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## Key Messages

This Aid Program Performance Report for the East Asia Regional program reports progress in 2013–14 against the three objectives of the interim regional strategy (see page 3).

Overall progress towards achieving the objectives is adequate. Budget reductions during 2014 did not impact negatively on the delivery of the program’s outcomes.

Key achievements during 2013–14 include:

* Australian supported investments contributed positively to progress toward implementation of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) Economic Community
* Program to combat human trafficking embedded in ASEAN member countries
* Australian aid program provided practical support to increase the corporate and project management capacity of the ASEAN Secretariat, which faces challenges.

Key challenges for the coming period include:

* ensure program continues to reflect government priorities and those of ASEAN while further consolidating the number of investments
* maintaining and strengthening the commitment of key program stakeholders and their active engagement in meeting shared strategic objectives
* improving the ability of our investments to generate good quality performance data that is results-focused and informs decisions that improve program effectiveness.

A new strategy (Aid Investment Plan) will be drafted by April 2015. The program is already targeted to regional needs, and is well positioned to respond to the requirements and priorities of the new aid policy released on 18 June 2014[[1]](#footnote-1)—in particular to economic diplomacy imperatives and engagement with the private sector.

## Context

There are significant development gaps in the East Asia region despite impressive economic growth[[2]](#footnote-2) and poverty reduction. Over 250 million people live on less than US$1.25 a day.[[3]](#footnote-3)

Australia has aid programs with several East Asian countries[[4]](#footnote-4) but not all development challenges are best addressed bilaterally. The regional program complements Australia’s bilateral aid by addressing trans-boundary issues best dealt with through regional cooperation and coordination (e.g. economic integration, human security and health), through improving the capacity of regional organisations and strengthening critical regional institutions.

East Asia is increasingly influential and engaging in mechanisms to enhance security and build economic prosperity. Regional organisations are evolving and setting new agendas. The 2013 Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) Integration Monitoring Report (AIMR)[[5]](#footnote-5), funded by Australia, noted significant gains to member states from implementation of ASEAN’s economic agenda. These gains include: an increase in intra-ASEAN trade and ASEAN’s trade with the rest of the world; some improvement in the development of the services sector; and the enhancement of foreign direct investment. ASEAN Economic Community efforts have narrowed the development gap in Mekong countries. Their share of GDP in ASEAN grew from 3.5 per cent in 1990 to nearly 10 per cent in 2011[[6]](#footnote-6).

Some areas of ASEAN’s Economic Community agenda require more effort. According to the AIMR, further work is needed to enhance trade facilitation, services and investments, and support transport sector reforms. East Asian nations have largely adopted outward-oriented policies, but barriers to trade, transit and traffic still exist[[7]](#footnote-7). These barriers exacerbate the gap between the poorest and richest countries, and limit the benefits of economic integration in the ASEAN Economic Community[[8]](#footnote-8).

As economic integration increases, so do trans-boundary development challenges including: growing numbers of trafficked persons; the exploitation of labour migrants; and the spread of communicable and livestock diseases. These challenges affect men and women differently.

Human trafficking originating in East Asia is the most prominent transnational flow worldwide[[9]](#footnote-9), with the Asia-Pacific home to over 11 million victims of forced labour and trafficking[[10]](#footnote-10).

The region is a recognised source of drug resistance (e.g. to malaria and tuberculosis drugs), exposure to poor quality and counterfeit drugs, and a hotspot for emerging infectious diseases with potential to become pandemic. Businesses and government productivity is reduced by staff illness, and disease-endemic areas are less attractive to investment, trade and tourism[[11]](#footnote-11).

The human and economic costs of disasters to the region are immense. For example, in November 2013 Typhoon Haiyan devastated the Philippines affecting 16 million people, with over 6000 lives lost and recovery and reconstruction costs estimated at over US$8 billion.

Civil society must adapt their work to this complex regional environment, at the same time that some domestic contexts are limiting their activities.

**Regional Program Focus and Objectives**

A stable and prosperous region is in Australia’s national interests. The program seeks to strengthen regional economic integration, thereby reducing poverty and boosting prosperity in South East Asia.

Our investments to address trans-boundary issues are long-term, and target priorities that are dealt with most effectively through regional cooperation and strong regional organisations. Current objectives are:

1. Strengthened Regional Economic Integration (promoting regional economic growth and continued openness in Asia by working with regional organisations on economic policies and reforms that support regional integration and development);
2. Priority trans-boundary development challenges are addressed effectively (addressing trans-boundary development challenges including trafficking of persons, spread of communicable diseases and the increasing challenge of natural disasters); and
3. Improved capacity of regional organisations to address agreed priority development challenges.

Our investments under Objective 1 and Objective 3 align with the Government’s economic diplomacy goals. Objective 2 fits under effective governance and health priorities.

## Expenditure

In 2013–14 the East Asia regional aid program amounted to $81.4 million, a decrease of $30 million from the previous financial year ($112 million). The $81.4 million includes Official Development Assistance of other government departments ($19.8m). The budget appropriation for East Asia Regional in 2013–14 included programs not covered by the interim East Asia Regional Strategy—for example some multilateral and humanitarian payments, as well as some initiatives covered by other strategies, such as the Mekong water investments. The investments covered by this APPR account for approximately $27.4 million.

It is not possible to compare directly Australia’s regional program expenditure to that of other donors, which include different countries in their definition of the region and have programs not directly comparable in terms of scope and objectives. However, Australia is one of the larger donors in East Asia. For example, the Australia-Asia Program to Combat Trafficking in Persons (AAPTIP) is the single largest anti-human trafficking program in the world ($50 million over 5 years). Australia is the leading provider of voluntary contributions to the APEC Support Fund—the only project funding source available to APEC economies that primarily works with developing member economies in agreed high priority areas of economic and technical cooperation[[12]](#footnote-12).

Table 1 Expenditure in FY 2013-14

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Objective | A$ million | % of program |
| Objective 1 Strengthened regional economic integration | $14.8m | 54% |
| Objective 2 Priority trans-boundary development challenges addressed effectively | $11.1m | 40% |
| Objective 3 Improved capacity of regional organisations to address agreed priority development challenges | $1.5m | 6% |

Source: AidWorks

### Progress towards objectives

DFAT did not have a finalised East Asia regional strategy document, as changes in Australian Government priorities and policy direction for the aid program were being determined during 2013–14. However, we finalised a performance assessment framework (PAF)[[13]](#footnote-13) outlining indicators and targets for 2013–14 against the interim strategy objectives (see page 3). The PAF informed the traffic light ratings of progress towards the objectives of the interim strategy, along with Quality at Implementation (QAI) ratings (see Annex B) and the findings of several evaluations and reviews undertaken during the period. Judgements about progress take into account the relative size, complexity and variety of initiatives[[14]](#footnote-14) contributing to each objective.

Overall the East Asia regional program’s progress towards achieving its objectives is adequate. Ratings of progress at initiative level are listed in Annex B. The majority of initiatives still need some work to be considered well on-track, but only two initiatives required significant remedial action (Project Childhood and Greater Mekong Subregion Trade and Transport Facilitation (GMSTTF)). The flagship $50million Australia-Asia Program to Combat Trafficking in Persons (AAPTIP) began. Several initiatives entered their exit phases —Project Childhood, HIV/AIDS Asia Regional Program (HAARP), Music Television End Exploitation and Trafficking (MTVEXIT) Phase IV and Tripartite Action to Protect Migrants within and from the Greater Mekong Subregion from Labour Exploitation (TRIANGLE) Project.

Table 2 Rating of the program's progress towards Australia’s objectives

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Objective | Previous Rating |  | Current Rating |
| Objective 1 Strengthened Regional Economic Integration | Amber |  | Amber |
| Objective 2 Priority trans-boundary development challenges are addressed effectively | Green |  | Green |
| Objective 3 Improved capacity of regional organisations to address agreed priority development challenges | Amber |  | Green |

Note:

⬛  Green. Progress is as expected for this point in time and it is likely that the objective will be achieved. Standard program management practices are sufficient.

⬛  Amber. Progress is somewhat less than expected for this point in time and restorative action will be necessary if the objective is to be achieved. Close performance monitoring is recommended.

⬛  Red. Progress is significantly less than expected for this point in time and the objective is not likely to be met given available resources and priorities. Recasting the objective may be required.

Reporting period:

### Objective 1: Strengthened Regional Economic Integration

On balance, progress is as expected during 2013–14 for this objective. However, because the implementation of many of the investments’ review recommendations is still to fully bear fruit, and because of unsatisfactory (though not irredeemable) performance ratings for the Greater Mekong Subregion Trade and Transport Facilitation initiative (GMSTTF), **this objective is rated amber**. PAF targets for 2013–14 are met, or partly met in the case of those relating to GMSTTF.

The contributing initiatives supporting APEC and ASEAN all performed well. AANZFTA Economic Cooperation Support Program (AECSP) continues to steadily improve its performance, largely as a result of AANZFTA partners taking ownership of the program. These programs require implementation of review recommendations to maintain good performance.

Australia’s contribution to strengthening regional economic integration is measured by improvements in capacity of relevant counterparts in the ASEAN and APEC Secretariats (and within the member countries) specifically in relation to supporting trade and regional economic integration. For example, a 2013 assessment survey of the APEC Secretariat Policy Support Unit (funded by Australia) found its work had a positive influence on the capacity of APEC fora and members in evidence-based policy making and evaluation[[15]](#footnote-15). We also look for evidence that relationships forged with Australia during program implementation are fostering conditions conducive to progressing economic integration and trade investment.

APEC is an important vehicle for deepening Australia’s economic engagement with the Asia-Pacific region. Our APEC initiative exceeded by 50 percent its PAF target[[16]](#footnote-16) for the number of Support Fund projects to strengthen trade and economic integration. Even with progress in improving APEC’s systems and processes (see Objective 3), it is hard to assess the sustained impact of these Australian-funded projects. Until recently, projects tended to be low cost and short term, and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is only now improving. Qualitative evidence suggests that these projects foster strong links between Australian Government officials and their developing economy counterparts[[17]](#footnote-17). Our projects are important to reinforce Australian priorities in the working groups and committees of APEC.

Australia is a leader in the APEC Policy Partnership on Women and the Economy (PPWE) to advance women’s trade and economic prosperity in the region and encourage the mainstreaming of gender considerations in all APEC fora and programs. In September 2013, the PPWE and the APEC Small and Medium Enterprise Working Group held a joint ministerial meeting that agreed to develop a coordinated approach to address common challenges faced by women in SMEs and to foster women entrepreneurs. In May 2014, the work of the PPWE culminated in the annual APEC Women in the Economy Forum aimed at strengthening women’s economic empowerment in the region. The resulting Ministerial statement included strong language on integrating gender in all APEC activities as a priority.

Australia’s capacity building support to the parties to the ASEAN Australia New Zealand Free Trade Agreement (AANZFTA) has gained momentum over the last 12 months. In 2012–13 useful outputs from our Economic Cooperation Work Program activities include those related to goods (including Rules of Origin) and standards, services, investment, intellectual property and competition policy. In 2014 we will strengthen monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems, piloted in 2013, to better understand results from these activities. With New Zealand, Australia has strengthened the engagement with ASEAN Secretariat (ASEC) leadership to support FTA implementation. While work remains, particularly improving communication flows to the ASEC senior leadership, recent results from Australia’s investments bode well for wider take-up and utilisation of AANZFTA provisions—potentially providing models for successful implementation of other FTAs.

Our trade enabling investments in the GMS require more focus and stronger links to the ASEAN economic integration agenda. The mid-term review in early 2014 highlighted less than effective cooperation between trade, customs and transport agency officials in the GMS, and the need for better linkages and alignment with ASEAN’s systems, processes, and economic integration agenda. However, the initiative has had some success supporting countries of the region to improve transport agreements. For example, piloting streamlined inspection procedures between Laos and Vietnam has decreased clearance times for cargo trucks from 90 minutes (2005) to 29 minutes (2013). Following the mid-term review, remedial action is in place to get the project back on track, after significant delays, by adjusting the scope to focus on fewer activities, strengthening alignment with broader ASEAN priorities, and by revising its monitoring and evaluation framework and program logic. In addition, a gender analysis of the impact of transport and trade measures was carried out in parallel to the mid-term review. Findings of this analysis will help inform the revised next phase of the TTF project.

### Objective 2: Priority trans-boundary development challenges are addressed effectively

A variety of trans-boundary development challenges are addressed under this objective and overall progress is **rated green**[[18]](#footnote-18).

Australia seeks to: contribute to a reduction in incentives and opportunities for human trafficking in the ASEAN region; increase labour protections for migrant workers in the GMS; improve capacity to prevent, contain and respond to regional public health threats; and improve disaster management response and cooperation in East Asia. In 2013–14 our health initiatives performed well, our anti-human trafficking programs satisfactorily, and there was anecdotal evidence of increased potential for effective collaboration on disaster management through the East Asia Summit (EAS). Reduced budgets for initiatives under Objective 2 during 2013–14 were dealt with effectively by our implementing partners without impacting on achieving results. AAPTIP was in inception phase during 2013–14, where progress often takes a while to build momentum as policies, procedures and systems are developed to support investment implementation. AMNEP’s first year of implementation in 2013-14 showed good progress towards meeting its objectives of improved partnerships with civil society organisations in the Mekong region, and more effective Australian aid through NGOs.

Health programs account for 52 per cent of the expenditure under Objective 2. Evaluation reports and data from improved M&E systems confirmed Australia’s investments are making good progress in improving countries’ capacities to prevent, contain and respond to regional human and animal public health threats. There is evidence that training and skills development has resulted in successful implementation of activities to reduce disease transmission risk. Countries’ policies plans and practices better align with regional and international standards. Regional health initiatives met most and exceeded some of the PAF targets for 2013–14.

For example, the HIV/AIDS Asia Regional Program (HAARP) provided over 480 000 life-saving HIV harm reduction services and treatments to people who inject drugs (PWID) and their partners—exceeding by 40 per cent its target. When HAARP began in 2005 there were few services for this target group. HAARP will end in 2014 but its achievements have good prospects of being sustained. The expansion of service delivery and the level of partner government backing for HAARP’s work (e.g. in China, Vietnam and Cambodia) now reflects a policy environment supportive of a harm reduction approach. HAARP has provided useful lessons in multi-country program design and implementation for future programming.

There were positive outcomes during 2013–14 from our health investments in preparing for and responding to pandemic threats. Stop Transboundary Animal Disease and Zoonoses (STANDZ) and PREVENT Community-based Emerging Infectious Disease Risk Reduction in the Mekong (PREVENT) trained over 3000 health and veterinary workers, community and government officials (on target). Those trained delivered effective communication and vaccination campaigns, which improved the surveillance and response to disease outbreaks during 2013–14. For example, a STANDZ-supported vaccination campaign in Burma protected communities in Saging from a foot and mouth disease outbreak and prevented its spread to other areas. PREVENT worked with the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) to deploy a risk reduction communication package to poultry markets near the Chinese border in Burma, Laos and Vietnam in response to cases of Avian Influenza A (H7N9) in China. Outcomes from PREVENT’s research activities are not yet apparent. Similarly, the STANDZ mid-term review observed the need for improved outcome reporting. We will work with partners on this in the coming year.

Anti-human trafficking and labour exploitation programs account for approximately 40 per cent of expenditure under Objective 2 and progress is satisfactory.

Australia’s new $50 million flagship program, the Australia-Asia Program to Combat Trafficking in Persons (AAPTIP), began in August 2013. AAPTIP builds on over ten years of Australian Government success helping countries in the region strengthen their criminal justice systems to deter and prosecute traffickers. AAPTIP has completed its start-up phase (e.g. setting up offices, recruiting staff, signing memoranda with partner governments, agreeing work plans, setting baseline data and targets). It is not possible at this stage of implementation to report against outcome targets. The impact on the target countries’ criminal justice systems to investigate, respond and prosecute human trafficking cases effectively, ethically and in ways that support the needs of male and female victims will be available in future reports.

The other anti-human trafficking initiative is MTVEXIT Phase IV, a communications for development program which aims through media campaigns and community-level outreach to raise awareness of trafficking and change the behaviour of those most at risk[[19]](#footnote-19). Early results of Phase IV include: 537 young people (50 percent female) trained as community leaders and advocates on anti-trafficking; over 46 000 people (41 percent female) reached with trafficking prevention information; and partnerships formed with 27 civil society organisations to strengthen prevention efforts in local communities in six countries[[20]](#footnote-20). There is some early evidence that target audiences are now better informed about how to migrate safely and avoid being trafficked[[21]](#footnote-21). Australia’s contract with MTVEXIT will end in September 2014[[22]](#footnote-22).

Our anti-trafficking work also aims to reduce the exploitation of labour migrants in the Greater Mekong Sub-region[[23]](#footnote-23). Through the International Labour Organisation (ILO) TRIANGLE project (2010–15) Australia supported improved labour protection mechanisms in partner countries and safe legal migration that contributes to economic growth. TRIANGLE has been a consistently effective project and ILO support is well received by partner ministries as useful and impartial[[24]](#footnote-24). TRIANGLE met its 2013–14 PAF targets in this regard e.g. assisting with eight ministerial orders in Cambodia and two in Vietnam on migrant recruitment standards. The project delivered training and technical support to over 2200 government representatives (one third female), supported 21 civil society organisations, and provided support to over 10 000 migrant workers (40 per cent female)[[25]](#footnote-25). These figures are comparable to previous years’ and TRIANGLE has already exceeded its final target by reaching over 30 000 migrant workers and potential migrant workers (target 25 000). In its final year TRIANGLE will implement a sustainability plan to ensure benefits continue, and fine-tune M&E to better report results.

With the creation of an ASEAN Economic Community in 2015, ASEAN is paying increasing attention to the rights of migrant workers. All ASEAN Member States have signed the Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers, which includes a provision for the development of an ASEAN Framework Instrument on the Rights of Migrant Workers. In June 2014 Australia launched a project with UN Women which will contribute to the prevention of abuse, violence and exploitation of women migrant workers in the ASEAN region.

Project Childhood ended in June 2014 and aimed to combat child sexual exploitation in travel and tourism (CSETT). An independent evaluation of Project Childhood in 2013 found the project had increased understanding of CSETT particularly among justice sector stakeholders and achieved some of its planned outputs[[26]](#footnote-26). However, it is too soon to ascertain credibly changes in the attitudes or behaviour of those trained. There are no plans for future regional program support to combat CSETT. Lessons learned (e.g. overly ambitious design, inappropriate timeframes and implementation modality) will inform any future investments in this area.

The final element of Objective 2 is to improve disaster management response and cooperation within the East Asia Summit. The contributing activity—East Asia Summit Disaster Management Support—is small in value ($180,000 in 2013–14), and this year funded a disaster rapid response workshop in Darwin in September 2013 delivered by Emergency Management Australia. The workshop successfully promoted the East Asia Summit as an important mechanism for regional coordination and cooperation in disaster management[[27]](#footnote-27). The workshop brought together 78 representatives from National Disaster Management Organisations, Ministries of Foreign Affairs and health experts from the member countries of the East Asia Summit. An Action Plan was agreed which identified obstacles to regional coordination and recommendations to improve these[[28]](#footnote-28). Progress against this Plan was reported on at a follow-up workshop in Bali in June 2014, which also advanced two key areas of the Action Plan[[29]](#footnote-29).

Work through the regional program to strengthen ASEAN’s disaster preparedness is complemented by bilaterally funded efforts. Australia has provided $2.83 million (2010-2014) through the Australia-Indonesia Facility for Disaster Reduction (AIFDR) to support ASEC’s implementation of the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management & Emergency Response, and the operations of the ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance on Disaster Management (AHA Centre). The AHA Centre has strengthened regional coordination when disasters strike and it responded effectively to Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines in 2013. The August 2014 review of AIFDR will inform future Australian investment with ASEAN on regional disaster management.

### Objective 3: Improved capacity of regional organisations to address agreed priority development challenges

In reporting against Objective 3 we consider that, within the scope of their influence, our investments have contributed to progress towards: strengthened institutional capacity of the APEC Secretariat; and improved skill of the ASEAN Secretariat in policy analysis and advocacy. The contributing investments, APEC Secretariat Support and the ASEAN Australia Development Cooperation Program Phase II (AADCP II) performed well in 2013–14. These are substantial long term investments[[30]](#footnote-30). In 2013–14 each represented approximately half the expenditure against this objective. In spite of the challenging capacity environment, **progress on Objective 3 is rated green**. This is an improvement on last year’s amber rating, and is recognition of the level of momentum now reached by our investments—as reflected in some improved QAI scores for 2013–14 and promising review findings.

Since Australia’s support to the APEC Secretariat began in 2005 we have helped establish transparent project selection and procurement systems, and improved the sustainability and strategic focus of projects. In 2013–14 we helped APEC develop a project evaluation framework to better assess how projects help achieve APEC’s capacity building objectives. This was approved by APEC in February 2014. The initiative has exceeded significantly its 2013–14 PAF targets. Thirty-seven research publications (target was nine) were produced by APEC’s Policy Support Unit with Australian support. Evidence from website data shows these reports are being accessed. Four institutional reform activities were advanced during the period (target was two). Such reforms are being adopted with widespread support of APEC members and are strongly endorsed by the APEC Secretariat Executive Director. However, obtaining the agreement and commitment of 21 diverse member economies of APEC is not easy in a consensus-based organisation. Australian advocacy and support is required to maintain reform momentum.

AADCPII is on track to achieve intended outcomes, with the 4th Annual Review (November 2013) finding it is now a mature, pragmatic and effective program. Eleven projects were completed during 2013 including several relating to our longstanding work to support implementation of the Mutual Recognition Agreement for Tourism, research for policy makers on narrowing the development gap between the more developed member states and the countries of the Mekong and efforts to further ASEAN’s agreement in investment. Nine new proposals were finalised during 2013 including follow on activities in tourism and investment, as well as new activity to strengthen the ASEAN Secretariat’s corporate area. These project numbers are a large increase on the 14 projects completed between 2009 and 2012. Implementation is also more efficient with a 25 per cent increased expenditure rate compared to 2012, reflecting that activities were implemented to plan during 2013. Outputs were high quality and PAF targets largely achieved. Longstanding support to the tourism sector continued to pay off for ASEAN and for Australia, through the ASEAN Mutual Recognition Agreement in facilitating free flow of services and skilled labour within ASEAN. At the 17th meeting of ASEAN Tourism Ministers in January 2014, the Ministers again acknowledged AADCPII’s contribution to improvements in the tourism sector.

ASEC adopted a number of administrative reform processes in 2013, developed with AADCPII support. These will improve ASEC’s capacity to implement plans for creating an ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) by 2015. For example, International Public Sector Accounting Standards were adopted, resulting in improved financial policies and practices. Standard Operating Procedures for project appraisal, approval and management were adopted. AADCPII supported ASEC in producing the AIMR (see page 2). A ‘Program Results and Reporting’ adviser has been engaged in 2014 to help improve the policy influence of AADCPII-supported products.

The successes of AADCPII, AESCP and our support to ASEAN’s disaster management efforts is underpinned by the strength of the partnership established with ASEC and the quality of program management systems. The establishment of the Australian Mission to ASEAN (September 2013), providing Ambassador-level engagement with the ASEAN Committee of Permanent Representatives (CPR), has increased the profile of AADCPII projects and the potential for influence. In 2014 we will strengthen our dialogue with other donors to build more coordinated programming and cohesion in messaging.

### Mutual Obligations

The East Asia regional strategy was not finalised at the time of reporting. Under the next strategy (East Asia Regional Aid Investment Plan) specific mutual obligations will be considered, drawing on the commitments of each partner under existing Memoranda of Understanding (MOU). For example the MoU for AADCPII, the Commitment Agreements between ASEC and DFAT for AESCP and disaster management, and AAPTIP’s Memoranda of Agreement with each national partner.

Further information about the performance of our partners is discussed on page 13.

### Program Quality and Management

The PAF was used to assess progress for this APPR. However, the quality of M&E at initiative level (which informs the PAF) is mixed (see below analysis of QAI reports). The previous APPR noted two evaluations planned for 2013–14 (for AECSP and for Project Childhood), though more were undertaken (see Annex C for completed evaluations and forward pipeline). Recommendations from all evaluations are being acted on.

### Analysis of Quality at Implementation Reports

**Relevance:** As in previous years, relevance is the highest scoring category in 2013–14. All but one initiative score at least a 5. The economic development initiatives (ASEAN and APEC) scored the highest rating of 6, recognising their alignment with the government’s economic diplomacy and aid-for-trade focus. Project Childhood scored 4 (as it did last year) because it has not been the most appropriate modality to efficiently deliver on the objectives[[31]](#footnote-31).

**Effectiveness:** Over 80 percent of initiatives are satisfactory (rated 4 or above) and achieving results expected during 2013–14. These initiatives account for over 90 per cent of expenditure. Three initiatives rated a 5 (good quality) representing approximately a quarter of the initiatives and one third of expenditure. ILO TRIANGLE scored well (5) for the second time in two years. AADCPII and STANDZ both improved, up to a 5 from a 4 the previous year. The fourth Annual Review of AADCP II was very positive, finding it on track to achieve intended outcomes as set out in the PAF. STANDZ also achieved all its performance targets, making greater progress in 2013–14 towards meeting all its end-of-program outcomes. Two initiatives were unsatisfactory—Project Childhood and GMSTTF. Rated unsatisfactory for the third consecutive year, and following critical independent evaluation findings (November 2013), Project Childhood was subject to remedial action during 2013–14 to narrow its scope until completion in June 2014. GMSTTF, implemented by the ADB, also rated a 3 for effectiveness with initial findings from the mid-term review (February 2014) finding many, if not most, of the activities and expected outputs yet to be achieved. DFAT drafted a remediation plan for the initiative and is working closely with the new ADB management to ensure the review recommendations are implemented; confident that this will increase effectiveness.

**Efficiency:** Most initiatives (75 per cent) rate as adequate quality for efficiency—the use of Australia and other partners’ time and resources towards achieving outcomes. Five initiatives changed rating from the previous year. HAARP and STANDZ improved from 3 to 4 after actions taken to fix issues raised previously (STANDZ), and demonstrated improvements in program management efficiency (HAARP). APEC Secretariat support increased its efficiency score from 4 to 5 as it continues to track well against its budget and is proving good value for money. The two initiatives with decreased efficiency scores also rated less than adequate quality for effectiveness this year. Project Childhood’s rating fell from 4 to 3 due to implementation delays and a high management burden for DFAT. The GMSTTF rating decreased from 4 to 2 due to the adverse findings of the mid-term review. During 2013–14 DFAT invested time and resources into improving GMSTTF, given its potential contribution to aid-for-trade objectives and with improvement under new ADB management arrangements.

**Monitoring and Evaluation:** Ratings for M&E are unsatisfactory in 41 per cent of the initiatives—a slight improvement on last year (44 per cent). Four initiatives showed improvement in M&E 2013–14. Two of the health programs improved their scores this year (HAARP and STANDZ) to a satisfactory level (4). Similarly, the APEC Support initiative’s M&E is now at a satisfactory standard—upgraded to a 4 due to improvements in the Secretariat’s M&E systems and the introduction of a new M&E framework in 2013. Further work will be needed in 2014 to maintain this rating though. AADCPII also improved its rating to a 5 this year as it implemented annual review recommendations to improve M&E, and the AADCPII PAF began to generate useful information. TRIANGLE and Project Childhood both downgraded to a 3 as their M&E remains too focused on output level results. It will be challenging for these initiatives to report final outcomes and impact when they finish during 2014. PREVENT’s M&E is also highly output focused and it fell to a 3 this year. GMSTTF’s M&E rating is poor (2) for a second consecutive year, and remedial action is underway to revise the M&E framework and program logic.

**Sustainability:** Sustainability rates well for all objectives. This is consistent with the previous year (also overwhelmingly 4s), with only two initiatives losing ground—Project Childhood dropped from 4 to 2, and STANDZ from 4 to 3 (on the basis of low financial sustainability). AAPTIP has the only 5 rating, given the potential for sustainability built into its design.

**Gender:** By their nature and design it is easier for health and human security initiatives to achieve higher ratings for gender equality, and this is the case for 2013–14. However, there are no ratings above a 4, except for the AMNEP which scored 5 (though in its first year such a score reflects its gender-responsive design rather than achievement of outcomes). There are two decreased ratings this year (HAARP, TRIANGLE) due to unrealised potential or plans that will now struggle to bear fruit with these initiatives ending soon. STANDZ increased its rating this year—to a 4 with evidence of implementation of gender sensitive programming and sex-disaggregated monitoring.. With the exception of the APEC Secretariat support (which maintains its rating of 4), all other initiatives under Objectives 1 and 3 rate poorly again during 2013–14 (rating 3). However, during the second half of 2014 we will contract a study on how ASEAN economic integration can better address gender equality and how the Australian economic development programs can best support this. Implementing the opportunities identified by this study may see ratings for gender improve in the medium to longer term. The 2014 gender analysis of the GMS TTF project has identified ways to improve its gender rating.

### Performance of key delivery partners

Australia delivers the regional program in partnership with regional organisations and selected multilateral partners.

The capacity of our key regional counterparts—ASEAN, the EAS and APEC— is limited, but improving with support from Australia and other donors (see pages 10-11).

Quality engagement on regional development issues with partner governments and officials occurs through, for example: the ASEAN Australia Joint Cooperation Committee (JCC); ASEAN-Australia-New Zealand FTA Joint Committee; ASEAN Australia Forum; several APEC working groups, committees, ministerial meetings and the Leaders’ Summit; and the EAS. The JCC—comprising senior DFAT representatives, the ASEC and the Committee of Permanent Representatives to ASEAN—facilitates high-level future-looking dialogue, and has helped raise awareness of Australia’s aid program in the region.

The long term initiatives with APEC and ASEAN involve several whole-of-government partners interested in promoting economic integration and trade liberalisation[[32]](#footnote-32). In 2013–14 DFAT’s Government Partnerships for Development and the Public Sector Linkages Program provided $2.37 million to government and university partners for priority development activities. These activities helped build relationships between Australia and partner governments. Strengthened relationships are critical platforms for wider development and foreign policy dialogue[[33]](#footnote-33).

AMNEP made strong progress in its first year. It strengthened processes to select effective civil society partners, manage risk, engage on regional issues, and provide advice[[34]](#footnote-34).

The ILO has been an effective partner on the TRIANGLE project, and worked cooperatively with DFAT to manage risks and minimise impacts of the reduction in funding to the project.

Our health initiatives provide an opportunity for close engagement with regional partners and with the US. Through PREVENT Australia benefits from USAID’s experience and expertise and USAID has been responsive to our contributions to the project such as improvements in monitoring and reporting, including in relation to gender. The World Organization for Animal Health is a valued implementing partner of STANDZ, working closely with DFAT and the Department of Agriculture. During 2013–14 STANDZ effectively leveraged additional and complementary donor support from New Zealand and Japan, the FAO, and a planned research project with ACIAR. STANDZ also increased south-south cooperation in veterinary human resource development, continuing its successful university twinning programs between Laos-Thailand and the Philippines.

Our partnership with the ADB on the GMSTTF has required significant effort and management action over the period (see page 6) to rectify a range of concerns around monitoring of activities and alignment with the broader ASEAN context. In response to our concerns, the ADB has put in place more effective senior level engagement to help improve results-based management.

### Risks

Table 3 Management of key risks to achieving objectives

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Key risks | What actions were taken to manage the risks over the past year? | What further actions will be taken to manage the risks in the coming year? |
| Partner organisations’ limited institutional capacity to service ASEAN’s growing agenda impacts on policy engagement and program delivery.  Growing competition from donors and development partners reduces aid effectiveness. | AADCPII recruited finance and legal officers work closely with ASEC staff already;  AADCPII actively monitors risk and reports annually to the JPRC; ongoing coordination with other DPs for AADCP11 | ASEAN : engagement of external quality/results advisers for AADCPII and AESCP to build program momentum by making sure programs remain relevant and responsive to ASEAN needs |
| Proliferation and/or fragmentation of regional investments undermines our ability to actively manage programs and secure value for money | Active contracts with delivery partners across the regional program reduced by 30 per cent over 2013-14;  Canberra-managed regional investments now under the supervision of one branch | Continue to consolidate the program to focus on fewer, larger investments that satisfactorily meet effectiveness and efficiency standards |
| Lack of, or diminished, political will and commitment of key program stakeholders | SE Asia Regional development team worked closely with implementing partners to strengthen key stakeholder participation through: a demand-driven, participatory approach ensuring regional investments, country work plans and strategies aligned with key stakeholder priorities and action plans; facilitated round-table discussions with key stakeholders; and increased advocacy of regional investments through strategic communications. | Continue to promote regional aid investments with key stakeholders though communications via cable, emails and briefings; targeted face to face visits; attend key regional meetings to promote achievements of investments. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Management Responses

**Apply new aid policy priorities to East Asia Regional program**

* Finalise the Aid Investment Plan (AIP) for regional East Asia by mid-2015, clarifying objectives and ensuring complementarity with the AIPs of bilateral programs in the region.
* Through the AIP identify and articulate the alignment of the East Asia regional program’s investments with new aid policy priorities including gender equality, private-sector engagement and opportunities for innovation in existing and new investments.

**Implement recommendations from evaluations and undertake further reviews**

* Engage actively with implementing partners (including through at least two field monitoring visits per initiative) to fine-tune the M&E frameworks for TRIANGLE, STANDZ and GMSTTF by end 2014, so that data generated is high quality, outcome-focused and meets DFAT and other stakeholders’ needs.
* Implement recommendations of the GMS TTF mid-term review to accelerate progress against stated objective of the project in its second and final phase, with a focus on supporting CLMV countries to fully participate in the ASEAN Economic Community.
* For programs ending in 2014-15, ensure sustainability plans are in place and undertake appropriate communications with stakeholders of the MTV EXIT program, Project Childhood, HAARP and PREVENT.
* Undertake annual stocktake of program achievements and challenges in 2014 for both AADCPII and AECSP.
* Implement the AECSP communications plan presented to program partners in June 2014.

**Improve the quality of attention to achieving gender equality outcomes**

* Program managers to reinforce with partners the expectation for inclusion of gender issues, such as women’s economic empowerment, and outcomes in regular progress reporting.
* Australia’s mission to ASEAN to commission a study by end 2014 on how Australian economic development programs such as AADCP II can better address gender equity.
* Incorporate findings of GMS Trade and Transport Facilitation gender study into the M&E framework and the redesign of the next phase of the program.

**Manage and strengthen partner relationships**

* Finalise AAPTIP agreements with at least five partner governments by end 2014 through active engagement and advocacy on Australia’s anti-trafficking interests.
* Southeast Asia Regional Branch to improve internal communication with Australia’s bilateral missions in ASEAN countries to build understanding and promote complementarity through key meetings/regular updates.
* Southeast Asia Regional hub to coordinate with ADB and development partners (Japan, US, EU, ASEAN, World Customs Organisation) to develop a common Trade and Transport Facilitation regional strategy to promote alignment with ASEAN economic community blueprint by November 2014.
* Manage relationships with program stakeholders (particularly ASEAN Dialogue partners and ASEAN) in light of forward pipeline, including leveraging the role of Australian Ambassador to ASEAN.

## Annex A

## Progress in addressing 2012-13 management responses

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Management consequences identified in 2012-13 APPR | Rating | Progress made in 2013-14 |
|  |  |  |
| ***Program Strategy and management*** |  |  |
| 1. Endorse the regional situation analysis. | n/a | As a result of the change in government and integration of AusAID into DFAT during the reporting period it was not possible to finalise any strategy-related documentation. |
| 1. Publish the East Asia Regional Strategy including a performance assessment framework by the end of 2013. | n/a |  |
| 1. Clarify the strategic intent, program logic and operational arrangements by developing delivery strategies for sustainable economic development, health and human security in 2013-14. In particular the health delivery strategy will need to clarify the relevance and f directions of emerging infectious diseases and HIV/AIDS policies, and clarify the respective roles of DFAT’s Health Policy section and East Asia Regional Section’s roles in relation to policy, strategic guidance and program delivery. | n/a |  |
| 1. Clarify the management and reporting arrangements for Mekong subregion programs. | n/a | As a result of the integration of AusAID into DFAT, new management and reporting arrangements for all programs are being determined. |
| ***East Asia Summit*** |  |  |
| 1. Continue to engage with ASEAN and whole-of-government partners to establish an expanded ASEAN Committee for Disaster Management Secretariat by end 2013. | Not achieved | Despite continued productive engagement with ASEAN and whole-of-government partners little progress was made and we did not establish an expanded ASEAN Committee for Disaster Management (ACDM) Secretariat by the end of 2013. However we note the progress achieved with ASEAN in terms of the EMA workshops. In an effort to promote greater regional coordination and cooperation on disaster management initiatives Australia continues to actively participate in the annual ACDM session on EAS Cooperation on disaster management. |
| ***ASEAN*** |  |  |
| 1. Continue to advocate to ASEAN and the ASEAN Secretariat the importance of gender equality issues in regional development practice. | Partly achieved | There are limited opportunities to advance gender equality issues. However during 2014 DFAT will conduct an expert study on how Australian economic development programs with ASEAN can better address gender equality. This work should also be of relevance to our support to APEC. |
| 1. By 30 June 2013, complete the no-cost extension of the program’s duration to end 2019, as recommended by the 2012 ASEAN Australia Development Cooperation Project Phase II independent progress report, to build on the program’s results achieved to date and realise its potential to deliver sustainable outcomes. | Achieved | The no-cost extension for AADCPII, until December 2019, was finalised in June 2013. |
| 1. By December 2013, review ASEAN Australia Development Cooperation Project Phase II staffing support to the ASEAN Secretariat to confirm the focus and priorities beyond 2014. |  | The 4th Annual Review undertaken in December 2013 confirmed the current level of program staffing resources as adequate. The review confirmed that a number of ASEC core positions funded by AADCPII have provided significant contribution to ASEC business processes and are valued by ASEC. Discussions have continued between Australia and ASEC regarding future needs AADCPII could address. We are implementing the review recommendation continuing to fund contract, economics and finance positions, but hand over funding of HR positions to ASECs own funds. |
| 1. In consultation with AANZFTA Economic Co-operation Support Program partners, develop the management response to the independent progress report by 31 July 2013 and implement the agreed recommendations by the end of 2013–14. Program partners will work together to consolidate those areas where the program is performing well, and address those issues where improvements can be made. |  | The management response to the independent progress report was completed in August 2013. DFAT is currently implementing all responses. The no-cost extension of the program has been approved; the communications strategy is being developed; and devolution of the program to DFAT Jakarta occurred in February 2014. Other responses relating to M&E, gender and capacity building are ongoing. |
| ***APEC*** |  |  |
| 1. Improve performance management arrangements for the APEC Support Fund by the end of 2013 through a comprehensive evaluation framework that assesses the impact of APEC Support Fund projects in achieving its capacity building objectives and policy priorities. |  | In mid-2013, BMC agreed to a new framework to monitor and evaluate APEC projects. Implementation of this framework has commenced. Australia’s support to APEC has resulted in tan improvement in the monitoring and evaluation of APEC projects, including those supported by Australia through the APEC Support Fund. However the pace of change has been uneven due to difficulties of attaining the support of all of the organisations 21 members. |
| 1. Commence a mid-term review of APEC Support Fund multi-year projects in the first quarter of 2014. |  | This will occur in the second half of 2014. |
| ***Whole of Government Engagement*** |  |  |
| 1. Resolve by end 2013 whether a separate mechanism that addresses the needs of the East Asia Regional Section’s whole-of-government partners in progressing economic integration will need to be implemented to supplement Government Partnerships for Development. |  | It was determined that no new funding mechanism was needed for whole of government partner activities in 2013-14. Existing mechanisms such as GPFD and the APEC Targeted Cooperation Facility met all needs. |
| ***Mekong Regional Connectivity*** |  |  |
| 1. Improve the performance management arrangements for the Australian–Asian Development Bank Greater Mekong Subregion Trade and Transport Facilitation project by developing a more comprehensive monitoring and evaluation framework by the end of 2013. |  | The mid-term review (see below) found that the monitoring framework for the project requires a significant amount of revision to provide the performance information required. An M&E specialist has been engaged in 2014 and the findings of the M&E report will inform the monitoring framework for the second and final phase of the project. |
| 1. Undertake a mid-term review of progress and future direction of the project by end 2013. |  | Timing of the mid-term review slipped to December 2013 to March 2014. Findings of the review provide the basis for changes to the design and implementation of the project in its second and final phase. |
| ***Addressing Priority Transboundary Issues*** |  |  |
| 1. Develop a human security delivery strategy by the end of 2013 to guide DFAT’s regional programming of human security issues in East Asia | n/a | As a result of the change in government and integration of AusAID into DFAT during the reporting period it was not possible to finalise any strategy-related documentation. |
| 1. Develop a health delivery strategy by the end of 2013 to guide DFAT’s regional programming of health initiatives in East Asia | n/a | As a result of the change in government and integration of AusAID into DFAT during the reporting period it was not possible to finalise any strategy-related documentation. |
| 1. Develop a plan for future investments in the human security and health portfolios post 2015 (managed from the Bangkok Regional Office), which will involve further consolidation of the number of regional activities and reflect the following decisions: a) approved exit strategy for current HIV/AIDS harm reduction program by August 2013 b) approved approach to the decent work agenda in South East Asia by February 2014 |  | Work began on pipeline planning for post -2015 however the change of government and budget reductions for 2013-14 changed the parameters. The exit strategy for the HIV/AIDS harm reduction program was approved in December 2013. We are also progressing scoping work for a potential regional program on the quality of essential medicines. |
| 1. Begin implementing the regional malaria prevention program from 1 July 2013 |  | Work began in mid-2013 on the formal handover of program management responsibilities of the malaria regional program from Canberra Health Policy Section to Bangkok Post. However, the change in government, the integration of AusAID into DFAT, and budget reductions for 2013-14 delayed the actual transfer of funds to Bangkok Post until end-February 2014. Formal management handover processes to Post commenced in March 2014. |
| 1. Start establishing the Australia–Asia Program to Combat Trafficking in Persons program by August 2013 including recruiting the program’s advocacy manager. |  | The Australia–Asia Program to Combat Trafficking in Persons began in August 2013 and the Partnership and Advocacy Manager began work in November 2013. |
| 1. Complete an independent review of Project Childhood by end 2013. |  | An independent evaluation of Project Childhood was completed in November 2013. |
| ***Disaster Management*** |  |  |
| 1. Improve regional coordination in responding to natural disasters by working with Emergency Management Australia to deliver a workshop on disaster rapid response by end 2013 |  | DFAT funded EMA to deliver a disaster rapid response workshop in Darwin in September 2013. The workshop brought together EAS officials from national disaster management organisations, health organisations and foreign affairs to discuss a range of issues related to improving regional coordination in responding to natural disasters. An Action Plan was agreed to by EAS countries which identified obstacles to regional coordination and recommendations to improve these. Progress against this Plan will be monitored and reported on in at a follow-up workshop in 2014. |

Note:

⬛  Achieved. Significant progress has been made in addressing the issue

⬛  Partly achieved. Some progress has been made in addressing the issue, but the issue has not been resolved

⬛  Not achieved. Progress in addressing the issue has been significantly below expectations

## Annex B

## Quality at Implementation ratings

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Investment name | Approved budget and duration | | QAI year | | Relevance | | Effectiveness | | Efficiency | | Monitoring and Evaluation | Sustainability | Gender equality |
|  |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |
|  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |
| INH157 ASEAN Australia Development Cooperation Project: Phase II | $62.8m  11/4/07—31/12/19 | 2013 | | 6 | | 5 | | 4 | | 5 | | 4 | 3 |
| 2012 | | 6 | | 4 | | 4 | | 4 | | 4 | 3 |
| INI358 AESCP | $15.9m  3/11/08—31/12/15 | 2013 | | 6 | | 4 | | 4 | | 4 | | 4 | 3 |
|  |  | 2012 | | 6 | | 4 | | 4 | | 4 | | 4 | 3 |
| INH446 APEC Secretariat Support | $35.3m  3/8/07—30/05/17 | 2013 | | 6 | | 4 | | 5 | | 4 | | 4 | 4 |
|  |  | 2012 | | 5 | | 4 | | 4 | | 3 | | 4 | 4 |
| INJ585 – GMS Trade, Transport Facilitation | $6m  1/11/10—31/12/16 | 2013 | | 5 | | 3 | | 2 | | 2 | | 4 | 3 |
|  |  | 2012 | | 5 | | 4 | | 4 | | 2 | | 4 | 3 |
| INJ332 Project TRIANGLE | $9.4m  13/5/10—31/5/15 | 2013 | | 5 | | 5 | | 4 | | 3 | | 4 | 3 |
|  |  | 2012 | | 5 | | 5 | | 4 | | 4 | | 4 | 5 |
| INI940 Project Childhood | $7.0m  14/9/09—30/6/14 | 2013 | | 4 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 2 | 4 |
|  |  | 2012 | | 4 | | 3 | | 4 | | 4 | | 4 | 4 |
| INK642 Australia Asia Program to Combat TIP | $50.0m  1/7/13—30/6/18 | 2013 | | 6 | | 4 | | 4 | | 5 | | 5 | 3 |
|  |  | 2012 | | n/a | | n/a | | n/a | | n/a | | n/a | n/a |
| INK599 MTV EXIT Phase IV | $5.6m | 2013 | | 5 | | 4 | | 3 | | 3 | | 4 | 4 |
|  | 14/12/12—30/6/16 | 2012 | | n/a | | n/a | | n/a | | n/a | | n/a | n/a |
| ING221 HIV/AIDS Asia Regional Program | $37.8m  21/7/05—31/12/14 | 2013 | | 5 | | 4 | | 4 | | 4 | | 4 | 4 |
|  |  | 2012 | | 5 | | 4 | | 3 | | 3 | | 4 | 5 |
| INJ703 STANDZ | $12.8m  20/5/11—30/6/16 | 2013 | | 6 | | 5 | | 4 | | 4 | | 3 | 4 |
|  |  | 2012 | | 5 | | 4 | | 3 | | 3 | | 4 | 3 |
| INJ704 PREVENT | $5.9m  18/10/11—31/12/15 | 2013 | | 6 | | 4 | | 4 | | 3 | | 4 | 4 |
|  |  | 2012 | | 5 | | 4 | | 4 | | 4 | | 4 | 4 |
| INK727 – Australia Mekong NGO Engagement Platform | $15m  10/8/12—30/6/18 | 2013 | | 5 | | 4 | | 4 | | 4 | | 4 | 5 |
|  |  | 2012 | | n/a | | n/a | | n/a | | n/a | | n/a | n/a |

Definitions of rating scale:

Satisfactory (4, 5 and 6)

⬛ = 6 = Very high quality

⬛ = 5 = Good quality

⬛ = 4 = Adequate quality, needs some work

Less than satisfactory (1, 2 and 3)

⬛ = 3 = Less than adequate quality; needs significant work

⬛ = 2 = Poor quality; needs major work to improve

⬛ = 1 = Very poor quality; needs major overhaul

## Annex C

## Evaluation and Review Pipeline Planning

List of evaluations completed in the reporting period

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Investment** | **AidWorks number** | **Name of evaluation** | **Date finalised** | **Date Evaluation report Uploaded into AidWorks** | **Date Management response uploaded into AidWorks** | **Published on website** |
| AADCPII | INH157 | 4th Annual Review | 5/3/14 | 22/4/14 | n/a | May 14 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AECSP | INI358 | 2013 Annual Review | 28/2/14 |  | n/a |  |
| Project Childhood | INI940 | Independent Mid-Term Evaluation | 17/11/13 | 20/1/14 | 20/1/14 | March 2014 |
| STANDZ | INJ703 | Independent Mid-Term Evaluation | 3/4/14 | 22/5/14 | 24/6/14 | August 2014 |

List of evaluations planned in the next 12 months

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name of Investment | AidWorks number | Type of evaluation | Purpose of evaluation | Expected completion date |
| AADCPII | INI157 | 2014 Annual Quality Stocktake | To assess program performance and verify program outcomes | 15/2/2015 |
| AECSP | INI358 | 2014 Annual Review | To assess program performance and verify program outcomes | 28/2/2015 |
| AAPTIP | INK641 | Mid-Term Evaluation | To improve existing program; to verify program outcomes | Second half 2015 |
| ILO TRIANGLE | INJ332 | Independent Final Evaluation | To identify lessons learned and recommendations; to identify the successes and constraints | March 2015 |
| MTVEXIT Phase IV | INK599 | Independent Completion Evaluation | To outline activity achievements, impact, sustainability and lessons learned | September 2014 (TBC) |
| HAARP | ING221 | Independent Completion Evaluation | To identify lessons learned and recommendations; to identify the successes and constraints of the project | January 2015 |

## Annex D

## Performance Benchmarks 2014 -15

| Program strategic objective | 2014-15 benchmark | Rationale for selecting this performance benchmark |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective 1: Strengthened regional economic integration** | |  |
|  | Quality engagement with ASEAN in the development of *Initiative for ASEAN Integration* work plan 3 for adoption by leaders (June 2015) | Greater regional economic integration can support regional economic growth, business and investment links and trade. Failure to achieve inclusive economic growth, both between and within ASEAN nations, could put a break on progress towards further economic integration and lead to patchy implementation of an ASEAN Economic Community. Strengthening ASEC capability, supporting ASEAN efforts to narrow the gap between the ‘ASEAN 6’ and ‘CLMV’ countries, and ensuring that the benefits of economic integration flow equally to women and men are all relevant outcomes for AADCP II. |
| **Objective 2: Priority trans-boundary development challenges are addressed effectively** | |  |
|  | At least 500 law enforcement officials trained (data to be sex disaggregated). | The relevant end-of-program outcome for AAPTIP is: law enforcement agencies improve the effective and ethical investigation of trafficking in persons, and related cases. AAPTIP aims to build the capacity of law enforcement officials across seven partner countries in investigation techniques, including joint cross-border operations. A well-conducted investigation is the critical first step in identifying trafficking victims and collecting evidence that prosecutors will use to convict traffickers. |
|  | Six FMD-free countries (or areas in South East Asia countries) have FMD-free status (5 maintained, 1 new) | The relevant end-of-strategy outcome is: improved capacity to prevent, contain and respond to regional public health threats. Our investments assist countries to effectively manage the prevention and control of Foot and Mouth Disease (and Rabies). Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) in livestock is endemic in mainland South East Asia and is a national biosecurity threat to Australia’s economy and livestock industry. FMD stunts rural productivity and threatens food security in the Greater Mekong Subregion. It restricts trade and access to markets. Asia (excluding China and India) incurs an estimated USD479m per year in direct production losses and vaccination costs. Since 1997 Australia has been the region’s largest donor to FMD control. The STANDZ initiative has achieved notable outcomes since it began in 2011. |
| Objective 3: Improved capacity of regional partners to address agreed priority development challenges | | |
|  | The momentum of our regional programs is maintained as a result of quality and sustained partnerships and effective policy dialogue | Australia’s relationship with our counterparts and the ongoing commitment and political will of partners is critical to the successful delivery of the regional aid program. Stronger regional organisations which can support effective regional cooperation and policy dialogue are a key outcome for the program. Some measures of momentum include level of funding and number of activities in the pipeline. Qualitative measures are also appropriate for assessing progress on this benchmark. Evaluation questions may include:  What evidence is there that continuing relationships between Australia and counterparts foster conditions conducive to progressing economic integration or trade investment?  Does support for discrete activities effectively leverage ongoing Australian involvement/influence, for example, within ASEAN? |
|  | Training delivered to least 4200 public servants charged with delivering the targets set in the ASEAN Community (across all 3 objectives). Data to be sex disaggregated. | Training activities are an important element across many investments under the strategy. Training refers to knowledge transfer that builds the capacity of government personnel. This includes on-the-job training, workshops, mentoring and teaching people how to train others (train-the-trainer). Monitoring and evaluation activities gather information about changes in capacity, the application of skills and knowledge gained from training activities, and the contribution of training to improvements in service delivery by government agencies and officials. For example: provision of training to customs and border officials in Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam in regulatory and legal frameworks for cross border transport will improve their understanding and increase the implementation and compliance with these. Evaluation questions will look for evidence that this implementation has led to increased coordination of border management, transit procedures and implementation of traffic rights and that these have led to improvements in the flow of transport and trade in the GMS corridors. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Program Management/ Operations | | |
| **All objectives** |  |  |
| Improve the quality of attention to achieving gender equality outcomes | Conduct study by end of 2014 on how Australian economic development programs such as AADCP II can better address gender equality | Women are critical to the achievement of sustainable economic development in the region. This study will complement an ASEAN conducted study (which is planned to be funded by AADCP II) on how ASEAN Economic Integration (the AEC) can better address gender equality. Gender mainstreaming has not been a policy priority in ASEAN and annual reviews of AADCPII highlight the difficulties in changing how gender is treated in the program. Since 2001 APEC leaders and ministers have recognised gender as a cross-cutting theme in APEC and have established the APEC Policy Partnership on Women and the Economy to integrate gender into APEC activities—however there has not been significant progress to date. APEC has a stronger institutional and policy commitment to gender but can benefit from the ASEAN study, and DFAT will ensure relevant findings and recommendations are shared and used throughout our economic development programs. |

1. *Australian aid: promoting prosperity, reducing poverty, enhancing stability* http://aid.dfat.gov.au/aidpolicy/Pages/home.aspx [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Average real GDP growth rate (unweighted) 2009 to 2013 was 5.5% for ASEAN countries (plus Timor-Leste, and excluding Singapore). The unweighted average is the average of the growth rates over 5 years across the group of countries, and as such, it does not reflect the relativities between the size of each country’s economy. Source: International Monetary Fund, World Economic Outlook Database, April 2014 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <http://povertydata.worldbank.org/poverty/region/EAP>. 2010 figures are the most recent (and include the Pacific). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Burma, Mongolia, Philippines, Timor-Leste and Indonesia [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. ASEC receives technical assistance from the World Bank, funded by AADCPII to produce this report. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. AIMR, page vi [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. These include difficulties in moving goods, high transport costs, divergent processes and requirements for customs, migration, visas, quarantine, security, and other non-tariff trade measures. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. For example, the average time to complete an export transaction in Mekong countries is between 3.5 and 10 times longer than in Singapore. *Economic Benefits of Trade Facilitation in the GMS, Centre for International Economics, 2010* [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The UNODC Global report on Trafficking in Persons 2012 detected East Asians in 64 countries worldwide, often in large numbers. While most of the trafficked persons from East Asia stay within the region (including within a single country), the region is a significant area of origin of interregional trafficking. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. ILO Global Estimate of Forced Labour, 2012 <http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/forced-labour/publications/WCMS_182004/lang--en/index.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. WHO Roll Back Malaria Partnership http://www.rbm.who.int/ProgressImpactSeries/report12.html [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Australia has contributed 45% of the voluntary contributions to the APEC Support Fund, managed by the APEC Secretariat, since it was established in 2005. The next largest contributor is Japan (26%). The United States is a larger donor overall but primarily contributes through the US managed APEC Technical Assistance to Advance Regional Integration. (http://www.apec.org/Projects/Funding-Sources.aspx). [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Country and regional programs with an annual budget over $50 million are required to develop a Performance Assessment Framework—a management tool which describes how progress towards the strategic objectives and expected results of the Aid Investment Plan (in this case the regional strategy) will be assessed and reported over the life of the strategy. The PAF assists programs to identify performance benchmarks and mutual obligations. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Initiatives are listed at Annex B: Quality at Implementation Ratings. Detailed information is available at <http://aid.dfat.gov.au/countries/eastasia/regional/Pages/home.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. The Policy Support Unit (PSU) Survey 2014 was the second annual survey undertaken by the APEC Secretariat PSU. It collected feedback on work completed in 2013. The survey was sent to seven APEC groups (including senor officials groups, committees and some working groups) and the Chairs and Co-Chairs of three APEC Business Advisory Council working groups. The results were reported to the 19th Policy Support Unit Board Meeting, Beijing China in August 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Three institutional reform activities were implemented (as of February 2014). The target was 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Reported in the *Public Sector Linkages Cluster Study Quality at Implementation Report*, March 2014. This drew on the activity completion reports of the Australian and APEC partners. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Because Project Childhood only accounts for 1.6 per cent of the total expenditure this year under Objective 2, its underperformance (rating 3 for effectiveness) has not impacted on the overall rating for this objective. This was also the approach taken in the 2012–13 APPR. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. MTVEXIT has operated as a mass-media awareness-raising campaign since 2004, with funding from Australia since 2010. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. These results were delivered using funding provided from January 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. ‘Knowledge, Attitudes and Practice’ survey data (pre and post events) as reported in the 2013 MTVEXIT Annual Report. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. This is 30 months earlier than planned and due to changes made by MTVEXIT that shift the scope and focus of the program away from that originally agreed. DFAT will ensure a thorough handover with project partners and stakeholders. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. And also works with migrant worker destination countries such as Malaysia. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. TRIANGLE Annual Report (June 2013), which confirmed the similar findings of the mid-term evaluation (March 2013). [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. These figures cover July 2013 to March 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. For example, since 2011 training and educational activities on how to protect at-risk children from sexual abuse including CSETT was delivered to over 13 000 children, parents, community members, duty bearers (e.g. teachers) and tourism personnel (57 per cent female). Also, since 2012 training was provided to over 4000 law enforcement officials and public servants (25 per cent female) to respond to child sexual exploitation. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Feedback to EMA from participants shows that “the Workshop was a significant step in progressing implementation of the Indonesian-Australian East Asia Summit (EAS) disaster management initiative, endorsed by EAS Leaders in November 2011.” *East Asia Summit Rapid Disaster Response Workshop Evaluation Report, December 2013* [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. *East Asia Summit Rapid Disaster Response Workshop 23-24 September 2013, Report and Action Plan* [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. The process for rapid deployment of foreign medical teams, and the EAS rapid disaster response toolkit. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. AADCPII runs from 2008 to 2019, and was preceded by an earlier initiative that began in 2000. Australian support to the APEC Secretariat began in 2006. The current initiative is due to end in 2017. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. As CSETT generally occurs within a single country’s jurisdiction it may be better dealt with through bilateral programs. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. E.g. the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission, IP Australia, the Treasury, and the Departments of Finance, Infrastructure and Regional Development, Education, and Agriculture [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. The 2013-14 PSLP Cluster Study Quality at Implementation Report rated effectiveness as ‘adequate quality’. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. AMNEP also supports quality bilateral work with CSOs in the Mekong. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)