, Department of Public Expenditure and Reform in Ireland, The Government Strategic Analysis Center in Lithuania, Independent agency CoNEVAL in Mexico. Each ministry sets its own evaluation policy. In Israel, for example, there is no central evaluation mechanism, but most government ministries have an evaluation unit that reports to the specific ministry. In India the Independent Office of Evaluation, Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), NITI Aayog, has been created to consolidate the evaluation function, while maintaining independence from any one ministry or department. In some cases, the executive is the coordinating body for all evaluations and the evaluations themselves are carried out by separate ministries or departments (Malaysia).

5.3. Sectors in which the evaluation function is prevalent

In general, the countries where the administrator is the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, evaluation is conducted on international projects rather than on domestic ones (Austria, Finland, Spain). These countries conduct evaluations for their external development projects and not for their internal programs and policies. Local and external evaluators have developed evaluation frameworks in cooperation with the large number of donor organizations that require an evaluation component to all programs – evaluation assistance is provided from the World Bank, the UN (UNDP, UNICEF, UNDAF), USAID, Asian Development Bank, OECD/DAC, the EU to name a few. In some cases, these evaluation frameworks develop into sector Evaluation Policies (Poland). In others they apply only to programs that require evaluation (EU sponsored programs in Greece, Romania, donor programs in Guatemala).

In the Education Sector evaluation has been well-established in many countries (Albania, Argentina, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Ireland, Israel, Spain, Poland, UK). In some cases, such evaluation is driven by international testing such as OECD's Programme for International Student Assessment. Health is one of the first sectors to use some form of evaluation or evidence-based policy making encouraged by the WFP-UNDP for example in Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Tanzania. The UK (the National Health System), the USA through the Center for Disease Control and Israel through the numerous health funds, have influential MESs the health arena. Another growing area of evaluation policy and use is climate change in part to fulfill the requirements of the Paris Agreement on Climate (Fiji, and Norway).

Some countries have an NEP for specific sectors only. These are listed in table 10 below.

Table 10: Countries with a sectorial policy (7)

Country	Sector	Year	Link to policy or information	English
1. Belgium	Development Cooperation	2010	Special Evaluation Service	English
2. Fiji	Climate Change Bill, Mandated	2019	M&E Framework for Fiji's National Adaptation Plan Process	English
3. Luxembourg	For External development only	2017	Politique d'évaluation Loi du 15 décembre 2017 Art. 18	French
4. Morocco	Adaptation Climate Control	2017	Morocco Adaptation M&E	English
5. New Zealand	Official Development Assistance funded initiatives as part of New Zealand's International Development Cooperation	2017 2020	Evaluation Operational Policy external (mfat.govt.nz) A Study on the Status of National Evaluation Policies and Systems in Asia Pacific Region Implementation and monitoring responsibilities New Zealand	English
6. Poland	Cohesion Policy Education Development Cooperation/ Development Assistance	2006 2009 2011	Development Policy Poland Minister of Education and Science Development cooperation	Polish
7. Slovenia	Evaluation Policy and the Evaluation Guidelines	2014, 2015	Slovenia Evaluation Mandate OECD Slovenia - DAC Evaluation Network Member	English

6. Conclusions

In addition to the kinds of NEPs and the variations in the evaluation function among the countries surveyed, the research brought to light widespread developments in the field of evaluation. These are discussed below.

6.1. Focus on capacity building and enabling environment

As mentioned in the introduction, the findings indicate an increased focus on capacity building and creating an evaluation enabling environment within a country while advocating for an NEP (Argentina, Ethiopia, Sri Lanka). The development and implementation of the National Evaluation Capacity Index (INCE as per its acronym in Spanish) reflects this focus. In a recent working paper, INCE is defined as a group venture aimed at *developing an index for evaluation capacities by representatives from evaluation units of the governments in the region, professional evaluation networks, academic centres, civil society organisations and bilateral and multilateral international agencies who contributed to its development through different consultation mechanisms (technical meetings, specific consultations, review of consultancy deliverables, etc.)*.²⁶ A change has taken place in incentives and advocacy for institutionalizing evaluation before legislating NEP. The consensus seems to be that establishing a positive enabling evaluation environment should be the first step before formulating an NEP. The Philippines provides a good example of this trend. They have proposed a National Evaluation Policy Framework which was approved in 2015. The NEP bill has been awaiting congressional approval since 2015. In the meantime, they have created the Evaluation Task Force (EFT) to develop the evaluation agenda.²⁷ Another example is Sri Lanka, which has had a NEP approved by the cabinet since 2018 and is awaiting legislative approval. In the meantime, they are creating academic evaluation programs.

6.2. Different forms of evaluation

The kinds and uses of evaluation have changed since the 2015 mapping report. Countries develop different systems of evaluation and within the same country different departments use different systems. A popular system involves performance management system (PMS). Depending upon how it is used, PMSs are a form of evaluation. Some countries (Brazil, Ghana, India) promote PMS in various form, which is different from program evaluation that closely examines the workings of a program. Some countries combine the two (Benin, Uganda, South Africa). Gaining popularity are forms of Rapid Results Initiatives (RRI) because of the shorter time needed to perform the evaluation (Kenya, Uganda). Kenya and Uganda introduced the National Integrated M&E Strategy (NIMES), which improved policy formulation and implementation.²⁸ New

²⁶ National Evaluation Capacity Index Working Paper. Date of last update: May 2021 Persons responsible for updating this paper: Michala Assankpon (WFP) Juan Carlos Sanz (DEval)

²⁷ [National Evaluation Policy Framework Philippines](#)

²⁸ Ibid p.5

Public Management (NPM) has been the driver in some countries like India (Division in the Indian Cabinet Secretariat), New Zealand (Office of Auditor General) and Australia (Australian Public Service Commission). Results-based evaluation (RBE) is strong in Austria, Iceland, Luxemburg, Mongolia, and Peru. Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA) has been incorporated into many evaluation systems (Belgium, Czech Republic, Portugal).

The increasing use of RIA has influenced the spread of evaluation use and the drive for NEPs. As defined in an Israeli Oversight Committee document, RIA is *an international model that helps in making decisions and evaluating their effects. beneficial to the public. At the end of the process, it is made transparent in a public report.*²⁹ Because of privacy and transparency issues RIA sometimes conflicts with evaluation. It is important to ensure that the evaluation process fits the regulatory requirements and not at the expense of either one. Value-for-money is another term that has been mentioned as a rationale for conducting evaluations (Ireland, Singapore, and South Africa).

The research indicates an increase in use of ex-ante evaluation. In 2019, the government of Benin decided to have an ex-ante evaluation prior to any project, program or action plan being submitted for approval.³⁰ In Chile, the Ministry of Social Development evaluates ex-ante and ex post in social programs of all ministries. In Japan, more ex-ante evaluations were conducted on public works than ex-post evaluations in 2020.³¹ Another interesting development is the rising interest in self-evaluation as practiced in Japan, Malaysia, and the Republic of Korea.

In terms of evaluation use, evidence-based policy making is becoming more widespread in Brazil, India, Japan, Lithuania, the Philippines, Uganda, and the USA. Goldman and Pabari, confirm this influence on African governments: *there are African examples of policy makers using evidence from evaluations and evidence synthesis, of experimentation in approaches to evaluation and evidence synthesis, and evidence use is being discussed in national and international platforms.*³²

6.3. Government programs and policies vs. donor driven programs and projects

Like the other two studies, the 2021 study showed a distinction between government programs and policies and development programs funded by outside donors. Evaluations are performed according to donor requirements in Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Palestine, Slovakia, Trinidad & Tobago for example. Many wealthier countries that donate funds to less wealthy countries have formulated evaluation

²⁹ [Parliamentary Oversight Coordination Unit Knesset](#)

³⁰ [Using Evidence in Policy and Practice](#)

³¹ FY2020 Report on the Implementation Status of Policy Evaluation, etc. and the Reflection of the Results on Policy

³² Goldman, Ian, Pabari, Mine, editors. Title: Using evidence in policy and practice: lessons from Africa (2020). New York, NY : Routledge.. P.4

policies and mechanisms for the international programs they fund for example, Denmark and Luxembourg. In the past, their own teams would conduct the evaluations, however, since the Paris Declaration in 2005, a high-level effort has been made to work as partners and not in the former paternalistic construct. Fortunately, many countries have learned from the donor requirements for M&E and have applied them to their own programs and policies. An example of such transfer is inspired by the Adaptation Community³³, which focuses on climate change. The organization stresses the importance of M&E, has its own evaluation policy, and provides resources for members. Thus, some countries have evaluation policies in conjunction with climate control activities, for example Fiji and Morocco.³⁴

7. Challenges, Lesson Learnt & Suggestions

Here we discuss the challenges involved in creating an NEP and the lessons learned from the research. The report ends with suggestions based on the research.

7.1. Challenges concerning NEPs

It is clear from the study that evaluation frameworks and policies are emerging around the world. As more policies are implemented, understanding of the challenges involved grows. The major challenges concern quality, use and follow-up of the evaluations generated by the policy. These are complicated by the practical conditions on the ground. Development of an evaluation policy is an iterative process, and any such policy should include room for adaptations and flexibility.

The complexities are reflected in the activities in the field. The 2019 UNPD, IEO conference *Leaving No one behind: Evaluation for 2030*, highlighted the challenges inherent in NEPs and evaluation in general. The participants made it clear that monitoring and evaluation is not just a technical process, but also a political one. Evaluations should address participation, voice and power and are central to institutionalizing equity. Implementation is not always simple. However, this is not an easy process. The Nepalese representative mentioned the following challenges: *Data disaggregated by socio-economic and spatial considerations are not available impeding equity-focused and gender-responsive M&E. Both demand and supply sides of evaluation have limited capacity to facilitate, conduct and use outcomes of rigorous evaluations.*

These issues have taken center stage since the last mapping reports and were central to the 2021 conference jointly organized by the CPBRD, in partnership with the SEP and the (UNICEF-Philippines addressed the challenges faced by institutionalizing an NEPF. Violeta Corpus, director of NEDA, asserted: *the main obstacles involve enlisting cooperation and engagement of stakeholders, finding qualified local evaluators, and*

³³ [Adaptation Community](#)

³⁴ [Ecosystem-based Adaptation](#)

difficulty in securing stakeholder use of the findings. This statement points to the need for capacity building, not only for potential evaluators, but for stakeholders and parliamentarians as well. VOPEs try to influence policy but have limited power. They generally strengthen and reinforce the professional side of the evaluation equation. Efforts are made to interest stakeholders and to provide information about evaluation. Some evaluation organizations promote evaluation through advocacy and are successful in pooling resources and influencing those with power. The great accomplishment of gaining international support for designating 2015 the International Year of Evaluation has done much to place the issue squarely on the agenda. However, influential champions are needed to move forward.

7.2. Lessons learned from the research

There has been a great deal of activity surrounding the subject of NEPs. An increasing number of countries are interested in improving the capacity and implementation of evaluation and recognize the role an NEP plays in the process.³⁵ A greater understanding of the need for preparation and capacity building has developed. The following lessons emerged from the research.

1. Developing a good NEP is a slow and iterative process.
2. A well thought out NEP system is better than a policy that is too difficult to implement.
3. Evaluation policy being in place is not enough to institutionalize evaluation.
4. Implementation does not always follow an NEP.
5. An NEP is not the only way to ensure that evaluation is conducted and used, but it is a good option to ensure relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability.

These challenges and lessons lead to the suggestions in the following section.

7.3. Suggestions

According to the challenges mentioned above and the lessons learned from the research we make the following suggestions.

1. Devise an all-encompassing NEPF before moving on to an NEP.
2. Include a formal and strategic plan for implementation in the NEP.
3. Ensure that the NEP is flexible enough to adapt to a country's changing context.
4. Explain and review the NEP with all stakeholders as well as with parliamentarians on a regular basis.
5. Back the NEP with commensurate budget allocation in the annual budget.

³⁵ [Evaluate schemes for better outcomes](#)

6. Advocate and work with parliamentarians. In the words of a long-time champion of NEP and evaluation, Hon. Kabir Hashim, *to establish an NEP and make it a priority, you need parliamentary support, as well for funding.*
7. Provide capacity building for stakeholders and parliamentarians as well as local evaluators.

The periodic mapping of NEPs has shown that NEPs are becoming part of the worldwide evaluation picture. It is hoped that this tendency will continue and gain momentum with the help of information and experience from the field. A good, working, and inclusive evaluation function will produce and support better programs and improved conditions around the globe.

References

Askim, Jostein, Doving, Eric and Johnsen, Age (2021). Evaluation in Norway: A 25-Year Assessment Accepted for publication in Scandinavian Journal of Public Administration. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Administration*.

Diwakar, Y., De Mel, R. L., & Samarsinghe, C.H. (2021). *A Study on the Status of National Evaluation Policies and Systems in Asia Pacific Region*. Manila: Asia Pacific Evaluation Association.

Goldman, I., Pabari, M., Eds. (2020). *Using evidence in policy and practice: lessons from Africa*. New York, NY: Routledge. Available online at [Using Evidence in Policy and Practice](#)

Goldman, et al. (2020) Mere compliance, or learning – M&E culture in the public service of Benin, Uganda and South Africa (2020). In I. Goldman, M. Pabari, Eds. *Using evidence in policy and practice: lessons from Africa*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2020. [Using Evidence in Policy and Practice](#)

Goldman, I., Deliwe, C.N., Taylor, S., Ishmail, Z., Smith, L. & Masangu, T., (2019), 'Evaluating the national evaluation system in South Africa: What has been achieved in the first 5 years?', *African Evaluation Journal* 7(1), a400. [Evaluating the national evaluation system in South Africa](#)

Holm, G. (2006) Evaluation in the Nordic countries. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation* (JMDE:4) ISSN 1556-8180

Kanyamuna, V. (2021). Towards Building a Functional Whole-of-Government Monitoring and Evaluation System for Zambia: The Demand Side." *World Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, vol. 7, no. 3: 83-105. doi: 10.12691/wjssh-7-3-2.

Korea Institute of Public Administration. Performance evaluation systems of the Korean central government agencies: Self and specific evaluations. (2016) In Eds. Sujae Yoon, Younhee Kim, Kim. *Korean cases in public administration for training and practice*. Chapter: 2 Publisher: Daeyoung Moonhwas Publishing. [Korean Institute of Public Administration Yoon, Kim, Kim](#).

Mapitsa, C.B., Tirivanhu, P., Pophiwa, N. Eds. (2020) *Evaluation Landscape in Africa* (2020) Human Science Research Council. Available online at [Evaluation Landscape in Africa](#)

Mehrotra, S. (2013). *The Government Monitoring and Evaluation System in India: A work in progress*. ECD Working Paper Series, No. 2. Independent Evaluation Group, The World Bank Group Washington, DC 20433. www.worldbank.org/ieg/ecd

Mwaijand. (2018) Why Should Countries have National Evaluation Policies. *eVALUation Matters First Quarter* 2018.

Segone, M., Bamberger, M., and Reddy, S. Eds. (2014) National evaluation policies for sustainable and equitable development How to integrate gender equality and social equity in national evaluation policies and systems.

[Segone, Bamberger, Reddy](#)

Stockmann, R.· Meyer, W. and Taube, L. Eds. (2020) *The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Stolyarenko, K., (2014) *National evaluation policy. Case studies*. Parliamentary Forum for Development Evaluation. [Case studies on NEP](#)

Van den Berg, R.D. Naidoo, I and. Tamondong, Eds. (2017). *Evaluation for Agenda 2030: Providing Evidence on Progress and Sustainability*. Exeter, UK: IDEAS

Towards a baseline study: Insights on National Evaluation Capacities in 43 Countries
[NEC Base study](#)

Conferences

Evaluation Conference of EvalMENA in 2018 entitled *National Evaluation Policies in the MENA Region: Institutional Framework and Processes at National and Sub- national levels*.

LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND: EVALUATION for 2030 Proceedings from the 2019 National Evaluation Capacities Conference [Leaving no one behind](#)

Live webinar: Institutionalizing a National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF) September 16, 2021.

Guidelines, policies, reports

Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications. Government of Japan. Laws, Basic Guidelines and Guidelines for Policy Evaluation

[Laws, Basic Guidelines and Guidelines for Policy Evaluation](#)

National Evaluation Policy Framework (2015) Republic of the Philippines. National Economic and Development Authority.

[National Evaluation Policy Framework Guidelines](#)

National Evaluation Capacity Index Working Paper. Date of last update: May 2021
Persons responsible for updating this paper: Michala Assankpon (WFP) Juan Carlos Sanz (DEval)

Parliamentarians Forum on Development Evaluation in South Asia jointly with EvalPartners. Rosenstein, B. (2015)

[Status of NEP 2015](#)

Parliamentarians Forum on Development Evaluation in South Asia jointly with EvalPartners. Rosenstein, B. (2013)

[Status of NEP 2013](#)

Proceedings from National Evaluation Capacity conferences, 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015, 2017, 2019. United Nations Development Programme. [NEC 2019](#)

Websites not including those in the country lists in the appendix

[Adaptation Community](#)

[Average Survey Response Rate 2021 Benchmark](#)

[Decade for Action](#)

[Ecosystem-based Adaptation](#)

[EvalParticipativa](#)

[European Commission. Cohesion Policy 2017-2021](#)

European Union Development Cooperation. Evaluation Matters.

[Evaluation Matters](#)

[IOCE VOPE directory](#)

[Knesset Oversight Coordination Unit](#)

[National Evaluation Systems in the Public Service](#)

[Open government Partnership](#)

[Regional advocacy to accelerate action towards influential evaluation to support the achievement of the 2030 Agenda | Department of Economic and Social Affairs \(un.org\)](#)

[Sustainable Development Goals Fund. Monitoring and evaluation](#)

[Twende Mbele Moving forward together](#)

[United Nations Digital Library](#) p.9, #31 p. 10 #32

Appendices

Appendix A: Letter sent to VOPEs and other contacts

Subject - Update of the Mapping of National Evaluation Policies

Dear Colleagues,

I am happy to inform you that the Global Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation has commissioned me to update the 2015 National Evaluation Policy mapping report. I need your professional input for the update. Your answers to the following questions are necessary to ensure the validity of the report.

1. Does your country have an NEP?
2. Is there a document declaring it? legislating it? decreeing it? If so, what is the link to it?
3. Who administers it? Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Planning and Development, the Cabinet, the Office of the President? Others?
4. Does it cover all govt. ministries and departments?
5. Or is there a separate policy for each sector?
6. If there is no formal policy, how is evaluation conducted in your country?

Please send your response directly to me – rosensteinbarbara@gmail.com

Your response to these questions and any other information that you think is relevant is greatly appreciated.

It may be necessary to contact you again with follow-up questions as the project progresses, I hope this will not be an inconvenience.

Please excuse double posting.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Barbara Rosenstein on behalf of Global Forum of Parliamentarians for Evaluation

rosensteinbarbara@gmail.com

Appendix B: VOPE contacts who provided information for the research

Countries for which information came from VOPEs (48)

Table 11: Countries for which information came from VOPEs (48)

	Country	VOPE	Name of VOPE	Additional sources of information: internet, evaluation publications, conference proceedings and government websites
1.	Afghanistan	AfES	Afghan Evaluation Society EvalPartners Coordinator, Samandar Mahmodi	
2.	Bolivia	REDMEBOL	La Red de Monitoreo y Evaluación de Bolivia	Political, Social and Economic Analysis Unit - Bolivia
3.	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bheval	Evaluation Society of Bosnia Herzogovina, Rijad Kovac.	
4.	Brazil	RBMA (BMEN)	Rede Brasileira de Monitoramento e Avaliação (Brazilian M&E Network) Marcia Joppert	Circular in relation to Article 10.6 Evaluation of public policies in Brazil and the US. Regulatory Impact Assessment in Brazil
5.	Bulgaria	BMEN	Bulgarian Monitoring and Evaluation Network, Las Soeftestad	
6.	Caribbean	CEI	Caribbean Evaluators International	
7.	Costa Rica	RedEvalCR ACE	Red de Evaluación y Seguimiento de Costa Rica Asociación Centroamericana de Evaluación, Ronny Munoz	Ministry of National Planning Costa Rica Politica Nacional de Evaluacion 2018-2010
8.	Djibouti	ADE	l'Association Djiboutienne de l'Évaluation, Khaled Naguib	Decree establishing a mechanism for M&E Republic of Djibouti
9.	Ecuador	ReLAC	Red de Seguimiento, Evaluacion y Sistematizacion de Latinoamerica y el Caribe, Viviana Lascano	Ecuador's Constitution Article 85 and 227 Regulations of the Organic Code for Planning and Public Finance of Ecuador
10.	El Salvador	RESALVASE	Red Salvadoreña de Seguimiento y Evaluación (El Salvador M&E Network) Carmen Alicia Valle	

11.	Ethiopia	EEvA	ETHIOPIAN EVALUATION ASSOCIATION, Yohannes Belihu	Is Ethiopia ready for evaluation? UNICEF
12.	Greece	HES	Hellenic Evaluation Society, Leonados Kantsos, Vice-President, HES	Hellenic Evaluation Society
13.	Guatemala	REDGUAM	Red Guatemalteca de Monitoreo y Evaluación, Luis Armando Ruiz Morales	
14.	India	ECOI	Evaluation Community of India Rashmi Agrawal	Evaluate schemes for better outcomes Indian Development Review The Government Monitoring and Evaluation System in India : A Work in Progress (worldbank.org)
15.	Israel	Former IAPE now PAI	Israeli Association for Program Evaluation now PAI Organizational Development in Israel	National Institute for Testing and Evaluation Israel Jerusalem Institute for Policy Research National Insurance Evaluation of Projects
16.	Italy	AIV	Italian Evaluation Association	Melloni, E. (2020) <i>The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe</i> . pp. 273-302 Impact Assessment Office
17.	Japan	JES	Japanese Evaluation Society Akihiko HASHIMOTO, Ph.D. Department for Educational Policy and Evaluation, National Institute for Educational Policy Research of Japan. Keiko Kuji-Shikatani, evalcanada Ryo Sasaki on the Board of JES	Government Policy Evaluations Act (2020.1.7) Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications Govt Policy Evaluations Act (NO. 86 of 2001) Laws, Basic Guidelines and Guidelines for Policy Evaluation
18.	Jordan	EvalJordan	Jordan Development Evaluation Association	USAID/Jordan Monitoring and Evaluation Support Program
19.	Kenya	ESK	Evaluation Society of Kenya, Benjamin Masila, secretary	Kenya evaluation guidelines Kenya - Twende Mbele/kenya/ Goldman and Pabari Using Evidence in Policy and Practice Blending evaluation Principles with Development Practices to Change People's Lives Policies for evidence: a comparative analysis of Africa's NEP landscape

				Final Evaluation of NIMES Aloyce .M. Ratemo, <i>Director</i> , Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate State Department for Planning, The National Treasury and Planning: Kenya
20.	Kyrgyz Republic	Kyrgyz MandE Network	National Monitoring and Evaluation Network of the Kyrgyz Republic Tatiana Tretiakova, Adema Zholdosbekova	Hon. Natalia Nikitenko Kyrgyz Republic at CPBRD-SEPO-UNICEF Webinar cum roundtable discussion on Institutionalizing a National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF) Sept. 16, 2021
21.	Lebanon	LebEval	Lebanese Evaluation Society Dana Shdeed Ziad Moussa and the LebEval Board	Practical Guidelines to SOPMIP Process and Tools
22.	Macedonia	MEN	Macedonian Evaluators Network Vlatko Daniov	
23.	Malaysia	MES	Malaysian Evaluation Society Aru Rasappan Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand,	Review of National Evaluation Systems and Capacities.....Asia-Pacific Region A Study on the Status of National Evaluation Policies and Systems in Asia Pacific Region
24.	Mali	APEM	Association pour la Promotion de l'Evaluation au Mali Michee Sagara	John Hopkins National Evaluation Platform Mali
25.	Mongolia	MEN	Mongolian Evaluation Network Dolgion Aldar and information from Aru Rasappan	Cabinet Secretariat Monitoring, Evaluation, and Internal Audit Department
26.	Morocco	AME	L'Association Marocaine de l'Evaluation Brahim Badri	Morocco : Adaptation M&E
27.	Nicaragua	ReNieSE	Red Nicaraguense de Seguimiento y Evaluacion Eduardo Centeno	Regional Observatory of Planning for Development Nicaragua Planning Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Nicaragua 2010 Nicaragua Sixth Year Annual Project Report
28.	Niger	ReNDE	Le Réseau Nigérien de Suivi et Evaluation Idrissa Chefou	Draft Evaluation Policy Republic of Niger Nigeria NEP.
29.	Nigeria	NAE	Nigerian Association of Evaluators Aliyu Aminu Ahmed , Dr. Uzodinma Adirieje	Agba receives draft NEP
30. 8	Pakistan	PEA	Pakistan Evaluation Association Khadija Khan Coordinator	Planning & Development Depart.

31.	Palestine	PEA	Palestine Evaluation Association Nuha iter, Khalil Bitar	
32.	Panama	LAC	Latin American Caribbean Rubilu Rodriguez	
33.	Paraguay	RPE	Red Paraguaya de Evaluación Sebatian Codas	
34.	Peru	REDPERUME	Red EvalPeru, Emma Rotondo Alejandro Bardales - Amalia Cuba	Blending evaluation Principles with Development Practices to Change People's Lives
35.	Poland	PES	Polish Evaluation Society Monika Niziolek	Bartosiewicz, M., et al. (2020), <i>The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe</i> . pp. 405-434
36.	Romania	ROSE ADER	Virgil Pamfil. President ROSE - Romanian Society of Evaluators Monica Chiffa, ADER – Association for the Development of Evaluation in Romania	Todera, N.,s and Iacob, T.D. (2020). <i>The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe</i> . pp.435-461
37.	Rwanda	RMES	Rwanda Monitoring and Evaluation Society Jean de Dieu Bizimana	
38.	Serbia	SEA	Serbian Evaluation Association Mihajlo Dkic	
39.	Slovakia	SES	Slovak Evaluation Society Dagmar Gombitová	
40.	Slovenia	SiES	Slovenia Evaluation Society Bojan Radej (no information_	
41.	Spain	APROEVAL	Aida El-Khoury de Paula APROEVAL Iberian Association of Professional Evaluators	Maria Bustelo (2020). <i>The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe</i> pp. 303-328
42.	Tajikistan	MonEvCoPTajiki stan	Farhod Khamidov Monitoring and Evaluation Community of Practice of Tajikistan	
43.	Togo	STéval-Ee	Société Togolaise de l'Evaluation Koffi HOUNDEBASSO, Consultant Coordonnateur National de STEVAL Chargé de cours à l'Institut IFORDD	Guide National de Suivi-évaluation Togo
44.	Trinidad &	LAC	Ms. Aditi Bisram Singh	

	Tobago		Implementation Coordinator Ministry of Planning and Development	
45.	Tunisia	RTE	Réseau Tunisien de l'Evaluation , Anis Ben Younes	Blending evaluation Principles with Development Practices to Change People's Lives
46.	Uganda	UEA	Uganda Evaluation Association, President, Matthew Lubuulwa	Goldman and Pabari Using Evidence in Policy and Practice Blending evaluation Principles with Development Practices to Change People's Lives
47.	Ukraine	UEA	Ukrainien Evaluation Association, . Olha Krasovska	Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine Resolution 2015 Resolutions and Order of the Cabinet #19 and #32 refer to M&E
48.	Uruguay	ReUrEv	Red Uruguaya de Evaluadores Leopoldo Font and Federico Ott	Uruguay's International Cooperation Policy MIDES Evaluacion y monitoreo Budget, Investment, Management and Evaluation Uruguay National Evaluation Institution Uruguay Centro de Informacion Oficial Uruguay (Budget Transparency Portal Uruguay) Sustainable Dev. The case of Uruguay
49.	Yemen	EVALYemen	Monitoring and Evaluation Association of Yemen, Nashwan Ahmed, chair	

Appendix C: Countries other resources (65)

Table 12: Countries from which information came from other resource (65)

No	Country	Source of information
1.	Albania	Albania OECD Reviews of Evaluation and Assessment in Education
2.	Algeria	Algeria – Mainstreaming
3.	Argentina	Director of the Monitoring and Evaluation Program, CIPPEC Natalia Aquilino Agencia Nacional de Evaluacion : el aporte de CIPPEC
4.	Armenia	Armenia Impact Evaluation Armenia Measure Evaluation
5.	Australia	Professor M. Gray and Dr J. R. Bray, Centre for Social Research and Methods, Australian National University Blending evaluation Principles with Development Practices to Change People's Lives
6.	Austria	OECD Austria's results, evaluation, and learning
7.	Azerbaijan	AzerbaijanRoomAMonitoringandEvaluationProcess.pdf Center for Analysis of Economic Reforms and Communications Azerbaijan 2016
8.	Bangladesh	Bhabatosh Nath Chairman/ Responsive to Integrated Development Services (RIDS) MED Policy Study Bangladesh
9.	Belgium	Pattyn, V. and Peuter, B. (2021). <i>The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe</i> . pp. 115-138 Special Evaluation Service
10.	Benin	Politique Nationale d'Évaluation 2012-2021 Republique du Benin Mere compliance or learning: M&E culture in the public service of Benin, Uganda, and South Africa
11.	Bhutan	Development Evaluation Policy of Bhutan 2017

12.	Botswana	(PDF) Monitoring and Evaluating Government Performance in ...
13.	Cambodia	"Rectangular Strategy" for Growth, Employment, Equity and Efficiency
14.	Cameroon	Blending evaluation Principles with Development Practices to Change People's Lives
15.	Canada	Government of Canada Policy on Results Evaluation in the Government of Canada Policy on Results What is evaluation?
16.	Chile	Dra. Andrea Peroni, Coordinator of the Interdisciplinary Nucleus in Evaluative Research , University of Chile. Nacimiento de la Oficina de Planificación Nacional Evaluacion y Revision del Gasto
17.	Colombia	SINERGIA Departamento Nacional de Planeacion Blending evaluation Principles with Development Practices to Change People's Lives National Evaluation Policy in Colombia
18.	Croatia	HEM VOPE website
19.	Czech Republic	Remm J. and Potluka. O. (2021). <i>The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe</i> . p. 351-376
20.	Denmark	Dahler-Larsen, P. and Foss, H. (2021). <i>The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe</i> . Hansen p.37-62 Evaluation in the Nordic Countries
21.	Dominican Republic	Blending evaluation Principles with Development Practices to Change People's Lives
22.	Estonia	Republic of Estonia Ministry of Education and Research Impact Evaluation
23.	Fiji	Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for Fiji's National Adaptation Plan Process 2020
24.	Finland	Liisa Horelli, PhD., Department of Built Environment Aalto University Evaluation in Norway: A 25-year Assessment
25.	France	Lacouetter-Fougere, C. and Simon, B. (2021). <i>The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe</i> .pp.139-166
26.	Gambia	Blending evaluation Principles with Development Practices to Change People's Lives
27.	Georgia	Blending evaluation Principles with Development Practices to Change People's Lives
28.	Germany	Stockmann, R. and Meyer, W. (2020). The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe.p.167-198

		GIZ's evaluation policy
29.	Ghana	Ghanaian Draft National Monitoring and Evaluation Policy 2019 National Monitoring and Evaluation Manual Republic of Ghana
30.	Iceland	OECD Iceland Mid-term Review 2020
31.	Indonesia	Review of NES and Capacities Indonesia Indonesia Vision, Mission, Aim, and Strategic Plan Blending evaluation Principles with Development Practices to Change People's Lives
32.	Ireland	Boyle,R., O'Harra, J., McNamara, G. and Brown, M.. (2020) <i>The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe</i> . pp. 227-248
33.	Jamaica	Blending evaluation Principles with Development Practices to Change People's Lives
34.		
35.	Korea, the Republic of	Korea's Government Performance Evaluation System and ... 제도소개 – 정부업무평가위원회 Introduction of the system - Government work evaluation committee Evaluation Business Government Chapter 2 Performance and Evaluation systems for the Korean Central Govt Agencies
36.	Latvia	Veitners, K. (2020). In Eds. Reinhard Stockmann,Wolfgang Meyer, Lena Taube <i>The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe</i> . p.376-403
37.	Lithuania	The Lithuanian Government's Policy of Regulatory ... - Sciendo Evidence Based Policy Making and Policy Evaluation at the ...
38.	Luxemburg	Evaluations - Gouvernement LU
39.	Malawi	John Hopkins National Evaluation Platform Malawi
40.	Mexico	CONEVAL Decree of creation CONEVAL
41.	Mozambique	Mozambique USAID MMEMS National Evaluation Platform John Hopkins National Evaluation Platform Mozambique
42.	Myanar	A Study on the Status of National Evaluation Policies and Systems in Asia Pacific Region
43.	Namibia	Execution, Monitoring & Evaluation and Reporting Harambee Prosperity Plan.
44.	Nepal	A Study on the Status of National Evaluation Policies and Systems in Asia Pacific Region Blending evaluation Principles with Development Practices to Change People's Lives
45.	The Netherlands	Haarhuis, C. K. (2020) <i>The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe</i> . pp.89-114.

46.	New Zealand	A Study on the Status of National Evaluation Policies and Systems in Asia Pacific Region Implementation and monitoring responsibilities New Zealand
47.	Norway	Evaluation in Norway: A 25-year Assessment
48.	Philippines	National Evaluation Policy Framework Philippines National Evaluation Portal Philippines National Evaluation Policy Framework Guidelines
49.	Portugal	Diogo, A. (2020) <i>The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe</i> . pp. 329-350
50.	Russia	эмпирическая, индикаторная, экспертная - gLOCAL ... (Evaluation of Social Projects and Programs in Russia) Natalia Kosheleva
51.	Senegal	Evaluation development in Senegal Lomeña-Gelis Improving Evaluation Use in Senegal through ...
52.	Singapore	MOF Directorates - Ministry of Finance
53.	Slovenia	Slovenia Evaluation Mandate OECD Slovenia - DAC Evaluation Network Member
54.	South Africa	Evaluation the national evaluation system in South Africa Planning, monitoring & evaluation Republic of South Africa
55.	Sri Lanka	A Study on the Status of National Evaluation Policies and Systems in Asia Pacific Region National Evaluation Policy of Sri Lanka – The Sri Lanka Parliamentarians Forum for Evaluation (slpfe.org) Current situation in Sri Lanka on Monitoring & Evaluation of ... Monitoring and Evaluation System in Sri Lanka: Experiences, Challenges and the Way Forward
56.	Sweden	EVALUATION IN THE NORDIC COUNTRIES - Sfu
57.	Switzerland	Thomas Widmer (2020). <i>The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe</i> . pp.199-226
58.	Tanzania	Why should Countries have NEPs National Evaluation Platform: Tanzania
59.	Thailand	OECD Reviews of Regulatory Reform Thailand Review of National Evaluation Systems and Capacities.....Asia-Pacific Region OpenDevelopmentThailand
60.	Trinidad & Tobago	National Performance Framework
61.	United Kingdom	Tracy Wond (2020). <i>The Institutionalisation of Evaluation in Europe</i> . pp. 249-271
62.	USA	Public Law 115-435 Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking

63.	Vietnam	Vietnam Framework for Evaluation Policy and Standards (VN-FEPS)
64.	Zambia	National Monitoring and Evaluation policy Republic of Zambia Role of Actors Outside Government in Strengthening the Country MES in Zambia Towards Building a functional MES for Zambia
65.	Zimbabwe	Zimbabwean NMEP

Appendix D: Countries for which no current information was available (14)

Table 13: Countries for which no current information was available (14)

1.	Belize
2.	Caribbean Islands
3.	China
4.	Dominican Republic
5.	Egypt
6.	Gabon
7.	Gambia
8.	Georgia
9.	Ivory Coast
10.	Jamaica
11.	Kazakhstan
12.	Kosovo
13.	Turkey
14.	Venezuela

Appendix E: Administrating or Coordinating Bodies by Country for those with and without a policy (102)

Table 14: Administrating or Coordinating Bodies for Evaluation Function by Country for those with and without an NEP (102)

	Country	Administrating or Coordinating Body
1.	Albania	No evaluation
2.	Algeria	President of the Republic
3.	Argentina	Office of the Information, Evaluation and Monitoring System of Social Programmes (SIEMPRO) the National Council for the Coordination of Social Polices (CNPS)
4.	Armenia	No evaluation
5.	Australia	The Department of Finance, supported by the Secretaries Board
6.	Australia ACT (Australian Canberra Territories) WA - Western Australia	Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate
7.	Austria	Austrian Development Agency and the Development Bank of Austria
8.	Azerbaijan	President Center for Analysis of Economic Reforms and Communication of the Republic of Azerbaijan, and each ministry has a unit for evaluation
9.	Bangladesh	Implementation Monitoring and Evaluation Division Ministry of Planning
10.	Belgium (Flanders)	Audit Office
11.	Belgium (Wallonia)	Audit Office, Special Evaluation Service
12.	Benin	The President of the Republic, Public Administration Public Policy Evaluation Office (PPPO) Office of Evaluation of Public Policies Office for Evaluation of Public Policies and Actions, Benin (BEPPAG) in the presidency
13.	Bhutan	Gross National Happiness Commission Secretariat
14.	Bolivia	The Ministry of the Presidency (MDP) is the coordinating body between the president of the Plurinational State and the different ministries. The Ministry of Development Planning has the obligation to carry out monitoring and evaluation activities concerning the Comprehensive Planning System of the Plurinational State (SPIE) Economic Policy Analysis Unit (UDAPE) depended of Ministry of Development Planning
15.	Botswana	the Ministry of Finance and Development Planning

16.	Brazil	The Ministry of Development Planning has the obligation to carry out monitoring and evaluation activities concerning the Comprehensive Planning System of the Plurinational State (SPIE), in addition to monitoring and evaluating the State Investment and Financing
17.	Bulgaria	No coordinating body
18.	Burkina Faso	Economic Policy Analysis Unit (UDAPE) depended of Ministry of Development Planning
19.	Cambodia	Cabinet
20.	Canada	Treasury Board of Canada Department of Results Frameworks, Results division,
21.	Chile	The Ministry of Finance, through the Directorate of Budgets (DIPRES) and the Ministry of Social Development and Family, through the Undersecretary of Evaluation.
22.	Colombia	The National Planning Department - DNP is an Administrative Department that belongs to the Executive Branch of the public power and depends directly on the Presidency of the Republic.
23.	Costa Rica	Ministerio de Planificación Nacional y Política Económica (MIDEPLAN)
24.	Czechia	National Coordination Authority at the Ministry for Regional Development
25.	Denmark	Separate Ministries
26.	Djibouti	Prime Minister's Office
27.	Ecuador	The National Planning Secretary,
28.	El Salvador	Presidential Cabinet led by the Presidential Commissioner, For SDGs, the National Council for Sustainable Development
29.	Estonia	State Chancellery
30.	Ethiopia	Ministry of Education and Research, External Evaluation Department
31.	Fiji	Ministry of Economy
32.	Finland	Audit Office Prime Minister's Office The Ministry of Foreign Affairs The Finnish Education Centre
33.	France	Cours des Comptes (Court of Auditors) Secretary of State
34.	Germany	Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
35.	Ghana	National Development Commission
36.	Greece	Working on it – National Evaluation Strategy
37.	Guatemala	Each sector conducts its own evaluations

38.	Iceland	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
39.	India	the Development Monitoring and Evaluation Office (DMEO), which is an office attached to NITI Aayog
40.	Indonesia	The Deputy for Development Performance Evaluation State Minister of National Development Planning/Head of the National Development Planning Agency.
41.	Ireland	Department of Education and Skills Department of Public Expenditure and Reform
42.	Israel	All ministries have their own evaluation unit including the Knesset
43.	Italy	UVAL, the evaluation unit for evaluation of the investment programmes within the Department for Cohesion Policy Impact Assessment Office, The Senate's Impact Assessment Office, chaired by the President of the Senate
44.	Japan	Administrative Evaluation Bureau, Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communication , Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications,
45.	Jordan	The Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation was coordinating the efforts around NEP.
46.	Kenya	National Steering Committee (NSC) that is chaired by the Principal Secretary, State Department for Planning in the National Treasury and Planning which includes stakeholders from the Government, Development Partners and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate State Department for Planning, The National Treasury and Planning: Kenya.
47.	Korea, the Republic of	Prime Minister's Office, Ministry of Strategy and Finance Ministry of Culture and Sports and tourism depending on the area of the program being evaluated, Central administrative agency evaluation
48.	Kyrgyz Republic	The situation is in flux because of the recent change in government.
49.	Latvia	Cabinet of Ministers (CoM) Cross-Sectoral Coordination Centre under the direct authority of the Prime Minister
50.	Lebanon	Central Inspection of Lebanon (CI) with the Office of the Minister of State for Administrative Reform (OMSAR)
51.	Lithuania	The Government Strategic Analysis Center is an expert institution that provides government and ministries with the independent, research-based information required to make evidence-based public policy decisions.
52.	Luxembourg	«Évaluation et Contrôle de qualité» de la Direction de la coopération au développement et de l'action humanitaire, Ministère des Affaires étrangères et européennes (MAEE)
53.	Macedonia	No coordinating body
54.	Malawi	National Evaluation Platform in the health sector
55.	Malaysia	Ministry of Finance for all Programs

		Implementation Coordination Unit, Prime Minister's Departments for Projects
56.	Mali	Bureau du Vérificateur Général Officer of the Auditor General, NEP – National Evaluation Platform in the health sector
57.	Mexico	The National Council for the Evaluation of Social Development Policy (CONEVAL, Consejo Nacional de Evaluación de la Política de Desarrollo Social) is a Federal Public Administration decentralized public organization. Created by the General Law of Social Development (LGDS).
58.	Mongolia	Ministry of Finance and Cabinet Secretariat
59.	Morocco	Head of department of the environmental database, National Observatory of the Environment and Sustainable Development Secretariat of State for Sustainable Development
60.	Mozambique	Mozambique Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanism Services (MMEMS) for USAID projects National Evaluation Platform in the health sector
61.	Namibia	Monitoring and Evaluation Department, Government of Namibia , Sylvanus Nambala, National Planning Commission
62.	Nepal	National Planning Commission (NPC) It is headed by the Right Honorable Prime Minister, the Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS), functions as a specialized entity of the NPC Secretariat, headed by a Director-General.
63.	New Zealand	Treasury
64.	Niger	Ministry of Planning, National Evaluation Agency (ANEV)
65.	Nigeria	Ministry of Budget and National Planning
66.	Norway	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Climate and Environment Norwegian Agency for Public and Financial Management's Evaluation Portal
67.	Pakistan	The Ministry of Planning, Development and Reform Cabinet and the Office of the Prime Minister
68.	Palestine	Prime Minister's Office M&E Office
69.	Panama	If a govt institution wants to conduct evaluation, technical assistance is solicited from an international organization.
70.	Paraguay	There is also no coordination mechanism, so each performs its evaluation work in isolation with very limited resources.
71.	Peru	The Presidency of the Council of Ministers and the Ministries Ministry of Economic and Financial Affairs Several sectors have created their own evaluation units.
72.	Philippines	National Economic and Development Authority and Department of Budget and Management, Evaluation Task Force (ETF) is responsible to develop and Evaluation Agenda.

73.	Poland	Ministry of Investment and Economic Development Ministry of Education has its own legal policy Strategy for Responsible Development
74.	Portugal	International Development and Cooperation – administrative regulations, not policies
75.	Romania	Public Policies Unit under the General Secretariat of the Government The Ministry of European Funds
76.	Russia	Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation, Chamber of Auditors
77.	Rwanda	Ministry of Economic Planning and Finance
78.	Serbia	Public Policy Secretariat under the supervision of the Prime Minister’s Office
79.	Singapore	Ministry of Finance Performance and Evaluation (P & E) Directorate
80.	Slovakia Slovak Republic	Not practiced except for EU or other internationally funded projects
81.	Slovenia	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
82.	South Africa	National Evaluation System (NES) Treasury Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME)
83.	Spain	Evaluation Division of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Development Most sectors have their own evaluation units with a legal framework
84.	Sri Lanka	Ministry of Finance, National Operations Room Individual Ministries have Evaluation Units
85.	Sweden	The Swedish National Audit Office Most sectors have and perform their own evaluations.
86.	Switzerland	Parliamentary Control of the Administration and the Swiss Federal Audit Office
87.	Tajikistan	Evaluations are conducted mainly by international organisations only guided by their internal standards and norms.
88.	Tanzania	National Evaluation Platform in the Health sector National Evaluation Platform: Tanzania
89.	Thailand	National Statistical Office Sufficiency Economy Philosophy: Thailand’s Path towards the SDG.
90.	The Netherlands	Court of Audit
91.	Togo	Ministry of Planning and Development, the Cabinet, Office of the President
92.	Trinidad and Tobago	The Ministry of Planning and Development
93.	Tunisia	Evaluation in separate sectors
94.	Uganda	Office of the Prime Minister
95.	UK West of England combined Authority	Government Evaluation Facility Project

96.	Ukraine	Individual ministries
97.	United Kingdom	HM Treasury, Government Finance Function, Health, Education, International Development
98.	Uruguay	Planning and Budget Office (OPP), the National Institute for Evaluation of Education (INEED) and the Ministry of Social Development (MIDES), and the recently created Monitoring and Evaluation Agency within the scope of the Presidency of the Republic (to start operating)
99.	USA	Government Accountability Office Office of Management and Budget
100.	Vietnam	Currently working on a framework
101.	Zambia	Ministry of National Development Planning
102.	Zimbabwe	Office of the Auditor General



**Global
Parliamentarians
Forum for
Evaluation**

Email: gpf.evaluation@gmail.com

Website: www.gpffe.org

Twitter: www.twitter.com/eval_gpf