SIEA 2018 - Lot 2 - Infrastructure, sustainable growth and jobs

Mid Term Review of the ARISE Plus Assistance and
Executive Summary,
Jakarta, Indonesia

Letter of Contract No. 2019/410549

Final Report

18th March 2020

Project financed by:

Project implemented by:
PLANET S.A.

DISCLAIMER

"This document has been produced with the assistance of the European Union. The content of this document is the sole responsibility of the Consultant and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union"

COORDINATES OF THE CONTRACT

Project Title:	"Mid Term Review of the ARISE Plus Technical Assistance, Jakarta, Indonesia"	
Project Number:	SIEA 2018 –	
	Lot 2 - Infrastructure, sustainable growth and jobs	
	Specific Contract: 2019/410549	
Country:	**Indonesia**	
Name:	**Contracting Authority:**	**Contractor**:
	EU Delegation toPlanet S.A.	
	Indonesia and Brunei Darussalam	
Address:	Menara Astra, 38th floor,	Apollo Tower
	Jl	
. Jend Sudirman Kav 5-6,	64, Louise Riencourt	
	Jakarta 10220	GR-11523 Athens
	Indonesia	Greece
Tel. number:	███████████	+30 210 690 5000
Fax number:	███████████	+30 210 698 1885
E-mail:	█████████████████████	xmakr@planet.gr
Contact person:	**Mrs. Celine PRUD'HOMME MADSEN**	**Mr Chrysostomos MAKRAKIS KARACHALIOS**
	Project Manager	Project Director
	EU Delegation to	Planet S.A.
	Indonesia and Brunei Darussalam	
Signatures:	_____	_____
Date of Report	**18th March 2020**	
Planning Period	13.11.2019 – 11.02.2020	
Report Authors	TL – Terry FOULKES	
	KE2 - Eduardo Wally AUSTIN	
	KE3 - T. Ipun Zulrizal DJOHAN	

Table of contents

Acronyms

ABAC	ASEAN Business Advisory Council
ACCSQ	ASEAN Consultative Committee for Standards and Quality
ACCC	ASEAN Connectivity Coordinating Committee
ACCP	ASEAN Committee on Consumer Protection
ACD	Cosmetic Directive
ACTS	ASEAN Customs Transit System
AEC	ASEAN Economic Community
AECB	ASEAN Economic Community Blueprint
AEGFS	ASEAN Expert Group on Food Safety
AEO	Authorised Economic Operators
ASFAFGIT	ASEAN Framework Agreement on the Facilitation of Goods in Transit
AFAFIST	ASEAN Framework Agreement on the Facilitation of Inter-State Transport
AFAMT	ASEAN Framework Agreement on Multimodal Transport
AFFA	ASEAN Federation of Forwarders Associations
AFTA	ASEAN Free Trade Area
AHEEERR	ASEAN Harmonised Electrical and Electronic Equipment Regulatory Regime
AGVCBP	ASEAN Goods Vehicle Cross Border Permit
AMS	ASEAN Member States
API	Active Pharmaceutical Ingredient(s)
APLAC	Asia Pacific Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation
AR+	ARISE PLUS
ARAC	ASEAN Risk Assessment Centre for Food Safety
ARA	ASEAN Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed
ARISE	ASEAN Regional Integration Support by the EU
ARISE PLUS	ASEAN Regional Integration Support by the EU PLUs

ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
ASEAN-CBTP	ASEAN agreement on the Facilitation of the Cross-Border Transport of Passengers by Road Vehicle
ASEC	ASEAN Secretariat
ASOA	ASEAN Standard for Organic Agriculture
ASPSC	ACCSQ's 2016-2025 Strategic Plan for Standards and Conformance
ASSIST	ASEAN Solutions for Services, Investment and Trade
ASW-SC	ASEAN Single Window Steering Committee
ATIGA	ASEAN Trade in Goods Agreement
ATFF	ASEAN Trade Facilitation Framework
ATF-JCC	ASEAN Trade Facilitation Joint Consultative Committee
ATFW	ASEAN Trade Facilitation Work Plans
ATR	ASEAN Trade Repository
ATT	Authorised Transit Trader
AWP	Annual Work Plan
BDA	Business Development Agencies
BSA	Business Support Agencies
CBTP	Cross-Border Transport of Passengers by Road Vehicles
CCA	ASEAN Coordinating Committee on the Implementation of ATIGA
CCI	ASEAN Coordinating Committee on Investment
CCBWG	Customs Capacity Building Working Group
CCC	ASEAN Customs Coordinating Committee
CCS	ASEAN Coordinating Committee on Services
CECWG	Customs Enforcement and Compliance Working Group
CEN-CENELEC	European Committee on Standardization – European Committee for Electrotechnical Standardisation
CLMV	Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, and Vietnam

CMT	Central Management Team
CPTFWG	Customs Procedures and Trade Facilitation Working Group
DSG	Deputy Secretary General
DG-DEVCO	Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development
EC	European Commission
EDSM	Enhanced Dispute Settlement Mechanism
EEE	Electrical and Electronic Equipment
ERIA	Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia
EU	European Union
EUABC	EU-ASEAN Business Council
EUD	European Union Delegation
FA	Financing Agreement
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
ICH	International Council for Harmonization
IL	Intervention Logic
KE	Key Expert
MIS	Management Information System
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPAC	Master Plan on ASEAN Connectivity
MRA	Mutual Recognition Arrangement
MSME	Micro-, Small-, and Medium-Sized Enterprises
MST	Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NKE	Non-Key Expert
NTB	Non-Tariff Barrier(s)
OWP	Overall Work Plan

PFPWG	Prepared Foodstuff Product Working Group
PPWG	ACCSQ Pharmaceutical Product Working Group
PPWG	Pharmaceutical Product Working Group
PSC	Project Steering Committee
PWG	Product Working Group(s)
REI	Regional Economic Integration
RfS	Request for Service
SC-AROO	Sub Committee on ATIGA Rules of Origin
SEOM	Senior Economic Officers Meeting
SNKE	Senior Non-Key Expert
SPCD	Strategic Plans for Customs Development
TA	Technical Assistance
TAT	Technical Assistance Team
TBT	Technical Barriers to Trade
TF	Trade Facilitation
TFD	Trade Facilitation Division
TFWG	ASEAN Transport Facilitation Working Group
TOC	Theory of Change
TOR	Terms of Reference
TTCB	Transit Transport Coordinating Board
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WHO	World Health Organisation
WTO	World Trade Organisation

Executive Summary

Introduction

ASEAN cooperation and regional economic integration continues its development. The ASEAN Community Vision 2025 is supported by three strategic blueprints including the Economic Community Blueprint now also in 2025 version. The Community Vision is supported by the Master Plan for ASEAN Connectivity 2025 and the Initiative for ASEAN Integration Work Plan III. AECB 2025 itself is due to undergo a mid-term review this year.

Moreover, there will be a legal review of the ASEAN Trade In Goods Agreement, (ATIGA)

In addition, work is progressing on two dimensions- macro-level for ASEAN as a whole and meso-level for supporting the less-developed AMS and closing the gap between the most and least developed countries.

At present ASEAN consists of two developed countries, five middle income and three LDCs and has a total population of well over half a billion people. Notwithstanding the progress, there is still work to be done before development benefits are more evenly distributed.

ARISE PLUS TA Programme November 2017 - November 2020

Overall Objective:

The overall objective of the ARISE PLUS TA contract is:

To support greater economic integration in ASEAN through the implementation of the ASEAN

Economic Community Blueprint 2025

Purpose:

The purposes of this contract are as follows:

To provide technical assistance to the beneficiaries with the purpose:

1. To improve customs, transport facilitation, trade facilitation and standards with a view to achieve a highly integrated and cohesive economy;

2. To strengthen institutional capacities through, in particular, managing the integration process with an emphasis on strengthening compliance and outcomes monitoring and impact assessment, including statistics, coordination and management and improved capacity among ASEAN bodies and the ASEAN Secretariat.

Expected Results (Outcomes) are:

1.Implementation of the ASEAN Trade Facilitation Framework (ATFF) and implementation of ATIGA in addressing non-tariff barriers (NTBs), in particular through ASEAN Trade Repository/National Trade Repositories, ASSIST(ASEAN Solutions for Services, Investment and Trade), an ASEAN-wide self-certification of product origin scheme, and maintaining an NTM database;

2. Implementation of Harmonised Standards and Mutual Recognition Arrangements in specific sectors;

3. Harmonisation of customs and transport facilitation; development of an Implementation Framework for the ASEAN Framework Agreement on Multimodal Transport (AFAMT) and Implementing Guidelines of the ASEAN Framework Agreement on the Facilitation of Cross-Border Transport of Passengers by Road Vehicles (CBTP); and implementation of the ASEAN Customs Transit System (ACTS);

4. Enhancement of the ASEAN Economic Community integration monitoring framework through better monitoring of the progress and outcomes/impact of regional integration to facilitate the implementation of measures, and enhanced outreach and reporting.

Main analytical points

This is a Mid-Term Review of the ARISE PLUS TA Programme in accordance with the Financing Agreement and undertaken around the mid-point of the implementation.

The Review was to undertake a standard investigation using the DAC criteria. In the light of the fact that ARISE PLUS is a very big project and the mission was a short one, it was agreed that the methodology would consider the whole programme in a light touch approach but would focus in more depth on representative activities from the four components. To these were added specific component activities about which concerns were expressed and these were to be investigated in greater detail.

Findings

Relevance:

The design of the ARISE PLUS Programme continues with a general programme that has been agreed and refined over a number of previous EU programmes such as APRIS and ARISE. In addition the areas covered have also been drawn up in close consultation with the Secretariat, AMS and related sectoral bodies, whose goal is to realise ASEAN's economic integration goals and respond to challenges. Together they make the ARISE PLUS Programme very relevant.

Effectiveness:

The comments under Section 2.4 *Answered Questions* point to numerous instances of where the ARISE PLUS interventions have improved or speeded up the work of the various components and the working groups. This springs from a number of factors including that it is the same team from previous projects, (now augmented with many additional of non-key experts), the location of the TA Team in the Secretariat, the long history of working together between the TA Team and ASEAN counterparts. The TA Team are also said to be very responsive to ASEAN requests for help and quickly produce impressive solutions.

Efficiency:

The ARISE PLUS TA Team have managed to attract a lot of attention for the Programme and this helps them to network very effectively meaning that they are invited to numerous internal and external meetings and can reach a wider audience at relatively low cost to the project. Other examples such as the organisation of project missions, meetings and training all get very favourable reviews from ASEAN counterparts for their efficient planning and execution as do the combining of participants from assorted organisations, *breaking down the silos,* to get greater effectiveness and impact on cross- departmental or cross- component work.

Impact:

The project is just over two years old so it is very early to try to assess impact in terms of project outputs. Nevertheless, ASSIST has been made operational and translated into all ASEAN languages, which has had noted and favourable impact on ASEAN. The ATR/NTR are both operational and being populated in an on-going operation. ACTS is at an advanced stage and has clear plans to expand. These components *should* improve the technical capacity of ARISE + beneficiaries. How well that capacity is retained cannot be predicted at this stage. It will depend in part on how well the whole ASEAN ecosystem as well as personnel adapts itself to the overall change management development implicit in ARISE PLUS. It is probable that there will need to be additional support after ARISE PLUS to consolidate that impact.

There are, also encouraging signs from ASEAN of the impact ARISE PLUS has made on them in being asked to help with the MTR of the AEC Blueprint and a legal review of the ATIGA.

Sustainability:

It is difficult to find early signs of sustainability. Things are either sustainable or they are not. It is too early to say that any of the projects will be sustainable after the ARISE PLUS TA programme ends. Certainly, if the quote from the Debrief Presentation (page 23)

"*Sustainability will be achieved when the ASEAN Secretariat and the AMS are able to take over and maintain the various activities needed to achieve the goals of ASEAN Regional Integration…*"

is taken as the standard for sustainability, then the answer is no, at the time of the programme mid-term review.

If some elements of the Programme are fully completed by the end of the project, e.g. the ASSIST or the ATR/NTR AND if ASEAN has taken them over, then those elements might be sustainable. It is expected, however, that even then ASEAN would need some form of dedicated financial and human capacity to sustain them in the following years.

The comment about the ARISE PLUS TA operating at too low a level are valid. For the TA Team to be really influencing sustainability, they would need to operate as counterparts to, e.g. SEOM.

Visibility:

The conclusion is that the ARISE PLUS TA Programme has achieved good visibility for itself and for the EU both within the project ecosystem and more widely within ASEAN.

EU Added Value:

The EU has brought at least two key elements to help ASEAN achieve its regional economic integration (REI) goals, viz.

a) long-term programme commitment and consistency
b) a holistic approach to REI. The support is not just an isolated or ad hoc programme but a systematic attempt to cover the main factors in achieving REI.

Main Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions	Recommendations
1. Although it is a direct consequence of their remit, the ARISE PLUS TA Workplans are all at the operational level, i.e. they are focused on building systems and processes and creating institutions together with HRD capacity building.	The ARISE PLUS TA Team should be given encouragement to start to look beyond the activities in their work plans and begin to consider a more strategic approach with regard to sustainability and the post-project context during the remaining months of this programme.
2. There are only three more years left on the ARISE PLUS TA programme. Given the status of the work on all four components, it	The Team should watch the clock. With this Team, it is possible that they are doing so already but if not, the ARISE PLUS TA Team should check on each of the various

is clear that not all programme activities will be completed by the end of the programme	programme activities and determine which of them might be completed by November 2022 and which not. They can then spend the remaining three years working on adjusting the programme accordingly.
3. The ARISE PLUS Team are being asked to help with the MTR of the AEC Blueprint and will be asked to take on a legal review of the ASEAN Trade In Goods Agreement. That is testament to the degree of trust and respect that the ARISE PLUS Team have achieved	Work in prospect on the AECB MTR and the ATIGA will allow the ARISE PLUS Team to be involved in much higher levels of organization and policy than hitherto. Any such work should be planned to contribute to the development of an over-arching strategic framework which would help to achieve much-needed enhancements in both the ASEAN ecosystem and its modus operandi. These could, *inter alia,* enable the Secretariat to move beyond its current facilitatory role.
4. The work with the ASEAN Integration Monitoring Directorate under Component 4 should allow ARISE PLUS to extend its assistance into more and higher-level areas as the AIMD builds up its work on compliance and they work together to make the Monitoring arrangement more effective. Compliance Monitoring is the key to vast potential improvement in ASEAN performance	Superficially the work with AIMD under Component 4 is about monitoring frameworks. However, as reported on in section 3.1.4 there is ambition to make the compliance of implementation, in particular, much more effective and efficient. Implementation lapses are a big problem for ASEAN. Making optimum use of the databases as well as creating new authorization systems is highly necessary. Anything that can be done to render implementation deficiencies more visible would be very beneficial. Visibility is necessary but not sufficient. Methods of facilitating accountability and management follow-up should be developed and implemented. That would be a valuable role for the ARISE PLUS support to AIMD
5. ASSIST is potentially a good system, is needed and was requested by ASEAN. It has had teething problems but the requisite set up is now in place.	ASSIST was initially welcomed by both Government and the private sector when first unveiled but the uptake was subsequently not encouraging, through no fault of the TA Team. What is essential now is a full-blown effort to get ASSIST used by the private sector. The TA Team has its plans and other ideas are set out in section 3.1.1. The TA Team cannot, however, do it alone. There is a need for a strong lead from ASEAN Governments to promote ASSIST. There could also be a role for the national ARISE PLUS TAs in this, locally and internationally as their remits allow, particularly for private sector support. The EU can also encourage uptake and usage.

6. Some Programme activities. e.g. the ATR/NTRs are projected to be finished by the end of the current programme	Where programme activities are expected to be finished by the end of the project, the TA Team should identify them, then discuss with ASEAN and EUD and prepare their exit and hand-over strategies, including foreseeing and specifying any necessary follow-up requirements.
7. The ARISE PLUS TA Team are *de facto* playing a leading role in driving the whole programme. That is not and should not be their role. They are the repository of not only the expertise for the technical aspects of the programme but also the capacity building as well as the change management. At present, with a few exceptions, their main functional level in ASEAN is and should be operational. They have no official remit to work at a strategic or policy level.	The TA TEAM has built up a good reputation. They could use the opportunities presented by the work on the MTR for AECB and the legal review of ATGIA. With their usual sensitivity they might explore possibilities to engage with ASEAN on the creation of high-level programme management capability within the ASEAN ecosystem to support regional economic integration. Initially it could perhaps involve a reformed Secretariat or be under the purview of the Committee of the Whole Meeting (COW). In effect, that should replace the TA Team as *de facto* drivers of regional economic integration
8. Within the ASEAN ecosystem there is no systemic architecture for programme management. The ASEAN Secretariat cannot fulfil that role at present. There is a gap in that ASEAN ecosystem that needs to be addressed but there is little evidence of action.	Following on from 7 above, the TA Team could be prepared to use the "on-demand" facility and be ready to support any revision of the ASEAN ecosystem and structures to accommodate new roles and capabilities to take regional economic integration forward.
9. In the MTR Presentation on December 13th the statement about sustainability for ARISE PLUS was taken up in the discussion that followed. The EUD and a number of ASEAN colleagues talked of the need to work towards greater sustainability. This point was also made in some of the interviews during the mission.	The interest in sustainability shown during the MTR Presentation and interviews should be taken up where possible by the ARISE PLUS TA Team and the EU and strategies worked out for the remaining years of this Programme. Forward planning is the essence of the TA Team's design of Annual Work Plans. Therefore it would allow, for example, for sections on sustainability/exit strategy assessments for all project components/activities to be built into work plans from now on, if and where these are not already included. For any future support, if planned, the inclusion of a similar approach on building in sustainability would be a prudent strategic consideration.
10. The idea of coordination between the regional and national ARISE PLUS TA teams is potentially a good one. There is a need for good project management between	Any Regional Coordination Committee arrangements should keep separate the needs of the ARISE PLUS joint regional and national programmes possibly working in

the teams to reinforce and maximize the effects, impact and sustainability of the entire programme. That is the first and overriding priority. Annual meetings between them will not provide the regularity, the flexibility or the effectiveness for good programme management. By this it is not intended that there will be coordinated day to day management of the national and the regional programmes. They have their current remits. Development programme implementation, however, must be able to adapt. ASEAN is changing and will continue to do so. Therefore the TA programmes have to be able to adapt as well, especially over a five year period. Otherwise they could be become constrained by the, possibly out-dated, thinking from the time they were set up. ASSIST, The ATR/NTRs and ACTS are very good examples of where the national and regional programmes could coordinate to optimise impacts while still carrying out their specific remits. This is for the technical assistance teams. It is quite separate from the suggested Regional Coordination Committee	tandem as discussed in Conclusion 10 and any much larger awareness or visibility gatherings with different agendas.
11. The ARISE PLUS TA Programme is being managed and implemented to a very high level by best international standards.	Following Conclusion 11, the current TA Team was found to be performing very well. So the recommendation is that the current TA Team and contractor should be given the additional two years and the full €7.5 million budget.

Concluding Remarks

The ARISE PLUS programme is well-designed and implemented so is progressing very satisfactorily. There have been some initial problems but not the fault of the TA Team.

The next steps entail decisions about the timing and continuity or otherwise of the various programme activities. Those decisions, in turn, will depend on EU decisions about what happens after the ARISE PLUS Regional TA programme. There are clear statements from some quarters in ASEAN about the wish for further support post ARISE PLUS.

The approach of this evaluation, of what was a large and complex programme, had to focus on the macro-level rather than to try to dwell into the minutiae of a large number of sub-projects. Some were looked at in more detail, especially those under query.

The conclusion is that, by any development standards, ARISE PLUS TA is a successful programme which continues to build good foundations for potential successor programmes, if continued.

Alternatively, however, that Donor support is possibly approaching a watershed moment. The policy so far has been simply adding more and more operational programmes in a series of support for regional economic integration. Is that what the Donor and ASEAN intend? Perhaps it is time for the Donor to consider how long it is prepared to support such an approach, especially if sustainability is still not being actively pursued. The ultimate goal must be for ASEAN to become self-sufficient, at some stage, in planning and implementing its economic development. That, unfortunately, remains a generational exercise.

The Regional TA Team needs time to undertake a review of the sustainability and exit readiness of the programme components and activities for their forthcoming workplans as suggested in Conclusion/Recommendation 9.

Such work could be self-standing or could also provide a baseline for further activities. It might be, for example, a joint exercise with ASEAN to ascertain the state of readiness of the respective bodies (and their staff) to take over the implementation of regional economic integration as exemplified by the ARISE PLUS TA components and activities.

This latter idea is not intended to be added to the remit of the current ARISE PLUS TA programme. It might therefore be construed as a separate task or an independent study to follow on from that work and carried out under different implementation.

Possible impediments might be -

Firstly, it might be too early to raise the concept at this time. There are still some three years to go on the current programme. The prospective work on sustainability for inclusion in forthcoming Work Plans might be necessary for preparing the ground before the introduction of the idea and to facilitate productive discussions over the remaining months.

Secondly, it will require both high-level, i.e. Donor intervention, and sensitivity to engage a positive response and move the agenda forward. Thirdly, the ideal approach would be gradualist and should build on the success of the previous capacity building activities to develop a confidence-building programme for ASEAN staff. The intention would be to encourage them to adopt and engage with the idea of taking over some programme management responsibility at some time in the future.

If this was successful, then the work might be extended to other aspects of regional economic integration besides the ARISE PLUS Programme.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

ASEAN has made impressive improvements in economic growth and social development in the fifty years since the Kuala Lumpur Summit in 1997. This was followed in October 2003 when ASEAN Leaders declared that the ASEAN Economic Community would be the goal of regional economic integration by 2020. In addition to the AEC the ASEAN Security Community and the ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community were to become the two other integral pillars of the proposed ASEAN Community wherein all three pillars were envisaged to work in tandem to establish the ASEAN Community by 2020. Given the country disparities at the start in 1997 it is not surprising that there are still variations in the economic and social status of the individual Member States.

Three years later the ASEAN Economic Ministers Meeting (AEM) held in August 2006 again in Kuala Lumpur agreed to develop "a single and coherent blueprint for advancing the AEC by identifying the characteristics and elements of the AEC by 2015 to transform ASEAN into a region with free movement of goods, services, investment, skilled labour and a freer flow of capital.

The AEC Blueprint 2025 committed to building on its predecessor (AECB 2015) through five interrelated and, hopefully, mutually reinforcing characteristics, namely: (i) A Highly Integrated and Cohesive Economy; (ii) A Competitive, Innovative, and Dynamic ASEAN; (iii) Enhanced Connectivity and Sectoral Cooperation; (iv) A Resilient, Inclusive, People-Oriented, and People-Centred ASEAN; and (v) A Global ASEAN.

The new Blueprint's immediate priority was to complete the implementation of measures unfinished under the 2015 Blueprint by the end of 2016. In recognition of the needs of the CLMV countries, the ongoing commitments of Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar and Viet Nam under the 2015 Blueprint were to be carried over to 2018 and incorporated under the 2025 Blueprint.

In an indication of growing confidence for the next decade, ASEAN also foresees a new emphasis on the development and promotion of micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs). While at the same time moving to support the integration of evolving digital technology to enhance trade and investments, provide e-based business platforms, promote good governance, and facilitate the use of green technology.

ASEAN's combined GDP reached US$ 2.8 trillion in 2017, a 5.3% growth year-on-year annual growth is expected to remain stable at 5.2% in the following two years.

The ASEAN economy, both regionally and nationally, has a strong international orientation. Most of the trade is with countries outside the AMS.

In terms of regional integration, the forthcoming amendment of the ASEAN Trade in Goods Agreement (ATIGA) and the Mid-Term Review of the ASEAN Economic Blueprint will allow for progress to be made in a number of key areas.

Trade Facilitation

Efforts to facilitate the movement of goods within the AEC by improving the transparency and management of non-tariff measures continue but slowly. The work with the relevant sectoral bodies in contributing towards the finalisation of the Guidelines for the Implementation of ASEAN Commitments on Non-Tariff Measures on Goods is a case in point.

It is hoped that the adoption of the ASEAN Seamless Trade Facilitation Indicators (ASTFI) should provide a tool for measuring trade facilitation at the national and regional levels. Outside the ASEAN Community, key stakeholders feel that much more needs to be done on transparency and the removal of barriers. The Business community has expressed strong interest in the ASTFI being made public, together with published updates at regular intervals.

Standards and Conformance

The development of the ASEAN *General Principles for Harmonisation of Regulatory Regimes* and the work to support ACCSQ in the revision of 1998 ASEAN Framework Agreement on MRA in 2019 were significant steps forward for the Component.

All such gains help to address issues surrounding the question NTMs and TBTs as it is not simply deliberate impediments to trade that cause problems. Equally, they come about for a number of reasons. These might include gaps or deficiencies in legislative and regulatory regimes, in the sector systemic architecture and simply outmoded systems and processes. Examples would be a lack of necessary legislation or regulations, particularly in CLMV countries; insufficient numbers of accredited conformity assessment bodies or reference to standard procedeures which may not be internationally recognized, such as r those from ISO, IEC Codeex Alimentarius, etc.

Customs and Integration

There have been some improvements at all levels. Most of the ASEAN Member States have ratified both the Revised Kyoto Convention (RKC) of the World Customs Organisation as well as all of them for the Trade Facilitation Agreement (TFA) of the World Trade Organisation. These would be important steps in aligning not only customs but also border procedures with international standards.

There is also the signing of the ASEAN Framework Agreement on the Facilitation of Goods in Transit (AFAFGIT)'s Protocol 2 (Designation of Frontier Posts) including the endorsement of the List of Designated Frontier Posts by the all ten ASEAN Directors- General of Customs in May 2018.

Moreover, the enforcement of ATIGA Protocols 2 and 7 is a significant step forward and provides the legal framework to operationalise the ASEAN Customs Transit System (ACTS) in ASEAN.

Comments from stakeholders, and confirmed with the ARISE PLUS TA Team, indicate that the beginnings of improvements in the culture and procedures of Customs Departments and officials in a number of AMS is becoming apparent, as *inter alia,* new staff are deployed including those trained under ARISE PLUS.

Statistics and Integration Monitoring

The ASEAN Integration Monitoring Directorate was set up in 2016. It is a fully-fledged Directorate based in the Secretariat with a mandate to carry out monitoring and evaluation on the ASEAN Economic Community. Work with the Technical Assistance began under ARISE. The AEC 2025 M&E Framework was endorsed by the AEC Council in September 2016. Under ARISE PLUS work has continued including strengthening institutional capacity in compliance monitoring in the Directorate and supporting the development of the Country Visit process.

In addition M&E mechanisms have been jointly developed for the ACCSQ ASEAN Standards and Conformance Strategic Plan and for ACSN. Work on statistics has assisted ACSS on Open Data Implementation Framework and Big Data for Enhancing ACSS Official Statistics.

1.2 The ASEAN Ecosystem

The systemic architecture or ecosystem for ASEAN has the AMS Governments working together at Leadership and Minister level to set the overall agenda for the region and its countries. There are sectoral bodies that work in vertical structures headed by Ministerial bodies and are made up of staff from ministries in the Member States. They are the policymakers who determine the integration process through their respective plans as well as detailed measures to be implemented. They develop the sectoral work plans to guide and facilitate integration in particular areas. The chairs of the bodies rotate annually among the AMS.

The ASEAN Secretariat plays an important role in supporting the efforts of the AMS to implement The AEC Blueprint. The Secretariat is facilitatory and operates on the traditional ASEAN basis of consensus. Its staff are seconded from AMS and can be rotated frequently, which makes long-

term continuity of performance more difficult. In order to respond to and support technical assistance programmes, the Secretariat has to be instrumental in getting the support of AMS to expand and enhance its own staff and resource capabilities.

1.3 EU Support to ASEAN and Regional Economic Integration

The EU has been consistent in its support to ASEAN regional development. It began in the early 2000s with a number of programmes including the ASEAN-EU Programme on Regional Integration Support Phase I from 2003 to 2006.

The APRIS II Programme aimed to further support the process of ASEAN integration, with specific particularly in supporting the realisation of the ASEAN Economic Community as well as strengthening EU-ASEAN relations as a whole.

APRIS II was a 3-year 6.8 million EUR follow-on technical assistance programme for the ASEAN Secretariat (co-funded by the European Commission) and located in the Secretariat itself. APRIS II was to support ASEAN integration, particularly economic integration, and to strengthen EU-ASEAN relations in support of the TREATI and READI dialogues. It also provided follow-up activities to the 2003-2006 EC-ASEAN Standards Programme.

The successor programme was ASEAN Regional Integration Support by the EU (EU ARISE) "The ARISE programme was a technical cooperation facility. Its aim was to support the implementation of key regional initiatives prioritised in the Master Plan for ASEAN Connectivity, to build the ASEAN single market including its production base. ARISE was a €7.7 million programme which ran from November 2012 to 30th June 2017.

The above consistency for continued intervention logic was set out in the EU MIP for Asia 2014-2020. It describes ASEAN as one of the most successful integration initiatives among developing countries. The MIP plan of support to the region is based on three intervention areas (1) connectivity through sustainable and inclusive economic integration and trade; (2) climate change, environment and disaster management; and (3) a comprehensive dialogue facility.

1.4 ARISE PLUS Programme

The overall objective of ARISE Plus is to support greater economic integration in ASEAN through the implementation of the AEC Blueprint 2025 and strengthen its institutional capacity.

The ARISE Plus programme in totality is a macro programme of €41M over a six year timeframe (2016-2022) to support the ASEAN regional economic integration under Focal Sector 1 of the Asian Regional Indicative programme (2014-2020).

ARISE PLUS therefore seeks to consolidate and enhance the results from past and on-going EU regional technical assistance programmes to provide cogent and well-grounded support for the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) Blueprint 2025.

In this respect, it follows the structure of AEC Blueprint 2025 with its five characteristics and selected priority elements.

At the macro level, therefore, the ARISE Plus programme has five components,

- Component 1: ASEAN Single Market

  - Component 1.1: ASEAN Trade Facilitation
  - Component 1.2: ASEAN Standards, Conformance and Quality Infrastructure
  - Component 1.3: ASEAN Customs and Transport Facilitation

- Component 2: ASEAN Intellectual Property Rights
- Component 3: ASEAN Secretariat capacity building
- Component 4: ASEAN Integration Monitoring

  - Component 4.1: ASEAN Economic Integration Monitoring System

- • Component 4.2: ASEAN Statistics
- • Component 5: ASEAN Air Transport

The macro programme also has capability for bilateral country technical assistance programmes under the ARISE PLUS banner. These are administered separately.

1.5 Intervention Logic

As set out in the Action Document for ARISE PLUS:

The macro ARISE PLUS intervention is designed to build on the achievements of previous and current EU-ASEAN co-operation support for the market integration of goods, and several bilateral country programmes, with a special focus on CLMV, while making use of EU's specific knowledge and experience in meeting the challenges and reaping the benefits of regional economic integration, providing guidance on implementation, as well as monitoring and evaluation. Other components have other funding and modalities.

The Document later goes on to state that among the objectives are:

- • To improve customs, transport facilitation, trade facilitation and standards with a view to achieve a highly integrated and cohesive economy
- • To enhance connectivity and sectoral cooperation particularly in Food and Pharmaceuticals (Agro-based products and Healthcare),

These more specific aspects of the intervention logic are then carried over to the Proposal for the ARISE PLUS TA programme and the same wording has been used in all working documents for the ARISE PLUS TA up to and including *Annex 3 ARISE PLUS Logframe v5 25Nov19*. In that sense, the Intervention Logic can be said to have been derived from the Action Document and applied consistently at the workplan level so far.

1.6 ARISE PLUS TA Programme

Of the above, only Components 1 and 4 apply to the ARISE PLUS Technical Assistance Programme.

Overall Objective:

The overall objective of the ARISE PLUS TA contract is:

To support greater economic integration in ASEAN through the implementation of the ASEAN Economic Community Blueprint 2025

Purpose:

The purposes of this contract are as follows:

To provide technical assistance to the beneficiaries with the purpose:

1. To improve customs, transport facilitation, trade facilitation and standards with a view to achieve a highly integrated and cohesive economy;
2. To strengthen institutional capacities through, in particular, managing the integration process with an emphasis on strengthening compliance and outcomes monitoring and impact assessment, including statistics, coordination and management and improved capacity among ASEAN bodies and the ASEAN Secretariat.

Expected Results (Outcomes) are:

3. Implementation of the ASEAN Trade Facilitation Framework (ATFF) and implementation of ATIGA in addressing non-tariff barriers (NTBs), in particular through ASEAN Trade Repository/National Trade Repositories, ASSIST(ASEAN Solutions for Services, Investment and Trade), an ASEAN-wide self-certification of product origin scheme, and maintaining an NTM database;
4. Implementation of harmonised Standards and Mutual Recognition Arrangements in specific sectors;
5. Harmonisation of customs and transport facilitation procedures through the operationalisation of the ASEAN Single Window (ASW); development of an Implementation Framework for the ASEAN Framework Agreement on Multimodal Transport (AFAMT) and Implementing Guidelines of the ASEAN Framework Agreement on the Facilitation of Cross-Border Transport of Passengers by Road Vehicles (CBTP); and implementation of the ASEAN Customs Transit System (ACTS);
6. Enhancement of the ASEAN Economic Community integration monitoring framework through better monitoring of the progress and outcomes/impact of regional integration to facilitate the implementation of measures, and enhanced outreach and reporting.

2. Answered Questions and Findings

2.1 Data Collection and Analysis Methods

For the Inception Phase the MTR Team were supplied with a large and fairly comprehensive array of documents including Action Documents, ToRs, workplans and other documents from the EU and the Project. There were, however, no independent perspectives available from this source.

It was decided for this review that the team would not distribute questionnaires. From previous such missions, it had been found that they were not a very effective tool for such purposes. Firstly in this case, there was the brief timeframe to contend with. Secondly, the Team were trying to get information on different levels, from the strategic to the detailed and specific. Trying to put enough questions to cover all of these into a single document would make it too big to employ.

2.2 Review Limits

Before departure, it was assumed that from the TA group, Key Experts and non-Key, ASEC staff and committee or workgroup officials there would be a sufficient number of people available to be consulted during the Field Phase. The point was made in the Risk Section. Its mitigation was suggested under the assumption that the mission timing would facilitate the MTR. This did not prove to be the case. While September and October are known as the low season for missions, November and December are seen as the high season.

As a result, once the MTR Team Leader arrived as planned, the ARISE PLUS Team Leader, the Key Expert for Standards and the EU Task Manager were unfortunately scheduled to leave the next morning for a mission to Myanmar until the following week. The ARISE PLUS Customs Expert and the Head of the ACTS Programme were away from Jakarta for most of the MTR mission.

Of the ASEC staff and the various officials that make up the ASEAN cadres some were on back-to-back or continuous missions. Only a very few were able to make themselves available even with the aid of telecommunication systems. Unfortunately, others were not available or did not respond, none of which was conducive to carrying out an evaluation mission. Given the frequency of occurrence of such events, the constraints imposed by high season should be taken into consideration by the EUD Jakarta for any future similar assignments.

The MTR ToR required the MTR Team to consider the use of the final two years of the TA Programme, i.e. whether or not extension should be recommended. As the Financing Agreement had been signed, the five years had already been agreed. The question then was only whether

or not the present Contractor, AETS and partners, should be awarded the final two years and remaining budget.

If the current performance had been found to be sufficiently sub-standard to call into question the renewal of the AETS contract that would have created a dilemma for the Team. The only options would have been either recommendations for wholesale improvements and possibly team changes by AETS or recommending finding another contractor.

The latter course of action would have been very risky, because:

a. it would not be possible to know beforehand how a new team would perform

b. there are only two years left on the agreement – a very short time to take over the role.

In the event the review found that the implementation of the ARISE PLUS TA did not necessitate remedial action.

2.3 Review Questions

A set of indicative questions was given in the ToR.

The Team accepted that it could work with the set of questions below as a broad template for a uniform and consistent baseline, and would adapt as necessary where more detailed or deeper questioning was required. The review requirement was spread over three very different components. Generally speaking, however, the standard evaluation questions can be made appropriate to all project areas.

1. Assess the relevance of the programme: How well do the design and areas covered help ASEAN to realize its economic integration goals and respond to challenges?
2. Assess the efficiency of the programme: How well inputs have been turned into results, in terms of quality, quantity and timing. In other words, assess the extent to which outputs and/or the desired effects are achieved with the lowest possible use of resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.).

   In addition, assess the appropriateness of the implementation approach, specifically the demand driven nature of the programme and the level of involvement its beneficiaries (ASEAN Secretariat and ASEAN sectoral committees); and the adequacy of the EU engagement in support of the programme implementation.

3. Assess the effectiveness of the programme: Identify and assess overall progress, and results achieved by component and sub-components. Assess how they contributed to the overall purpose of the programme.
4. Assess the early signs of the impact of the programme and determine if it will produce improvements in the technical capacity of the ARISE Plus beneficiaries.
5. Assess the early signs of the sustainability of the programme and how the results will be maintained after the ARISE Plus Programme ends. Suggest recommendations for sustainability.
6. Assess the EU added value: To what extent the Action has added benefits being supported by the EU.
7. Assess the visibility of the programme (in line with EU guidelines), including any impact on the EU visibility in ASEAN, and how the Action contributes to ASEAN visibility in AMS.

2.4 Answered Questions

Sample answers from the few ASEAN, AMS and international respondents available. If any particular questions were not answered in individual cases, those questions were deleted for the sake of brevity.

2.4.1 Relevance

Assess the relevance of the programme: How well do the design and areas covered help ASEAN to realise its economic integration goals and respond to challenges?

Comment 1 Very relevant

"For example, Intra-ASEAN trade been on 20-25% for last decade but very particular products, e.g. food have potential for expansion. 2nd target to reduce trade transaction costs by 10% by 2020.The type of work ARISE PLUS is working on is very much linked to these targets".

Comment 2

"It is very relevant firstly because of the continuity of design with the previous programmes, APRIS and ARISE. Both of them were highly relevant to support for regional integration. The ARISE PLUS programme also continues the format of agreeing the main components but also having flexibility from the "on demand" So that way we in ASEAN know that the programme will be relevant because we are involved in working out the components".

Comment 3

"The relationship goes a long way back now. The benefit of having ARISE PLUS is that it continues the stress which is on flexibility and is very beneficiary driven so it makes it all very relevant. That works great as long as the beneficiary knows what it needs and wants. For us it actually works very well and helps us be clear about what we need."

Comments 4

"*The design and areas covered in the Components are good so the programme is very relevant."*

"The ACTS project is a good example. It was started with Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand to provide a seamless movement of transit goods by land through simplification and harmonisation of Customs and Transport procedures. Now it will bring in CLMV and then with Multi-modal it will include Indonesia, Philippines and Brunei."

"The ACTS and later the multi-modal dimension will help to integrate and improve the connectivity of ASEAN countries. That will boost the economic integration of the AMS."

Comments 5

"Again the ARISE PLUS Team started with consultations and discussions with The Secretariat, with AMS and related sectoral bodies in developing the programmes. This makes it all very relevant and gives us confidence that the programme is what we need."

Comments 6

"Very relevant, in particular for standards and conformance with the expanded component and sub-activities."

"ARISE PLUS carried on from where ARISE stopped and continues to give good support to the work of ACCSQ especially, but also the WGs/PWGs".

"Yes, it is very relevant and that is because the TA and ASEAN can work together."

Comment 7

"For Food the support from ARISE PLUS is very relevant. It is also supporting food safety, which is a cross-cutting area between trade, agriculture and health. We have not had any cross-cutting projects before."

"On Pharmaceuticals the support is in line with the ten-year workplan of the Pharmaceutical Products Working Group. It supports the development and implementation of an MRA."

"There are three main actors involved. Firstly, of course, the AMS. Without them providing inputs I think it would be useless for us to come up with drafts. Then the ASEAN Secretariat, we are servicing member states and coordinating the work. Then there are the ARISE PLUS experts. We work together to agree on the developments."

2.4.2 Effectiveness

Assess the effectiveness of the programme: Identify and assess overall progress, and results achieved by component and sub-components. Assess how they contributed to the overall purpose of the programme.

Comments 1

"In the past that could have taken five to ten years." (Comment on the development of an MRA)

"Within a very short period of time we have managed to have had a very significant achievement with ARISE PLUS. As one example there is the development of the Food Safety Regulatory Framework."

Comment 2

"This was a carry on activity form ARISE. The MRA was signed in 2018. When we entered the implementation stage, AMS wanted several procedures on how MRAs are implemented. Within a year we managed to finalise seven SOPs for implementing MRAs."

Comment 3

"ARISE PLUS is a very big project. But ARISE PLUS not only has the same long term experts but also a lot of short term experts so that they are very effective. They are all very active with the AMS and work with many people besides the Secretariat. People get to know each other through these regular meetings. So they work together more effectively and can understand issues much better and quicker."

Comment 4

"The ARISE PLUS Team is based in the Secretariat. They are here, always available and we can work closely with them. That is effective."

Comment 5

"The TA Team already had extensive experience of working with the Secretariat and on ASEAN Regional Integration. At the start of ARISE PLUS they still, however, spent the Inception Period working with the Secretariat and ASEAN partners to ensure complete understanding and agreement on the programme for ARISE PLUS. That is very effective"

Comments 6

"I think the ARISE PLUS guys are doing as great job in a very difficult environment. Given the circumstances, they are being very effective."

Comment 7

"What really impressed me was that ARISE PLUS has provided national languages for all 10 AMS which is really, really useful and very effective."

"Use of national & international experts working together sometimes required to be effective, for example in training courses or workshops, and ARISE PLUS is doing that very well."

Comment 8

"The TA has been very effective in all the components of the ARISE PLUS, in identifying and agreeing issues for the TA and in implementing them."

When we ask for help. It is discussed very thoroughly so we understand each other and they come up with very good solutions and quickly. We are impressed."

Comment 9

"There are mechanisms under ATIGA & other parts of the ASEAN Agreements, which would allow them to tackle the NTBs but they are not doing so. However, the ARISE PLUS team are

being very effective, not only in raising awareness but also in proposing solutions that can work."

Comment 10

ARISE PLUS is also supporting food safety as a cross-cutting area between trade, agriculture and health. Getting those three groups to work together, breaking up the silos, is a very effective way of team building"

Comment 11

"When the ACTS training is practical, ARISE PLUS puts a lot of trainers into the programme so that the officials get as much hands-on experience as possible under the guidance of a team of experts" That way they learn much quicker and more effectively so it speeds up the training schedule."

2.4.3   Efficiency

Assess the efficiency of the programme: How well inputs have been turned into results, in terms of quality, quantity and timing. In other words, assess the extent to which outputs and/or the desired effects are achieved with the lowest possible use of resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.).

Comment 1

"The ARISE PLUS Team manage their events very carefully and check the ASEAN calendar. They always set up their events to coincide with meetings and other events so that they are not bearing the cost of getting people together, which makes their events very cost effective and efficient."

Comment 2

"The ARISE PLUS Team are well-known in ASEAN and well-respected. They also network very well and are regularly invited to major events so they can do outreach, advertise their programme and spread the word about new developments for very little cost."

"Efficiencies have been made by increased cost-sharing with AMS, the organisation of workshops of longer duration, and back-back events. This also brings ASEAN partners into the programme organisation and management."

Comment 3

"With training programmes attendees can be changed by their departments. The ARISE PLUS Teams always check very carefully who will attend each training and adapt it accordingly. That is efficient management."

Comment 4

"For ACTS, the 500 trucks limit is a problem but only for the industry because it's drop in the ocean. But on the basis that we've got to get the project up and running & operational and tested out thoroughly, it's a good starting point. That is prudent. It is also efficient management to move in stages."

"And I think once the system is proven the argument for expanding the number of trucks and eventually removing the limitation becomes much more powerful. First, you need to build confidence in the system. Once people see it does actually work, I think you'll see a lot of pressure coming from logistics companies and others in the industry to get it up and running very soon – efficient management again."

Comment 5

"The ARISE PLUS Team have to work in a very complex ecosystem. On the one hand, there are the donors with their operating systems, on the other side you have the ASEAN Secretariat as a coordinator, then there are the Member States and perhaps lastly there is the collective leadership which makes pronouncements but does not actually implement them. Getting all those parties to coordinate and work together to support integration requires very efficient and effective management."

"At the operational level, the TA Team have learned to adapt their modus operandi to fit with not only the situation but also the personnel they are dealing with. In the multiple contexts of ASEAN that is very efficient and effective."

Comment 6

"The ARISE PLUS guys are not part of the ASEAN ecosystem. They have no ex officio status but they can help to drive the integration process because they are trusted and respected and that stage has come about because of the efficiency and effectiveness of their performance."

"There is a limit, however, to what they can achieve. Partly it's because they are de facto operating from the bottom up. They could do with help from DEVCO, maybe DG TRADE, DG GROW should be talking to their counterparts in ASEAN and just giving them some gentle encouragement to get on with it."

Comment 7

"Use of national & international experts working together can be very efficient on professional and cultural levels as it helps to break down silos and speeds up cross-learning."

"ARISE PLUS is using a large number of short-term experts to complement the four Key Experts. Getting maximum benefit and performance from this arrangement requires very systematic and efficient management and control."

2.4.4 Impact

ARISE PLUS is part of a large–scale and long-term change management programme being undertaken by ASEAN. That is a generational exercise. ARISE PLUS is only some two years old. On the positive side, the TA Team are getting more and more cooperation from the working

groups and the AMS officials and so are able to improve the workings of the various ASEAN bodies. Examples can be found here of where the involvement of ARISE PLUS has speeded up developments:

ASSIST:

- Made fully operational including capacity building workshops in 7 AMS,
- Updated User Manual to all ASEAN languages with an additional 5 online tutorials;
- Capacity built on ASSIST for trade services, implementation of NTMs & validation for SPS NTMs.

ATR/NTR:

- National Trade Repositories (NTRs) operational in all AMSs
- ASEAN Trade Repository (ATR) operational with min. of 3,000 NTMs from AMS
- The ASEAN NTM database established, based on data notified by AMSs
- 71 more officials attending workshops and roundtables to be able to operationalise respective NTRs and link to ATR

> *"ARISE PLUS is also supporting food safety as a cross-cutting area between trade, agriculture and health. Getting those three groups to work together, breaking up the silos, is a very effective way of team building."*
> *"This also brings ASEAN partners into the programme organisation and management."*
> *"In the past that could have taken five to ten years."*
> *"Within a very short period of time we have managed to have had a very significant achievement with ARISE PLUS."*
> *"Within a year we managed to finalise seven SOPs for implementing MRAs"*

In addition, the ARISE PLUS Team are being asked to help with the MTR of the AEC Blueprint and will be asked to take on a similar role for the ATIGA. That is testament to the degree of trust and respect that the ARISE PLUS Team have achieved and will allow the change process to be taken further. The work with the ASEAN Integration Monitoring Division under Component 4 should allow ARISE PLUS to extend its influence into more and higher-level areas as the AIMD build up its work on compliance.

The above is all very positive. We do, however, need to add a caveat. On the negative side there is still evidence of the psychological and operational dependence of ASEAN on the ARISE PLUS Team.

On several occasions in interviews with ASEAN officials we heard comments such as:

"The member states are already agreed that after this project of ARISE PLUS we want another project to continue - the AR++."

2.4.5 Sustainability

The Presentation for the Debrief in Jakarta on the 13th of December contained the following statement under Sustainability

"Sustainability will be achieved when the ASEAN Secretariat and the AMS are able to take over and maintain the various activities needed to achieve the goals of ASEAN Regional Integration. In partnership with the EU and the ASRISE PLUS TA Team that day is approaching."

From now the ARISE PLUS TA programme has nearly three years left to run. It is doubtful that the situation at the end of that period will meet the conditions set out in the quote above. One reason is that the ARISE PLUS TA Programme has introduce new components, Component 4, or expended them, Component 2. The work for Component 1, Trade Facilitation, is probably the most advanced but even that will probably not be finished in time.

Perhaps it is time to add to the operational work an element at strategic level to start to build more systematically towards creating a degree of sustainability. The problem for the ARISE PLUS TA

Team is that they are working at the wrong level, from the bottom up. Introducing sustainability into the change management needs to build not only processes, systems and HRD capacity but also a strategic dimension, perhaps as part of a policy dialogue framework. As one stakeholder observed:

"What is needed is influence. No matter how successful the ARISE PLUS Team are – and I think it's a great job in a very difficult environment. They could do with help from DEVCO, maybe DG TRADE, DG GROW should be talking to their counterparts in ASEAN and just giving them some gentle encouragement to get on with it."

2.4.6 Visibility

Comment 1

"The ACTS is becoming better-known and attracting interest even in non-ASEAN countries."

"The ASEAN Customs Transit System had been discussed in ASEAN meetings and mentioned at ministerial level."

Comment 2

"ARISE PLUS is mentioned in various official statements."

"The extension to involve the AMS more means that ARISE PLUS is more widely known now and therefore so is the EU."

Comment 3

"The work of ARISE PLUS to publicise the project activities such as ACTS, ASSIST and the ATR/NTR and also the team getting invited to more and more fora means that they are attracting the attention of trade bodies and other support agencies plus some of the private sector and that means the EU is getting attention, too"

Comment 4

"The ARISE PLUS team is very important in flying the EU flag, not only in ASEAN but more widely."

The Mid-Term Internal Assessment, September 2019 for the ARISE PLUS TA reports   37 results and 41 major activities were implemented. ARISE PLUS organized and conducted 46 events for a total of 131 days. The workshops benefitted a total number of 1527 participants. The activities resulted in a total of 404 major outputs. In addition to the workshops, a total of 20 official ASEAN meetings were attended by the ARISE PLUS team. ARISE PLUS workshops were hosted by all ASEAN Member States.

The TA Team worked in partnership with 13 ASEC Divisions, 38 Sectoral Bodies and Working Groups as well as 85 AMS entities. These facts not only demonstrate the strong ownership of the project amongst AMS but also highlights the range and coverage of the publicity and visibility of ARISE PLUS and therefore the EU.

3. Assessment

3.1 Introduction

ARISE PLUS is a much bigger project than the previous EU support for regional economic integration. The total package is a €41M six year programme (2016-2022) supporting the ASEAN regional economic integration under Focal Sector 1 of the Asian Regional Indicative programme (2014-2020).

ARISE PLUS has six specific objectives and brings together four previous regional programmes, viz. ARISE, COMPASS, ECAP III, and AATIP. In this version ARISE PLUS has five components:

- Component 1 ASEAN Single market with the sub-components: ASEAN Trade Facilitation, ASEAN Standards, Conformance and Quality Infrastructure: ASEAN Customs and Transport Facilitation
- Component 2: ASEAN Intellectual Property Rights
- Component 3: ASEAN Secretariat capacity building
- Component 4: ASEAN Integration Monitoring
- Component 5: ASEAN Air Transport

The ARISE PLUS Technical Assistance programme covers both Component 1 and Component 4. In addition, there are plans for national ARISE PLUS programmes in all AMS except Singapore and Brunei.

The ARISE PLUS TA Programme continues the work from ARISE on Trade Facilitation and Customs and Transport but has expanded commitments for Standards and Conformance which form a whole new component, Component 1.2, as does Monitoring, Component 1.3.

Given the status of the work on all four components and the fact that there are only three more years left on the ARISE PLUS TA programme, it raises a question as to what is the EU's long-term strategy for support to ASEAN regional economic integration.

Both the:

JOINT COMMUNICATION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL "The EU and ASEAN: a partnership with a strategic purpose" 18.05.2015

and

the *Bandar Seri Begawan Plan of Action 2013-2017 point* to a long-term commitment to EU-ASEAN cooperation.

3.2 Specific programme Issues

The question of commitment raised above can be seen in the concern in some quarters about the progress of a number of key ARISE PLUS activities. Among these are Component 1 activities -

ASSIST, the ATR/NTR and the ACTS.

3.2.1 ASSIST: ASEAN solutions for investment, services and trade

"ASSIST is a non-binding and consultative mechanism for the expedited and effective solution of operational problems encountered by ASEAN Enterprises on cross-border issues related to the implementation of ASEAN economic agreements and within the framework of the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) launched in 2015. ASSIST is fully internet based and free of charge".

ASSIST was set up under ARISE as an on-demand activity requested by the AMS. It is intended to help ASEAN businesses which are having problems when exporting goods or services or investing in other ASEAN countries. It allows them to raise a problem with overseas governments via the ASSIST web portal, which in turn, is linked to the ASEAN Trade Repository and the National Trade Repositories which carry trade information. The system has been available for

problems of Trade in Goods since August 2016. From May 2019 the facility has been extended to Trade in Services.

So far the uptake of ASSIST has been muted. There are a number of reasons for this.

Firstly, there is a cultural dimension. It is not the ASEAN way.

"People don't like to be raising their hand and criticising governments because they fear retribution."

To combat this issue the ARISE PLUS Team devised an anonymity feature whereby enterprises can use a variety of intermediaries. ASEAN-based trade associations, or other representative entities such as chambers of commerce, business councils, business federations on the one hand or registered ASEAN-based lawyers or law firms on the other. The service is still free and has the added advantage of raising the awareness of intermediaries and getting them involved. That is always an important consideration with trying to support SMEs, who need access to information and support services.

Such involvement begins to address another possible issue.

Secondly:

"Big issue is communication. Despite the best efforts of the ARISE PLUS team. The messaging is not getting out there. That's because Governments are not delivering the message. It should be down to AMS to be telling their own domestic Chambers of Commerce and trade associations this thing exists, - If you are having problems exporting, you should be using this system".

"You have a system that in theory is good and has been made better but it is just not being communicated properly to the business community."

Thirdly:

"Quality of the timing of the responses of Governments. If responses are not useful, industry will say what is the point?"

The ARISE PLUS TA Team have devised an additional number of mitigating strategies:

The Team are fully aware of the limitations so far and have taken steps to ensure that it is improved. There is an ASSIST website, user manuals, case studies and FAQs and now it is in all ASEAN languages. The Team is in the process of developing toolkits so that the AMS can implement outreach to their business support and business development agencies, chambers etc. again in the national languages. This is done full partnership with the ATF-JCC, SEOM and CCA.

The mention of national languages is important. Although ASEAN's working language is English, the majority of businesses, particularly SMEs, do not work in English so translation into the national languages was essential. Unfortunately, it seems that the finance was refused for the translation of the materials despite numerous requests from SEOM for over a year and a half. Belatedly, that was changed. Now there is a great deal of interest in the AMS and easy access can be found on the website and in all ASEAN languages.

"ASSIST is a way that we can make our dreams come true. You know that 10 ASEANs can see the same thing, understand the same thing though we speak differently."

It has been stated a number of times that ASEAN has embarked on a major change management exercise. In development terms, the more ways of getting understanding of new ideas, thinking, structures and processes, the greater the effect and the quicker the changes are achieved.

On that basis, the idea of using national languages is an elementary and obvious policy and the refusal to finance the translations makes no sense. Equally to question ASSIST and the ARISE PLUS TA on the grounds that the take up has been slow when the delay was self-inflicted is untenable. These would be lessons for the EUD to learn.

What is needed now is full support for the outreach programme to:

A. Involve business support agencies and business development agencies in all ten ASEAN countries driven by the responsible national ministry or ministries for trade and SMEs etc.

B. Get the message out to the private sector by all possible means. In addition to using BSA and BDA above find ways to place articles and stories in professional and business newspapers and journals to complement project activities -

"Private sector systematically engaged on utilization of ASSIST and increasing consultations with relevant ASEAN sectoral bodies, through ATF-JCC and through informal Roundtable Discussions on Trade Facilitation."

C. if national enterprises are reluctant to get involved initially, it is likely that international and certainly European businesses based in ASEAN will not have the same inhibitions. They should be co-opted to give impetus to the use of ASSIST through their own use of the system. Equally, they could play a role in cooperation/partnership with ASEAN business to get more take up.

D. ASSIST would be a very good example for starting off cooperation between the regional and national ARISE PLUS programmes. It would allow a two-pronged approach to getting national agencies involved and actively supporting and promoting the programme. It would also add weight to the effect that ARISE PLUS regional can exert. The goal should be to get the active involvement of both ministries/government agencies and the private sector. Then the programme will run itself.

3.2.2 ASEAN Trade Repository/National Trade Repositories

"The ASEAN Trade Repository (ATR) provides a single point of access to all the trade-related information of ASEAN Member States. The ATR is an ASEAN-level IT interface linked by means of hyperlinks to a series of interoperable National Trade Repositories (NTRs) that provide and maintain the national-level trade related information and the actual contents.

The trade-related information accessible through the ATR is organized on the basis of nine 'topics' in line with Article 13 of the ASEAN Trade in Goods Agreement (ATIGA). All the actual information is available on NTRs of the ASEAN Member States and duly maintained by their respective Governments."

The information on regulations is in the Member States. The work is to identify all the trade related regulatory parts in the systems of all countries, classify them and then upload them to the Trade Repositories.

ARISE PLUS undertook a mapping exercise and found that the quality was very poor. They started with SPS and have now identified 1365 measures. The territory is large. For SPS, alone they expect to hit the 1500 mark sometime in 2020.

ARISE PLUS helps the countries to collect the information, classify properly and then validate it under the supervision of the Trade Facilitation Key Expert. Currently, there are four short –term experts for the 10 countries. To get the information there are a multitude of agencies that they have to engage with.

After SPS will be TBT. The current estimate is that they have done about 40% of the work. The Team are expecting in the neighbourhood of 2500 measures by the end of May 2020. Some countries, however, are regulating from zero. So it is a moving target.

The current estimate is that the work can be finished if it continues for another two years.

At that stage, the project would have done capacity building for member states and would have left a cadre of regional expertise who can advise Member States. The project would consequently have regional experts in place with the knowledge and capacity to help Member States if they wish to draw on outside support. It would be for the AMS to fund.

In the meantime, ARISE PLUS will continue populating the NTRs. ASEC now hosts the ATR at no cost. Member States copied the design of ATR so they have similar systems.

It is likely that there will always be new regulations produced which will entail the NTRs will need to be kept up to date.

As is usual with technical assistance ARISE PLUS has so far been providing the external push to coordinate the development.

The only sustainability issue, therefore, <u>at the end of the current project</u> would be who would take on the upkeep. The responsibility of the ARISE PLUS would have been fulfilled so there would be no rationale for them to be involved further, even if there was to be a successor programme.

Logically there would be an ASEAN body mandated to take on the institutional coordination.

The importance of the work cannot be overstated.

"This is the most important thing that has ever been done. Without transparency in this region, you do nothing. If you do not know the rules, there is no facilitation."

"Transparency in NTMS is very important from Customs point of view. ATR/NTR & Assist – once completed it will be very, very useful for us."

The following comments introduce a note of caution for the present and looking to the future –

"Without the TA we cannot do the work because every day we have to do our main jobs. Also completion of the database is very complicated."

"I do not know if the government will take on the responsibility and have a budget for it. Perhaps we will need another Technical Assistance to do that."

"No, I don't think we will set up a new department."

If the project can foresee the completion of the initial development of the ATR/NTRs and bringing it to the stage that it could be handed over to the AMS by the end of this ARISE PLUS Programme, then in parallel with the on-going development of these activities the TA Team should start now to plan their exit and handover strategies. The same would apply to any other project activities that could be completed in the remaining timescale.

The ARISE PLUS Team will need assistance on this from the EU, certainly the Delegation, but probably also Brussels as getting ASEAN to take on such responsibilities is more a policy dialogue matter that a technical assistance one.

3.2.3   ASEAN Customs Transit System

The ACTS was taken as far as it could go under ARISE with Malaysia, Thailand and Singapore (MTS) because the legal framework & protocols were not ratified.

Under ARISE PLUS Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar and Vietnam (CLMV) have been added and linked to SMT. It has now been operationalised it in all seven countries. So now there are six countries linked to each other where all the systems are actually installed.

From July to November the project was running whole systems training for all stakeholders in four countries – Cambodia, Laos, Thailand and Malaysia.

In parallel, the Change Management Board has been established and there is also a new Central Management Team based in the ASEAN Secretariat. ARISE PLUS created the system for them and installed servers so they can be involved in some of the work.

The ACTS management expect to be ready in January to do a pilot run. There will be a kick-off meeting of the Pilot in January with people from all the six countries. There will a Pilot Phase A because CLMV has not had a chance to work together so far. The next step will be when they will join with MST and do the joint simulations under ARISE PLUS which is planned to last for six weeks.

After that the next development will be Pilot Phase B which is when the AMS staff will be joined by traders. This will also see real trucks on the move. The idea is to see how things are working

and to see how traders and their trucks are treated at the borders. The final three weeks, Pilot Phase C, is the legally backed live operations.

Once begun this is an on-going commitment

"If we finish next November we will have completed 40%. Once it is live the work will never really end."

A later stage will be to include Indonesia and the other islands under the multi-modal programme, which was signed some 18 years ago but had not been implemented until the ARISE PLUS programme.

Under ARISE PLUS the Team is providing assistance to Cambodia, Lao, Brunei and Malaysia to develop their multi-modal legislation. An implementation plan has also been developed and the Team is starting implementation on multi-modal transport. The plan to link it to the ACTS so that Indonesia, Philippines and Brunei can be brought into a unified customs transport system.

The capacity building programme is required to get participants to the stage where they are able to understand a range of situations and undertake set actions within the ACTS operations.

This will be all very new and unfamiliar to all parties both those operating the new systems and those using them. It is a major undertaking. It could have profound effect on the organisations involved at all levels – organisational structures, system, processes, roles and responsibilities -, even those not part of the initial capacity building.

The training therefore needs to intensive as well as effective. For example, a typical programme would be -

Group Training:

1. Customs only staff training courses takes two weeks i.e. 10 working days.

2. Procedures training takes 2 days,

3. Transport takes 1 day

4. Trainers takes an additional 2 days

Total 15 working days.

There are at least six weeks of training programmes per country.

At the end those who have been on the whole programme will be able to train other staff thereby creating a multiplier effect.

The training programmes and materials have been reviewed by the MTR Team. From a teaching and learning perspective, they are sound and well organised. The methodology is consistent and tries to be learner-centred and competence-based. The methodology recycles the previous day's work at the beginning of the next day. Some technical work requires a hands-on approach. To do that properly is labour–intensive for staff, i.e. entails multiple tutors in the same sessions, and is provided by the programmes as appropriate.

In addition to the above discussion, the Programme has moved forward on:

- Five Strategic Plans for Custom Development (SPCDs) implemented
- SPCD 07 on development of standardised authorized AEO programmes and AEO MRAs in ASEAN and SPCD 13 on narrowing the development gap in customs have been provided
- AMS progressing full implementation of AFAMT (expected 2020)
- AMS capacity to implement Authorised Economic Operator (AEO) Programmes strengthened through support by ARISE PLUS
- Implementation Guidelines for ASEAN-Cross Border Transport of Passengers by Road Vehicles (CBTP) established and ASEAN-CBTP Pilot planned

- Legal framework of ASEAN Framework Agreement for Goods in Transit (AFAFGIT) in place.

3.2.4 Components 2 and 4

Component 2

This component has been expanded considerably from the ARISE programme. In that case much of the work is at a less advanced stage that Component 1. Much of the activity is on developing the groundwork

<u>Sub-Component 2.1. Supporting the Development of the Quality Infrastructure and Related Policies in ASEAN</u>

Activity 2.1.2 Supporting mutual recognition of conformity assessment and harmonisation of technical regulations

Progress

Two main MRA's have been supported by ARISE PLUS for development and implementation

1.The ASEAN Sectoral Mutual Recognition Arrangement for Inspection and Certification Systems on Food Hygiene for Prepared Foodstuff Products

2.The ASEAN Mutual Recognition Arrangement for Bioequivalence Study Reports of Generic Medicinal Products

Both MRA's are published in the ARISE PLUS website. The MRA on inspection and certification of food hygiene was signed August 2018 and the other was signed in November 2017.

Specifically, the MRA for Food Hygiene inspections and certifications is highly important for harmonising inspection and certification criteria amongst the AMS.

<u>Sub-Component 2.3 Supporting the Market Integration and Enhancing Food Safety in Agro-based Sector</u>

Activity 2.3.1 Developing and Implementing ASEAN Food Safety Regulatory Framework

Progress

1.Following the concept of harmonisation for standards and regulation in the region, ARISE PLUS has assisted in the work of a task force comprising AMS representatives from the Agriculture, Economic and Health sectors to develop the ASEAN Food Safety Regulatory Framework.

2.ARISE Plus has supported a series of workshops to discuss the framework and assisted in drafting the agreement. Currently the 5th draft has been developed.

3.The production of this AFSRF has been successfully done in a record time (less than 2 years) which speaks of a high efficiency of the ARISE +.

This activity is a cross-cutting one. It is the first such activity for ASEAN involving three different fields (Agriculture, Trade and Health) working together.

<u>Sub-Component 2.4 Support to the Pharmaceutical Sector</u>

Activity 2.4.3 Enhancing Pharmaceuticals Standardization in ASEAN

Progress

ARISE PLUS has supported the Development of ASEAN Common Technical Requirements (ACTR): on Safety, Quality and Efficacy of Biologics.

The ACTR follows the principles of The International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH).

Component 4 ASEAN Economic Integration Monitoring and Statistics

Activity 4.1.1 Developing an Internal ARISE Plus Monitoring System and an Integrated Monitoring Framework for ARISE Plus Regional and National Projects

This activity focusses on two core areas of monitoring: firstly, an internal monitoring system of the ARISE Plus regional project; and secondly on an integrated monitoring framework for the ARISE Plus regional and national projects as a key mechanism for coherence and coordination within the ARISE Plus Programme. This will provide a strategic programmatic view of ARISE Plus to stakeholders including the EUDs in the AMS and DEVCO in Brussels.

Activity 4.1.2 supporting implementation of AEC 2025 M&E framework

The AEC 2025 M&E Framework consists of four components:

- Compliance monitoring (based on the Consolidated Strategic Action Plan (CSAP) and Annual Priorities drawn from sectoral work plans with reporting taking place every year)
- Outcomes monitoring (based on sectoral key performance indicators, with reporting every 2-3 years)
- Impact evaluation (based on socio-economic indicators, mid-term and end-term evaluations)
- Reporting, verification and review

Somewhat similarly to Component 1.2, Standards and Conformance, Component 4 is at a much earlier stage of development than the Trade Facilitation and Customs and Transport.

This component is the responsibility of the ASEAN Integration Monitoring Directorate. Under ARISE PLUS it has several tools for monitoring performance on the AEC. Firstly, it has instituted country visits whereby AIMD staff can travel to two countries per year funded by the ASEC budget to see for themselves the status of implementation performance and report back.

Other tools include two databases, one for compliance monitoring and the other for KPI, key performance indicators, so largely statistics. The compliance monitoring database covers everything that ASEAN has promised to do under the AEC.

"We do not have enforcement mechanisms. If they don't implement, they don't implement. But it is tracked and we know why it is not being implemented."

The first database has potential but it depends on what use is made of the information and what follow up, if any, is undertaken.

This is crucial point. It means that ASEAN does have the means to manage implementation and remedy any deficiencies.

There is also the COW, the Committee of the Whole Meeting, which is increasingly being used for a different purpose, particularly monitoring.

Starting at the beginning of the year, it can be used it to keep everyone informed.

"So this is what you promised to do last year. This is your year- end status of implementation". The two can be compared and actions taken as necessary.

It can also be used to look at potential problem areas, especially cross-sectoral.

"*This is so far what you have promised to do next year. Now go and see if there are cross-sectoral implications*"

In this way, potential issues can be identified upfront and hopefully the potential partners can talk together. "*So we can break down the silos again".*

ASEAN gets some criticism from commentators over its record on implementation, of rather the lack of it.

"If they would only implement what they say they will implement, things would be much better and the ASEAN economy much stronger and much more efficient."

The database also has another benefit. It puts on record exactly what has been promised for implementation, what is being implemented and what is not. It, therefore, provides a rationale for improving the management of implementation for AEC integration. What is missing is a mandated executive agency to drive it

3.2.5   Regional Coordination Committee

The Regional Coordination Committee was originally conceived during the development of the ARISE PLUS ToRs. The early mentions appear to see it as an M&E tool. Later the thinking moved to more of a matrix format to monitor what Regional and National TRTA do to assist the implementation of the AEC BP 2025 together with a formal coordination platform between the Regional and the national TRTAs.

An interesting point arises with the latter idea, the coordination platform between the regional and the national programmes. From the point of view of both regional and national TA programmes it does make sense for there to be regular coordination and meetings between the team leaders as *a project management tool* to maximise programme implementation effectiveness and efficiency. That would be in addition to any M&E role.

It has got to the stage that EUDs are included in the loop and will facilitate the exchanges where appropriate. Coordination is left to the Team Leaders discretion for flexibility. Meetings should be as regular as appropriate. A similar set up for Key experts exists and they are actively in contact with TRTA counterparts.

Because the national programmes have varying remits with separate inherent conditions and management structures, it would not be possible for close alignment between all national programmes in all activities areas. Such an arrangement would be too cumbersome to implement.

There could, however, be some specific areas that would not only allow but would benefit from such coordination. For Trade Facilitation there could be possibilities for ASSIST and the ATR/NTR. For Customs it could be ACTS. Standards and Conformance could perhaps find some common ground as well. The scope of such coordination might be for all eight countries with national programmes. Alternatively, as the TRTA countries have remits that do not necessary overlap, it might only be possible to set up sub-groups of the regional and national TRTAs.

A second idea is for wider regional group sessions involving senior level ASEAN staff, EUD and DG level staff, relevant members of the private sector and senior AMS staff, SEOM etc. has been under development since December 2018. The frequency could be once a year.

Given the potential range of interests of such a group of participants it is possible that the meeting would be difficult for fit into just one day and still be effective. It would certainly need to be managed carefully and entail very clearly defined agendas. Such an event would probably evolve over time and might need some kind of support mechanism or mini-secretariat to manage any follow-up,

4.   Main Conclusions and Lessons Learned

Lessons Learned:

1. Most development programmes start by trying to fit new projects into the existing national framework without regard to whether or not that framework will actually permit let alone facilitate the implementation of a new programme. Nevertheless key factors, probably the key factors, for

introducing change and generating new advances are the legal and regulatory environments. In the ASEAN context with its ten countries, the issue is much more complex not least because the countries are all at different stages. As ARISE and ARISE PLUS have both found some activities have been impeded by a lack of the requisite legislation or regulation. As part of the initial programme planning it would be prudent to include research on the legal and regulatory environments and how they might affect the letter and the spirit of the new programmes.

2. The expansion of the ARISE PLUS field of operations to include the AMS, as well as to give a degree of emphasis to the CLMV, means that the impact of the ARISE PLUS TA Team is effectively being spread more thinly than under ARISE at the very time when they need to have more impact. There is some benefit in the additional short-term expert pool but they are not the TA Team. Clearly, the TA Team cannot be expected to do more therefore other methods of maximising the impact of the TA need to be found.

3. The fact that ARISE PLUS now has a regional and national programmes is a both a benefit and a possible problem. It would be a benefit if both sets, regional and national, can work together to complement and reinforce the work of all of them for the benefit of the macro-ARISE PLUS. Such an outcome is not automatic but will require careful and sophisticated project management on a large scale. The national programmes do not form a coherent whole but are a set of individual remits. That could be a source of problems.

4. Creating a new over-arching organisation (ARISE PLUS Regional Coordination) consisting of an existing and a set of new individual organisations (ARISE PLUS National programmes) is best done very early in the existence of the latter so that the focus is on the macro-level and individual concerns do not skew the implementation. For ARISE PLUS the regional coordination needs to be operational now. Brussels is not helping the situation by delaying.

5. The ARISE PLUS TA Team are *de facto* driving the whole programme. That is not and should not be their role. They are the repository of not only the expertise for the technical aspects of the programme but also the capacity building as well as the change management. Their functional level is operational, not strategic.

6. Within the ASEAN ecosystem, there is no systemic architecture for programme management. The Leadership might set objectives but there is no systematic management of them. The ASEAN Secretariat cannot at present fulfil that role. There is a gap in the ASEAN ecosystem that needs to be addressed but there is little evidence of action. In this case there is probably a role for third parties to give support and encouragement.

7. Capacity building does not take place in a vacuum. The trainees always have to return to their organisations. Often those organisations cannot absorb the new knowledge and capabilities without themselves needing to change. Such change could include the need for new organisational structures, processes and staff roles and responsibilities. The ACTS project might be such an example. A number of organisations that deal with Customs-related matters as well as transport (including multi-modal) will find that they will need to review their organisational structures, processes and staff roles and responsibilities and adapt them to the demands of the new ways of working. Equally, organisations will be confronted by the need to work with new organizations and partners as well as dealing with the private sector. That is where they will have to start to break down the silos. Organizations should plan for this carefully and commit to new studies, embrace new thinking and address these issues as soon as possible.

8 .Change Management is a complex operation. Depending on what is to be changed, it comes in various forms but always involves five main characteristics;-

A, Scale –it affects all or most of the ecosystem or organization

B, Magnitude - it involves significant changes to the status quo

C, Duration - it lasts for months, or perhaps, years,

D, Strategic entailment – there is no alternative to making changes.

E, Impact - the change will only be effective if it covers everything from the very top to the very bottom i.e. it has to include (and get the buy-in) of everyone from the top leadership to the most junior associate.

9. Making changes also has to be customised for each recipient. There has to be a common overall message[1] but change has to speak to the individual. Customized messages should be adapted to the knowledge and part played by everyone involved at every level. The customized message for the top leadership will relate to their roles while the message for others in the hierarchy should be (for every level) and set to their stages of knowledge and their roles in the ecosystem. For example, senior management have responsibility for the big picture as well as their part of it. On the other hand, frontline customs officers have different knowledge needs and play different roles from the top levels in the Customs organization. Similarly, organizations employing laboratory staff or trade negotiators will have different requirements. So each of them need slightly different information and knowledge so they can all contribute to the desired change. The message needs to be reinforced and repeated through regular, timely and practical advice.

10. Ways of changing culture for impact:

1. Capacity Building:

Is intended to help people or organizations with foreseen change. Often it is used to transfer new information, knowledge or behaviours. It is designed to move participants from a <u>known</u> starting point (a) to a desired finishing point (b). Capacity building works best when linked with organizational capacity building to fit the new skills and capacities of the personnel with a newly changed organization.

2. Changing the operating environment.

People are comfortable when working with what they know and uncomfortable with the unfamiliar. The introduction of new working practices, systems, processes and roles is one of the quickest ways to change a culture but it has to be done in a way that can be accepted by staff and does not make them feel threatened.

3. Working Together ("Breaking down the silos")

Another effective method of addressing cultural issues is to get people from different backgrounds and organizations to work together or take part in joint capacity building programmes. They each bring their own experience and perceptions to the activity and working together will cause them to question and challenge each other and eventually themselves. The effect would be multiple interactions with other participants and their ideas whereas in a one group programme the only challenge would come from the presenter.

---

[1] The overall message can be, for example, any one of -(1) a highly integrated and cohesive economy; (2) a competitive, innovative, and dynamic ASEAN; (3) enhanced connectivity and sectoral cooperation; (4) a resilient, inclusive, people-oriented, and people-centred ASEAN; (5) a global ASEAN; or (6) "Leave no-one behind"

4. Continuous Perception Management

When working with staff from ecosystems or organizations that are undergoing change, it is very useful to get them to think about the effects of any changes in real time. That can be built into the planning for the change programme. For example, at an appropriate time in capacity building, perhaps at the end of a particular component, it could be useful to ask participants to think about how what they have just learnt could affect their ecosystem or organization. It could be a discussion in the round-up or could be in the form of an (blended learning) exercise to be done when back in their organization. It would be discussed at the next capacity building session. It can also serve as part of a revision of the previous component at the start of the succeeding one. The advantage is that the participants can exercise their own ideas but they can be supported and guided by the presenters.

5. Annexes

5.1 Annex 1 Persons Consulted

Name	Organisation	Directorate/Division
	ASEAN Secretariat	Sectoral Development Directorate
	ASEAN Secretariat	ASEAN Integration Monitoring Directorate
	ASEAN Secretariat	ASEAN Integration Monitoring Directorate
	ASEAN Secretariat	Trade Facilitation Division
	ASEAN Secretariat	Standards and Conformance
	Thailand	Chair of CCA
	Thai MOIT	DDG Multilateral Trade Policy Dept
	Singapore	Chair of SWG-ACTS
	Brunei	Chair TFWG
	Vietnam	Chairman Standards Working Group 1
	ASEAN Secretariat	Enterprise & Stakeholders Engagement Division
	ASEAN Secretariat	Standard and Conformance Division
	ASEAN Secretariat	Transport Division
	ASEAN Secretariat	Transport Division
	ASEAN Secretariat	Transport Division
	ASEAN Secretariat	Statistics Division
	ASEAN Secretariat	Trade Facilitation Division
	ASEAN Secretariat	Trade Facilitation Division
	ASEAN Secretariat	Trade Facilitation Division
	ASEAN Secretariat	Trade Facilitation Division
		PCPMD
		PCPMD
	ARISE PLUS TA	Team Leader

	ARISE PLUS TA	KE 1
	ARISE PLUS TA	KE 2
	ARISE PLUS TA	KE 3
	ARISE PLUS TA	Head of ACTS
	EU Delegation	Head of Cooperation
	EU Delegation	Trade Counsellor
	EU Delegation	Head of Finance & Contracts
	EU Delegation	Economic & Regional Cooperation Attache - ASEAN
	Executive Director	EU-ASEAN Business Council
	Director	ASEAN Business Council

5.2 Annex 2 Documents Consulted

- Bandar Seri Begawan Plan of Action to Strengthen The ASEAN-EU Enhanced Partnership (2013-2017)
- JOINT COMMUNICATION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL
- The EU and ASEAN: a partnership with a strategic purpose 2015
- REGIONAL PROGRAMMING FOR ASIA MULTIANNUAL INDICATIVE PROGRAMME 2014-2020
- ANNEX 1of the Commission Implementing Decision on the Annual Action Programme 2016 Part III in favour of the Asia region to be financed from the general budget of the European Union Action Document for ASEAN Regional Integration Support from the EU (ARISE Plus)
- ANNEX 5 of the Commission Implementing Decision on the Annual Action Programme 2017 Part II and 2018 Part I in favour of the Asia region to be financed from the general budget of the Union Action Document for ASEAN Regional Integration Support – Indonesia Trade-Related Assistance (ARISE Plus Indonesia)
- SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE Mid-Term Review of the ARISE Plus Technical Assistance
- FWC SIEA 2018 - LOT 2 Infrastructure, sustainable growth and jobs EuropeAid /138778/DH/SER/multi CRIS: 2019/410549/1 - OPSYS: 2019-M-1712 Contracting Authority: the European Union Delegation to Indonesia.
- ANNEX II ToRs ARISE PLUS TA
- ANNEX IV Key Experts ARISE PLUS TA
- ANNEX V Budget Breakdown ARISE PLUS TA
- ASEAN Regional Integration Support from the European Union (ARISE Plus)
- Support to ASEAN Secretariat Capacity Building INTERIM NARRATIVE REPORT 14 April 2018 – 13 April 2019
- CTR 3238094 M&O p 1-50
- CTR 3238094 M&O p 51-100
- CTR 3238094 M&O p 101-150
- CTR 3238094 M&O p 151-189 (logframe)
- ARISE-Overall-Work-Plan
- Preview-Work-Plan-One-Final
- Final-WP2-Cover-1.pdf
- Final WP2
- ANNEX 3 ARISE PLUS Logframe v5 25Nov 19
- 1st-6th-Monthly-Progress-Final-Report.
- 2nd-Six-Monthly-ARISE-Plus-Report
- Third-Six-Monthly-Report
- PSC 1 Endorsed Meeting Report 17 May 2019
- ARISE PLUS Brochure
- ARISE _INFOGRAFIK_Rev_1 13.11.18
- ASEAN Economic Community Blueprint 2025, November 2015
- ASEAN Organizational Structure, January 2016
- Towards ASEAN Economic Community 2025; Monitoring ASEAN Economic Integration, February 2017
- Session 3_03]_AEM 50 PPT.IR4.0 ASEAN Economic Community 2025 Consolidated Strategic Action Plan, February 2017
- ACCSQ Strategic Plan
- ASEAN 2025 Forging Ahead Together final
- ASEAN Integration Report 2-019

- Global-Megatrends-Implications-for-the-AEC _FULL
- Master-Plan-on-ASEAN-Connectivity-2025
- ASEAN Vision 2040 Towards a Bolder and Stronger ASEAN Community, Vols 1 and 2
- Trade Facilitation and its role in growing economies & helping SMEs: Whither ASEAN, EU_ASEAN Business Council 2019
- Trade Facilitation in ASEAN: path to Growth and Prosperity; EU-ASEAN Business Council 2018
- Trade Facilitation in ASEAN: Modernising Customs Procedures and Helping MSMEs May 2017 EU-ASEAN Business Council
- Integrated and Connected: Seamless ASEAN Economic Community. ERIA 2019
- NTMs in ASEAN An Update 2019, ERIA
- ASEAN Secretariat Post 2015 – Institutional Strengthening & Capacity Development, GIZ
- UNDP World Development Report 2016
- World Bank: East Asia and Pacific Economic Update, October 2017
- World Bank Doing Business 2018, Regional Profile Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC)
- World Bank East Asia and Pacific Enhancing ASEAN Connectivity Monitoring and Evaluation, May 2016
- ASEAN Integration Monitoring Report A Joint Report by the ASEAN Secretariat and the World Bank, 2013
- ASEAN-EU Programme on Regional Integration Support Phase II (APRIS II) Six Monthly Update No. 1 – August 2007
- Reimagining ASEAN: Are we on track for ASEAN economic integration? Deutsche Bank, May 2017
- Doing business in Asia Pacific 2017-2018: A world in transition The ASEAN Report A supplement to PwC's 2017 APEC CEO Survey Strategic Plan
- The Future of ASEAN; Time to Act. PwC 2018
- Doing Business 2020 World Bank Group
- Doing Business 2019 Factsheet: East Asia and Pacific
- Regional Economic Outlook; Asia and Pacific, IMF Oct 2019

5.3 ANNEX 3 Indicative Interview Questions

ARISE PLUS MTR Questions Basic Version

Questions:

ARISE PLUS Programme: 1. Please explain what is your involvement in the ARISE PLUS programme and state your sector:

A. Relevance

1. What is your overall impression of the ARISE PLUS Project so far?

2 On a scale of 1(low) to 10 (high), how relevant is the work of ARISE PLUS to helping ASEAN to support the implementation of the AEC Blueprint 2025?

3. How good are the design of ARISE and the areas it covers to help ASEAN meet the challenges of the implementation of the AEC Blueprint 2025?

4. Any specific examples from your sector?

 B. Efficiency

1. At what stage is the work by ARISE PLUS on your sector?

2. Do you have any views on how well the various project inputs are designed and managed?

3. Do you have any views on if they have yet been turned into results? If so, how well was it done?

Do you have a percentage in mind?

C. Effectiveness

1. Do you think the ARISE PLUS inputs have been effective?   On a scale of 1-10?

2. Do you have particular examples from your sector/experience?

3. Do you think that the ARISE PLUS could have done more up to now in terms of achievements and types of assistance?

D. Impact

1. Is it possible to say at this stage if the ARISE PLUS programme has had any impacts-?
A, on project components? B, on your sector?
2. In your opinion are there any other positive or negative impacts from the ARISE PLUS programme?

E. Sustainability

1. Do you think the inputs from ARISE PLUS and the results/benefits for ASEAN will be sustainable?

If yes why?   If not why?

2. Do you have particular examples for ?   or against?

F. Visibility

1. What effect do you think the ARISE PLUS programme has had on the profile of the EU in ASEAN?

2. Can you point to any good examples of project visibility?

G. General

1. To what extent is the need to work on multiple levels and with multiple partners a factor affecting the ARISE PLUS programme?   Please explain.

2. Do you have any comments on how to deal with such situations?

3. Please use this section for any comments or information you would like to add about the ARISE PLUS programme.

5.4 Annex 4 Status of the Project

Component 1

National Trade Repositories (NTRs) operational in all AMSs

ASEAN Trade Repository (ATR) operational with min. of 3,000 NTMs from AMS

The ASEAN NTM database established, based on data notified by AMSs

71 more officials attending workshops and roundtables to be able to operationalize respective NTRs and link to ATR

ASSIST fully operationalised including capacity building workshops in 7 AMS,

Updated User Manual to all ASEAN languages with an additional 5 online tutorials

Capacity built on ASSIST for trade services, implementation of NTMs & validation for SPS NTMs

Private sector systematically engaged on utilization of ASSIST and increasing consultations with relevant ASEAN sectoral bodies, through ATF-JCC and through informal Roundtable Discussions on Trade Facilitation

Component 2

Drafting of the ASEAN General Principles for Harmonisation of Regulatory Regimes has progressed, endorsement and publishing to follow in AWP2

Cooperation mechanisms between national accreditation bodies enhanced including a long-term cooperation framework for Working Group 2, Accreditation and Conformity Assessment

Cross-cutting initiatives on food safety and on organic agriculture enhanced as a result of the efforts of ARISE PLUS.

With ARISE PLUS support, Working Group 1, responsible for the Harmonisation of Standards, has agreed on priority areas to increase the rate and number of harmonised standards.

ASEAN Food Safety Regulatory Framework (AFSRF) Agreement development on track and it is anticipated that AFSRF Task Force will endorse by the end of 2019.

MRA on Inspection and Certification Systems of Food Hygiene for Prepared Foodstuffs implementation progressing with advanced development of implementation procedures and gap analysis.

An ASEAN Guideline on traceability being established, preliminary draft of the guidelines developed and presented to ARASFF NCP meeting, PFPWG and ASEAN Health Cluster 4

ASEAN Risk Assessment Centre for Food Safety (ARAC) strengthened sufficiently to conduct its first risk assessment for aflatoxins and recommendations to upscale ARAC through review of operating procedures and widening scope.

Component 3

Five Strategic Plans for Custom Development (SPCDs) implemented

SPCD 07 and 17 provided

AMS progressing full implementation of AFAMT (expected 2020)

AMS capacity to implement Authorised Economic Operator (AEO) Programmes strengthened through support by ARISE PLUS.

Implementation Guidelines for ASEAN-Cross Border Transport of Passengers by Road Vehicles (CBTP) established and ASEAN-CBTP Pilot planned

Legal framework of ASEAN Framework Agreement for Goods in Transit (AFAFGIT) in place. Live run of ACTS pilot in April

Updated ASEAN Customs Transit System (ACTS) installed in MST and CLV

The Central Management Team (CMT) of ACTS trained so full participation in planned ACTS live run of the Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand - Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Viet Nam (CLMV) Pilot can take place.

Capacities and systems enhanced in the ACTS Change Management Board (CMB) for the IT functional upgrades to be applied to ACTS and ensure full participation in ACTS Pilot for MST-CLV

Legal Framework is in place

Procedural training on ACTS held for AFFA (ASEAN Freight Forwarders Association), national freight forwarder associations, large transport companies, their associations and road hauliers

Early signs of Impact: Strong support from AMS and strong support and interest by transport industry

Component 4

Enhanced management and decision making in the ARISE PLUS regional project through operationalisation of a robust internal monitoring framework and system.

Integrated monitoring framework established to enable coherence and coordination between the national and regional ARISE PLUS projects. The Framework has been adopted by ARISE PLUS IPR, ARISE PLUS Indonesia and ARISE PLUS Cambodia projects

Operationalisation of the ASEAN M&E framework enhanced for compliance and outcome monitoring through the development and endorsement (by ACCSQ) of an M&E mechanism for a major sectoral plan: the ASEAN Standards and Conformance Strategic Plan 2016-2025 of the ACCSQ.

ASEAN research, capacity and awareness strengthened in the areas of the MTR of the AEC Blueprint)

ASEAN publications and outreach strengthened through enhanced AEC Integration Monitoring website.

Intra CLMV and Thailand Cooperation enhanced through Mirror Analysis/sharing of their International Merchandise Trade Statistics

CLM countries improved knowledge in the use of Eurotrace for International Merchandise Trade Statistics

The AEC Compliance Monitoring Database enhanced and ready for migration to production

New Operational Guidelines for implementation of ACSS

Enhanced readiness of Brunei's team to support the ASEAN-help-ASEAN, and confirmation of DOS Malaysia in their involvement in the coming ASEAN-help-ASEAN

The AEC Compliance Monitoring Database enhanced and ready for migration to production

This database will be very welcome to the business community

As one such stakeholder said "If they would only implement what they say they will implement, things would be much better and the ASEAN economy much stronger and much more efficient."

5.5 Annex 5 Mid-Term Review terms of reference

SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE
Mid Term Review of the ARISE Plus Technical Assistance
FWC SIEA 2018 - LOT 2 Infrastructure, sustainable growth and jobs
EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi
CRIS: 2019/410549/1 - OPSYS: 2019-M-1712
Contracting Authority: the European Union Delegation to Indonesia

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Relevant region background

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) brings together 10 Member States (AMS) including two developed countries (i.e. Brunei and Singapore), five middle-income countries (i.e. Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam) and three least developed countries (i.e. Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar). ASEAN is home to about 640 million people. In 2017, its GDP grew to over US$2.7 trillion, with and average GDP per capita over US$4,300 (ASEC). Yet the economic benefits of growth have been unevenly distributed. The GDP per capital for CLMV (Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar & Vietnam) was only $1,900, compare to the ASEAN-6 countries with an average of $5,100.

The economic development agenda of ASEAN is guided by: (i) the ASEAN Community Vision 2025, and its dedicated ASEAN Economic Community Blueprint (AECB) 2025, (ii) two cross-sectoral plans: the Master Plan for ASEAN Connectivity (MPAC) 2025 and the Initiative for ASEAN Integration Work Plan III which aim at narrowing the development with ASEAN, and (iii) the individual national and subnational development plans.

The overall objective of ARISE Plus is to support greater economic integration in ASEAN through the implementation of the AECB 2025, and strengthen the ASEAN institutional capacity.

The ARISE Plus programme is a six year programme (2016-2022) supporting the ASEAN regional economic integration under the Focal Sector 1 of the Asian Regional Indicative programme (2014-2020). ARISE Plus consolidates and enhances the results achieved with past EU-ASEAN support programmes. The programme follows the structure of AECB 2025, its five characteristics and a selection of priority elements (within the blueprint) for which EU has a comparative advantage, in terms of experience and knowledge.

The scope of work of the Action to be evaluated is limited to the ARISE Plus Technical Assistance; which is implemented under a service contract. The later aim at:

1.1 Enhancing Trade Facilitation and transparency;

1.2 Improving standards and conformity assessment, in particular in healthcare and agro-based products;

1.3 Supporting Customs and Transport reforms, including implementing the ASEAN Customs Transit System (ACTS);

4.1 Strengthening the ASEAN Economic Integration Monitoring System;

4.2 Strengthening the ASEAN Statistics capacity.

The rest of the ARISE+ programme actions are implemented under separate contract arrangements, and focus on strengthening ASEAN Intellectual Property Rights, Civil Aviation and the functioning of the ASEAN Secretariat.

1.2 The Action to be evaluated1
Title of the Action to be evaluated •Mid Term Review of the ARISE Plus Technical Assistance
Budget of the Action to be evaluated •EUR 13,833,125
CRIS number of the Action to be evaluated •ACA/2017/389-774
Dates of the Action to be evaluated •Start: 08/11/2017 •End: 07/11/2020
1.3 Stakeholders of the Action

The ASEAN Secretariat and officials from the ASEAN Member States (AMS) are the primary direct beneficiaries. Other key stakeholders include the private sector in ASEAN, including the ASEAN Business Advisory Council.

Each component of the Action to be evaluated supports a specific ASEAN sectoral committee responsible for the formulation, implementation and monitoring of the ASEAN integration policies in a given area.

In parallel the technical assistance supports the relevant directorate or division in the ASEAN Secretariat.

• Components 1.1 Trade Facilitation & 1.3 Customs and Transport are supporting: the Market Integration Directorate and Sectoral Development Directorate of the ASEAN Secretariat, the Coordinating Committee for the implementation of the ASEAN Trade In Good Agreement (ATIGA), the ASEAN Trade Facilitation Joint Consultative Committee, the ASEAN Directors General of Customs, the ASEAN Senior Transport Officers, the ASEAN Transit Transport Coordinating Board; among others.

• Component 1.2. Standards and Conformance Assessment: The Market Integration Directorate and Sectoral Development Directorate of the ASEAN Secretariat, the ASEAN Consultative Committee for Standards and Quality (ACCSQ) and its relevant working groups, i.e ACCSQ Pharmaceutical Product Working Group (PPWG), ACCSQ Prepared Foodstuff Product Working Group (PFPWG), and the ASEAN Committee on Sanitary and Phyto-Sanitary Measures; among others.

• Component 4. M&E and Statistics: the ASEAN Integration Monitoring Directorate of ASEC, the ASEAN Community Statistical System Committee and its relevant working groups.

In addition, relevant officials in AMS are also targeted by the Action, with a focus on CLMV.

1.4 Other available information

ARISE Plus Technical Assistance webpage: https://ariseplus.asean.org/

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

Type of evaluation Mid-term

Coverage The Action in its entirety

Geographic scope Jakarta, where the ASEAN Secretariat is based

Period to be evaluated from 8/11/2017 (Contract start day) to 7/11/2019

2.1 Objectives of the evaluation

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority2of the European Commission3. The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the **quality** and the **results4**of Actions in the context of an evolving cooperation policy with an increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches and the contribution towards the implementation of the SDGs.**5

From this perspective, evaluations should **look for evidence of why, whether or how these results are linked to the EU intervention** and seek **to identify the factors driving or hindering progress.**

Evaluations should provide an understanding of the **cause and effect links** between: inputs and activities, and outputs, outcomes and impacts. Evaluations should serve accountability, decision making, learning and management purposes.

The main objectives of this evaluation are to provide the relevant services of the European Union, the interested stakeholders and other audience with:

•an overall independent assessment of the past performance of the ARISE+ Technical Assistance, paying particular attention to its 'intermediate' results measured against its expected objectives; and the reasons underpinning such results;

•key lessons learned, conclusions and related recommendations in order to improve current and future Actions.

In particular, this evaluation will serve to:

- understand the performance of the Action, its enabling factors and those hampering a proper delivery of results in order to provide recommendations on how to improve the Action during its residual duration in order to achieve the expected objectives

---

2

COM(2013) 686 final "Strengthening the foundations of Smart Regulation – improving evaluation" - http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com_2013_686_en.pdf; EU Financial regulation (art 27); Regulation (EC) No 1905/200; Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1717/2006; Council Regulation (EC) No 215/2008

3

SEC (2007)213 "Responding to Strategic Needs: Reinforcing the use of evaluation", http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/docs/eval_comm_sec_2007_213_en.pdf ; SWD (2015)111 "Better Regulation Guidelines", http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd_br_guidelines_en.pdf ; COM(2017) 651 final 'Completing the Better Regulation Agenda: Better solutions for better results', https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/completing-the-better-regulation-agenda-better-solutions-for-better-results_en.pdf

4

Reference is made to the entire results chain, covering outputs, outcomes and impacts. Cfr. Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 "Laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action" - https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014_cir.pdf.

5

The New European Consensus on Development 'Our World, Our Dignity, Our Future', Official Journal 30th of June 2017. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:C:2017:210:TOC

- and to provide a basis to decide on the Technical Assistance extension for an extra two years.

The main users of this evaluation will be the European Union, the ASEAN Secretariat and its relevant Directorates, and the ASEAN sectoral Committees, including but not limited to those mentioned in section 1.3.

2.2 Requested services

2.2.1 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will assess the Action using the five standard DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and early signs of impact. In addition, the evaluation will assess two EU specific evaluation criteria:

−the EU added value (the extent to which the Action brings additional benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only);

−the coherence of the Action itself, with the EU strategy in ASEAN and with other EU policies and Member State Actions.

The evaluation team shall furthermore consider whether gender, environment and climate change were mainstreamed; the relevant SDGs and their interlinkages were identified; the principle of Leave No-One Behind and the rights-based approach methodology was followed in the identification/formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the Action, its governance and monitoring.

2.2.2 Indicative Evaluation Questions

The specific Evaluation Questions as formulated below are indicative. Based on the latter and following initial consultations and document analysis, the evaluation team will discuss them with the Evaluation Manager6and propose in their Inception Report a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions with indication of specific Judgement Criteria and Indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

Once agreed through the approval of the Inception Report, the Evaluation Questions will become contractually binding.

1. Assess the relevance of the programme: How well do the design and areas covered help ASEAN to realize its economic integration goals and respond to challenges?

2. Assess the efficiency of the programme: How well inputs have been turned into results, in terms of quality, quantity and timing? In other words, assess the extent to which outputs and/or the desired effects are achieved with the lowest possible use of resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.).

In addition, assess the appropriateness of the implementation approach, specifically the demand driven nature of the programme and the level of involvement its beneficiaries (ASEAN Secretariat and ASEAN sectoral committees); and the adequacy of the EU engagement in support of the programme implementation.

[6]

The Evaluation Manager is the staff of the Contracting Authority managing the evaluation contract. In most cases this person will be the Operational manager of the Action(s) under evaluation.

3. Assess the effectiveness of the programme: Identify and assess overall progress, and results achieved by component and sub-components. Assess how they contributed to the overall purpose of the programme.

4. Assess the early signs of the impact of the programme and determine if it will produce improvements in the technical capacity of the ARISE Plus beneficiaries.

5. Assess the early signs of the sustainability of the programme and how the results will be maintained after the ARISE Plus Programme ends. Suggest recommendations for sustainability.

6. Assess the EU added value: To what extent the Action has added benefits being supported by the EU.

7. Assess the visibility of the programme (in line with EU guidelines), including any impact on the EU visibility in ASEAN, and how the Action contributes to ASEAN visibility in AMS.

2.3 Phases of the evaluation and required outputs

The evaluation process will be carried out in four phases:

- Inception
- Desk
- Field
- Synthesis

The outputs of each phase are to be submitted at the end of the corresponding phases as specified in the synoptic table in section 2.3.1.

2.3.1 Synoptic table

The following table presents an overview of the key activities to be conducted within each phase and lists the outputs to be produced by the team as well as the key meetings with the Contracting Authority and the Reference Group. The main content of each output is described in Chapter 5.

Phases of the evaluation

Key activities Outputs and *meetings*

Inception Phase

- Initial document/data collection
- Background analysis
- Inception interview (call with EUD)
- Stakeholder analysis
- Reconstruction of the Intervention Logic, and description of the Theory of Change (based upon available documentation and interviews)
- Methodological design of the evaluation (Evaluation Questions with judgement criteria, indicators and methods of data collection and analysis) and evaluation matrix
- Kick-off meeting (phone call) with the Contracting Authority
- Inception Note

Desk Phase

- In-depth document analysis (focused on the Evaluation Questions)
- Identification of information gaps and of hypotheses to be tested in the field phase
- Methodological design of the Field

Phases of the evaluation

Key activities Outputs and *meetings*

Phase

Field Phase

•Gathering of primary evidence with the use of the most appropriate techniques (face-to-face interview in Jakarta or phone interview with stakeholders based in other ASEAN member states).

•Data collection and analysis

•Kick-off meeting with EUD Jakarta, followed by interviews in the ASEAN Secretariat with relevant Directorates

•Interviews with ARISE Plus Technical Assistance Key-experts and relevant Non-key experts; and with relevant ASEAN Sectoral Committees (phone interviews will be conducted if based outside Jakarta)

•Debriefing meeting with EUD Jakarta, presentation of the key findings of the field phase

Synthesis phase

•Final analysis of findings (with focus on the Evaluation Questions)

•Formulation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations

•Reporting

•Presentation of the Mid-term Review key findings with the Reference Group at the ASEAN Secretariat; including Slide PPT summarising the findings

•Draft Final Report

•Executive Summary according to the standard template published in the EVAL module

•Final Report

2.3.2 Inception Phase

This phase aims at structuring the evaluation and clarifying the key issues to be addressed.

The phase will start with initial background study, to be conducted by the evaluators from home. It will then continue with an initial teleconference (or phone meeting) between the EU Delegation in Jakarta and the evaluators. The evaluators will travel only at the beginning of the Field Phase. The initial phone meeting aims at arriving at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility. It also serves to clarify expectations regarding evaluation outputs, the methodology to be used and, where necessary, to pass on additional or latest relevant information.

In the Inception phase, the relevant documents will be reviewed (see annex II).

Further to a first desk review of the political, institutional and/or technical/cooperation framework of EU support to ASEAN, the evaluation team, in consultation with the Evaluation Manager, will reconstruct or as necessary construct, the Intervention Logic of the Action to be evaluated.

Furthermore, based on the Intervention Logic, the evaluators will develop a narrative explanation of the logic of the Action that describes how change is expected to happen within the Action, all along its results chain, i.e. Theory of Change. This explanation includes an assessment of the evidence underpinning this logic (especially between outputs and outcomes, and between outcomes and impact), and articulates the assumptions that must hold for the Action to work, as well as identification of the factors most likely to inhibit the change from happening.

Based on the Intervention Logic and the Theory of Change the evaluators will finalise i) the Evaluation Questions with the definition of judgement criteria and indicators, the selection of data collection tools and sources, ii) the evaluation methodology, and iii) the planning of the following phases.

The methodological approach will be represented in an Evaluation Design Matrix7, which will be included in the **Inception Note.** The **methodology of the evaluation should be gender sensitive, contemplate the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and demonstrate how actions have contributed to progress on gender equality.**

The limitations faced or to be faced during the evaluation exercise will be discussed and mitigation measures described in the Inception Note. Finally, the work plan for the overall evaluation process will be presented and agreed in this phase; this work plan shall be in line with that proposed in the present ToR. Any modifications shall be justified and agreed with the Evaluation Manager.

On the basis of the information collected, the evaluation team should prepare an **Inception Note;** its content is described in Chapter 5.

2.3.3 Desk Phase

This phase is when the document analysis takes place. The analysis should include a brief synthesis of the existing literature relevant to the Action.

The analysis of the relevant documents shall be systematic and reflect the methodology developed and approved during the Inception Phase.

The activities to be conducted during this phase should allow for the provision of preliminary responses to each evaluation question, stating the information already gathered and its limitations. They will also identify the issues still to be covered and the preliminary hypotheses to be tested.

During this phase the evaluation team shall fine-tune the evaluation tools to be used during the Field Phase and describe the preparatory steps already taken and those to be taken for its organisation, including the list of people to be interviewed, dates and itinerary of visits, and attribution of tasks within the team.

2.3.4 Field Phase

The Field Phase aims at validating / changing the preliminary answers formulated during the Desk phase and further completing information through primary research.

If any significant deviation from the agreed work plan or schedule is perceived as creating a risk for the quality of the evaluation or not respecting the end of the validity of the specific contract, these elements are to be immediately discussed with the Evaluation Manager and, regarding the validity of the contract, corrective measures undertaken.

In the first days of the field phase, the evaluation team shall hold a briefing meeting with the EU Delegation in Jakarta, followed by interviews in the ASEAN Secretariat with relevant Directorates. During the field phase, the evaluation team shall ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders; with the relevant ASEAN committees. Throughout the mission the evaluation team will use the most reliable and appropriate sources of information, respect the rights of individuals to provide information in confidence, and be sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local social and cultural environments.

7

The Evaluation Matrix is a tool to structure the evaluation analysis (by defining judgement criteria and indicators for each evaluation question). It helps also to consider the most appropriate and feasible data collection method for each of the questions,

At the end of the field phase, the evaluation team will summarise its work, analyse the reliability and coverage of data collection, and present preliminary findings in a meeting with the EU Delegation in Jakarta.

2.3.5 Synthesis Phase

This phase is devoted to the preparation by the contractor of **two distinct documents:** the **Executive Summary** and the **Final Report,** whose structures are described in the Annex III; it entails the analysis of the data collected during the desk and field phases to answer the Evaluation Questions and preparation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

The evaluation team will present, in a single Report with Annexes, their findings, conclusions and recommendations in accordance with the structure in Annex III; a separate Executive Summary will be produced as well, following the compulsory format given in the EVAL module (see Annex III).

The evaluation team will make sure that:

•Their assessments are objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence-based, and recommendations realistic and clearly targeted.

•When drafting the report, they will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place.

•The wording, inclusive of the abbreviations used, takes into account the audience as identified in art. 2.1 above.

The evaluation team will present in Jakarta the key finding of the Mid-term review to the Reference Group to discuss the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations. Half day of presence is required for the evaluation team. The **draft Final Report** will then be circulated to the Reference Group for comments. A minimum of three weeks will be given for comments.

The Evaluation Manager will then consolidates the comments expressed by the Reference Group members and sends them to the evaluation team for the report revision, together with a first version of the Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) assessing the quality of the Draft Final Report. The content of the QAG will be discussed with the evaluation team to verify if further improvements are required, and the evaluation team will be invited to comment on the conclusions formulated in the QAG (through the EVAL Module).

The evaluation team will then finalise (home-based) the **Final Report** and the **Executive Summary** by addressing the relevant comments. While potential quality issues, factual errors or methodological problems should be corrected, comments linked to diverging judgements may be either accepted or rejected. In the latter instance, the evaluation team must explain the reasons in writing. After approval of the final report, the QAG will be updated and sent to the evaluators via EVAL Module.

2.4 Specific Contract Organisation and Methodology (Technical offer)

The invited Framework Contractors will submit their specific Contract Organisation and Methodology by using the standard SIEA template B-VII-d-i and its annexes 1 and 2 (B-VII-d-ii).

The evaluation methodology proposed to undertake the assignment will be described in the Chapter 3 (Strategy and timetable of work) of the template B-VII-d-i. Contractors will describe how their proposed methodology will address the cross-cutting issues mentioned in these Terms of Reference and notably gender equality and the empowerment of women. This will include (if applicable) the communication action messages, materials and management structures.

By derogation of what is specified in the standard SIEA template B-VII-d-i, the maximum length of the specific Contract Organisation and Methodology is 7 pages, written in Times New Roman 12 or Arial size 11, single interline, excluding the framework contractor's own annexes (maximum length of such annexes: 3 pages), additional to the Annexes foreseen as part of the present Specific ToRs. The timetable is not accounted and may be presented on an A3 page.

2.5 Management and Steering of the evaluation

2.5.1 At the EU level

The evaluation is managed by the Evaluation Manager of the EUD in Jakarta; the progress of the evaluation will be followed closely with the assistance of a Reference Group consisting of the EUD Jakarta and the ASEAN Secretariat.

The main functions of the Reference Group are:

•To define and validate the Evaluation Questions.

•To facilitate contacts between the evaluation team and the EU services and external stakeholders.

•To ensure that the evaluation team has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the Action.

•To discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluation team. Comments by individual group members are compiled into a single document by the Evaluation Manager and subsequently transmitted to the evaluation team.

•To assist in feedback on the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation.

•To support the development of a proper follow-up action plan after completion of the evaluation.

2.5.2 At the Contractor level

Further to the Requirements set in the art. 6 of the Global Terms of Reference and in the Global Organisation and Methodology, respectively annexes II and III of the Framework contract SIEA 2018, the contractor is responsible for the quality of: the process; the evaluation design; the inputs and the outputs of the evaluation. In particular, it will:

•Support the Team Leader in its role, mainly from a team management perspective. In this regard, the contractor should make sure that, for each evaluation phase, specific tasks and outputs for each team member are clearly defined and understood.

•Provide backstopping and quality control of the evaluation team's work throughout the assignment.

•Ensure that the evaluators are adequately resourced to perform all required tasks within the time framework of the contract.

2.6 Language of the Specific contract

The language of the specific contract is to English.

3 EXPERTISE REQUIRED

3.1 Number of experts and of working days per category

The table below indicates the minimum number of evaluators and the minimum number of working days (overall and in the field), per category of experts to be foreseen by the Contractor.

Category of experts

Minimum number of evaluators

Total minimum number of working days (total)

(Out of which) minimum number of working days on mission

Cat I 1 27 15

Cat II 2 58 30

In particular, the Team Leader (to be identified in the Organisation and Methodology and in the Financial Offer) is expected to be a Cat I expert, possess a demonstrable senior evaluation expertise coherent with the requirements of this assignment and not provide less than 27 working days, out of which 15 in the field.

3.2 Expertise required

Minimum requirements of the team

Cat. I expert: Expert 1 - Team Leader/Trade Facilitation & Regional integration expert

• Education: at least Master Degree Academic level or equivalent professional experience of at least 12 years, in economics, international trade or any of the disciplines relevant to the Technical Assistance of ARISE Plus, including but not limited to Trade Facilitation, Standards, Customs, integration monitoring.

• General professional experience: 15 years' experience in the sector covered by the Technical Assistance of ARISE Plus.

• Specific experience:

o   A minimum 3 project evaluations in the area covers by the Technical Assistance of ARISE Plus.

o   Knowledge of EC project evaluation procedures would be an asset.

o   Experience working on regional economic integration matters, or of the ASEAN context would be an asset.

Cat. II experts: Expert 2 - Standard expert; Expert 3 - Customs and transport expert
• Education: at least Master Degree Academic level or equivalent professional experience of at least 6 years, in economics, international trade or any of the disciplines relevant to the Technical Assistance of ARISE Plus, including but not limited to Trade Facilitation, Standards, Customs, integration monitoring.
• General professional experience: 10 years' experience in the sector covered by the Technical Assistance of ARISE Plus.
• Specific experience:
o Project evaluations experience would be an asset.
o Knowledge of EC project evaluation procedures would be an asset.
o Experience working on regional economic integration matters, or of the ASEAN context would be an asset.

Language skills of the team:
• English: at least two members shall possess a level C2 expertise (writing, speaking, understanding) Languages levels are defined for understanding, speaking and writing skills by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages available at https://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/en/resources/european-language-levels-cefr and shall be demonstrated by certificates or by past relevant experience.
The European Union pursues an equal opportunities policy. Gender balance in the proposed team, at all levels, is highly recommended.

3.3 Presence of management team for briefing and/or debriefing
The presence of member(s) of the management team is not required for briefing or debriefing purposes.

4 LOCATION AND DURATION

4.1 Starting period
Provisional start of the assignment is first half of November 2019.

4.2 Foreseen duration of the assignment in calendar days
Maximum duration of the assignment: **90 calendar days.**
This overall duration includes working days, week-ends, periods foreseen for comments, for review of draft versions, debriefing sessions, and distribution of outputs.
Following the presentation of the Mid-term review key findings with the Reference Group at the ASEAN Secretariat on the last days of the evaluation team in Jakarta, the Draft Final Report will have to be submitted to the EUD in Jakarta before the evaluation team leaves Jakarta (week of 9 December 2019). Comments will be gathered and shared with the Evaluation team mid-January 2020.

4.3 Planning, including the period for notification for placement of the staff[8]
As part of the technical offer, the framework contractor must fill in the timetable in the Annex IV. The 'Indicative dates' are not to be formulated as fixed dates but rather as days (or weeks, or months) from the beginning of the assignment (to be referenced as '0').
Sufficient forward planning is to be taken into account in order to ensure the active participation and consultation with government representatives, national / local or other stakeholders.

4.4 Location(s) of assignment
The assignment will only take place in Jakarta, Indonesia.

[8]
As per art 16.4 a) of the General Conditions of the Framework Contract SIEA

5 REPORTING
5.1 Content, timing and submission
The outputs must match quality standards. The text of the reports should be illustrated, as appropriate, with maps, graphs and tables; a map of the area(s) of Action is required (to be attached as Annex).
List of outputs:
Number of Pages *(excluding annexes)*
Main Content
Timing for submission
Inception Note 7 pages •Intervention logic

•Stakeholder map

•Methodology for the evaluation, incl.:

o Evaluation Matrix: Evaluation Questions, with judgement criteria and indicators, and data analysis and collection methods

o Consultation strategy

•Analysis of risks related to the evaluation methodology and mitigation measures

•Work plan
End of Inception Phase
Draft Final Report
40 pages •**Cf. detailed structure in Annex III** Just after the presentation of the Key findings with the Reference Group; and before the Evaluation team leaves Jakarta
Draft Executive Summary – by using the EVAL online template
N/A •**Cf. detailed structure in Annex III** End of Synthesis Phase
Final report 40 pages •Same specifications as of the Draft Final Report, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted
One after having received comments to the Draft Final Report.
Executive Summary – by using the EVAL online template
N/A •Same specifications as for the Draft Executive Summary, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted
Together with the final version of the Final Report
5.2 Use of the EVAL module by the evaluators
It is strongly recommended that the **submission of deliverables** by the selected contractor **be performed through their uploading in the EVAL Module,** an evaluation process management tool and repository of the European Commission. The selected contractor will receive access to online and offline guidance in order to operate with the module during the related Specific contract validity.
5.3 Comments on the outputs
For each report, the Evaluation Manager will send to the Contractor consolidated comments received from the Reference Group or the approval of the report within 10 calendar days. The revised reports addressing the comments shall be submitted within 7 calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments. The evaluation team should provide a separate document explaining how and where comments have been integrated or the reason for not integrating certain comments, if this is the case.
5.4 Assessment of the quality of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary
The quality of the draft versions of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager using the online Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) in the EVAL Module (text provided in Annex V). The Contractor is given – through the EVAL module - the possibility to comment on the assessments formulated by the Evaluation Manager. The QAG will then be reviewed following the submission of the final version of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary.
The compilation of the QAG will support/inform the compilation by the Evaluation Manager of the FWC SIEA's Specific Contract Performance Evaluation.
5.5 Language
All reports shall be submitted in English.
5.6 Number of report copies

Apart from their submission -preferably via the EVAL Module-, the approved version of the Final Report will be also provided in 3 paper copies and in electronic version (USB key) at no extra cost.

5.7 Formatting of reports

All reports will be produced using Font Arial or Times New Roman minimum letter size 11 and 12 respectively, single spacing, double sided. They will be sent in Word and PDF formats.

ANNEXES

ANNEX I: SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

[Request for Services n. …….]

FWC SIEA 2018 - LOT LOT 2 Infrastructure, sustainable growth and jobs

EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi

1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Contracting Authority selects the offer with the best value for money using an 80/20 weighting between technical quality and price9.

Technical quality is evaluated on the basis of the following grid:

Criteria Maximum

Total score for Organisation and Methodology 40

•Understanding of ToR and the aim of the services to be provided **5**

•Overall methodological approach, quality control approach, appropriate mix of tools and estimate of difficulties and challenges **20**

•Technical added value, backstopping and role of the involved members of the consortium **5**

•Organisation of tasks including timetable **10**

Score for the expertise of the proposed team 60

OVERALL TOTAL SCORE 100

2. TECHNICAL THRESHOLD

Any offer falling short of the technical threshold of 75 out of 100 points, is automatically rejected.

3. INTERVIEWS DURING THE EVALUATION OF THE OFFERS

No interviews are foreseen during the evaluation of offers.

9
For more details about the 80/20 rule, please see the PRAG, chapter 3.3.10.5 - https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/funding/about-funding-and-procedures/procedures-and-practical-guide-prag_en
Page 16 of 28

ANNEX II: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM

•Action's contract: ToRs, Organisation & methodology, Budget
•Action's Overall Work Plan and Annual Work Plan 1 & 2
•Actions' 6-monthly progress reports
•Minutes of the Steering Committee meetings
•Action's Calendar of activities
•Any other relevant document

Note: The evaluation team has to identify and obtain any other document worth analysing, through independent research and during interviews with relevant informed parties and stakeholders of the Action.

ANNEX III: STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The contractor will deliver – **preferably through their uploading in the EVAL Module** - **two distinct documents:** the **Final Report** and the **Executive Summary.** They must be consistent, concise and clear and free of linguistic errors both in the original version and in their translation – if foreseen.

The Final Report should not be longer than the number of pages indicated in Chapter 6. Additional information on the overall context of the Action, description of methodology and analysis of findings should be reported in an Annex to the main text.

The presentation must be properly spaced and the use of clear graphs, tables and short paragraphs is strongly recommended.

The cover page of the Final Report shall carry the following text:

''This *evaluation is supported and guided by the European Commission and presented by [name of consulting firm]. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the European Commission''.*

Executive Summary A short, tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons to be learned and specific recommendations. It is to be prepared by using the specific format foreseen in the EVAL Module.

The main sections of the evaluation report shall be as follows:

1. Introduction A description of the Action, of the relevant country/region/sector background and of the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant.

2. Answered questions / Findings A chapter presenting the answers to the Evaluation Questions, supported by evidence and reasoning.

3. Overall assessment *(optional)* A chapter synthesising all answers to Evaluation Questions into an overall assessment of the Action. The detailed structure of the overall assessment should be refined during the evaluation process. The relevant chapter has to articulate all the findings, conclusions and lessons in a way that reflects their importance and facilitates the reading. The structure should not follow the Evaluation Questions, the logical framework or the evaluation criteria.

Page 18 of 28

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.3 Lessons learnt Lessons learnt generalise findings and translate past experience into relevant knowledge that should support decision making, improve performance and promote the achievement of better results. Ideally, they should support the work of both the relevant European and partner institutions.

4.1 Conclusions This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion.

In order to allow better communication of the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission, a table organising the conclusions by order of importance can be presented, or a paragraph or sub-chapter emphasizing the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive.

4.2 Recommendations They are intended to improve or reform the Action in the framework of the cycle under way, or to prepare the design of a new Action for the next cycle.
Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, and carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, especially within the Commission structure.
5. Annexes to the report The report should include the following annexes:

•The Terms of Reference of the evaluation

•The names of the evaluators (CVs can be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person)

•Detailed evaluation methodology including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations; detail of tools and analyses.

•Evaluation Matrix

•Intervention logic / Logical Framework matrices (planned/real and improved/updated)

•Relevant geographic map(s) where the Action took place

•List of persons/organisations consulted

•Literature and documentation consulted

•Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures, matrix of evidence, databases) as relevant

•Detailed answer to the Evaluation Questions, judgement criteria and indicators

ANNEX IV: PLANNING SCHEDULE
This annex must be included by Framework Contractors in their Specific Contract Organisation and Methodology and forms an integral part of it. Framework Contractors can add as many rows and columns as needed.
The phases of the evaluation shall reflect those indicated in the present Terms of Reference.
Indicative Duration in working days10
Activity Location Team Leader Evaluator … Indicative Dates
Inception phase: total days

•

•

Desk phase: total days

•

•

Field phase: total days

•

•

Synthesis phase: total days

•

•

Dissemination phase: total days

•

•

TOTAL working days (maximum)

10
Add one column per each evaluator

ANNEX V: QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

The quality of the Final Report will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager (since the submission of the draft Report and Executive Summary) using the following quality assessment grid, which is included **in the EVAL Module;** the grid will be shared with the evaluation team, which will have the possibility to include their comments.

Evaluation title
Evaluation managed by Type of evaluation
CRIS ref. of the evaluation contract EVAL ref.
Evaluation budget
EUD/Unit in charge Evaluation Manager
Evaluation dates Start: End:
Date of draft final report Date of Response of the Services
Comments

Main project evaluated
CRIS # of evaluated project(s)
DAC Sector

Evaluation Team Leader Evaluation Contractor
Evaluation expert(s)
Legend: scores and their meaning
Very satisfactory: criterion entirely fulfilled in a clear and appropriate way
Satisfactory: criterion fulfilled
Unsatisfactory: criterion partly fulfilled
Very unsatisfactory: criterion mostly not fulfilled or absent

1. Clarity of the report
This criterion analyses the extent to which both the Executive Summary and the Final Report:
•Are easily readable, understandable and accessible to the relevant target readers
•Highlight the key messages
•The length of the various chapters and annexes of the Report are well balanced
•Contain relevant graphs, tables and charts facilitating understanding
•Contain a list of acronyms (only the Report)
•Avoid unnecessary duplications
•Have been language checked for unclear formulations, misspelling and grammar errors
•The Executive Summary is an appropriate summary of the full report and is a free-standing document
Strengths Weaknesses Score

2. Reliability of data and robustness of evidence
This criterion analyses the extent to which:
•Data/evidence was gathered as defined in the methodology
•The report considers, when relevant, evidence from EU and/or other partners' relevant studies, monitoring reports and/or evaluations
•The report contains a clear description of the limitations of the evidence, the risks of bias and the mitigating measures
Strengths Weaknesses Score

3. Validity of Findings
This criterion analyses the extent to which:
•Findings derive from the evidence gathered
•Findings address all selected evaluation criteria
•Findings result from an appropriate triangulation of different, clearly identified sources
Page 22 of 28
•When assessing the effect of the EU intervention, the findings describe and explain the most relevant cause/effect links between outputs, outcomes and impacts
•The analysis of evidence is comprehensive and takes into consideration contextual and external factors
Strengths Weaknesses Score

4. Validity of conclusions
This criterion analyses the extent to which:
•Conclusions are logically linked to the findings, and go beyond them to provide a comprehensive analysis
•Conclusions appropriately address the selected evaluation criteria and all the evaluation questions, including the relevant cross-cutting dimensions
•Conclusions take into consideration the various stakeholder groups of the evaluation
•Conclusions are coherent and balanced (i.e. they present a credible picture of both strengths and weaknesses), and are free of personal or partisan considerations
•(If relevant) whether the report indicates when there are not sufficient findings to conclude on specific issues
Strengths Weaknesses Score

5. Usefulness of recommendations
This criterion analyses the extent to which the recommendations:
•Are clearly linked to and derive from the conclusions
•Are concrete, achievable and realistic
•Are targeted to specific addressees
•Are clustered (if relevant), prioritised, and possibly time-bound
•(If relevant) provide advice for the Action's exit strategy, post-Action sustainability or for adjusting Action's design or plans
Strengths Weaknesses Score

6. Appropriateness of lessons learnt analysis *(if requested by the ToR or included by the evaluators)*
This criterion is to be assessed only when requested by the ToR or included by evaluators and is not to be scored. It analyses the extent to which:
•Lessons are identified
•When relevant, they are generalised in terms of wider relevance for the institution(s)
Strengths Weaknesses

Final comments on the overall quality of the report Overall score

ANNEX VI: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED ACTION