

Republic of the Philippines
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Quezon City

EIGHTEENTH CONGRESS
Third Regular Session

House Bill No. **10181**



Introduced by Representative Sharon S. Garin

EXPLANATORY NOTE

Sound public policies and programs are major determinants of development. Thus, it is imperative to know through regular and systematic evaluations whether our government agencies are doing the right programs and projects, implementing them correctly, efficiently and effectively; and achieving the results that matter in many government interventions—the improvement of our people’s lives.

Evaluation refers to the systematic and impartial reviews of the results of government policies and programs. It focuses on analyzing the efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and impact of public policies and programs. It can generate credible and valuable information for results-oriented planning, programming, budgeting, formulation and reformulation and implementation of various public policies, programs and projects. Evaluation can also contribute to good governance by promoting transparency and accountability for results among those who have been given the authority and funds to implement our public policies, programs and projects.

However, despite its huge potential as a tool for development, evaluation has not been widely and systematically integrated in our government’s processes and systems. Evaluation has been conducted on only a few and selected programs and projects. While the Executive Branch through Joint Circular No. 2015-01 of the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) and the Department of Budget and Management (DBM) has established an evaluation policy framework for programs and projects receiving budgetary support from the government, the Circular only applies to the agencies of the Executive Branch. Moreover, as an Executive Circular, its implementation is subject to uncertainty when there is a change in government administration.

Some countries have recognized the importance of evaluation by institutionalizing versions of National Evaluation Policy that apply to all branches and levels of government. Many other countries are in the process of establishing their own NEP (Rosenstein, 2015). A sound NEP that defines the purposes, responsibilities, functions and organizations of the public-sector

evaluation function in the country can ensure that there is sufficient supply and demand for credible evaluations in national development planning, programming, budgeting, and implementation.

This bill proposes the passage of a law establishing a National Evaluation for Results Policy (NERP) that will ensure that regular measurement, reporting, and utilization of the results of our public policies, programs, and projects. Its focus is to strengthen accountability for results of national government agencies and to ensure the credible evaluations are regularly produced and used to serve as guide in continuously improving the planning, formulation, budgeting and implementation of government interventions intended to promote sustainable development and improve the living standards of all Filipinos especially the poor and the marginalized.

Approval of this bill is earnestly sought.



SHARON S. GARIN
Party-list, AAMBIS-OWA

Republic of the Philippines
House of Representatives
Quezon City

EIGHTEENTH CONGRESS
Third Regular Session

House Bill No. 10181

Introduced by Representative Sharon S. Garin

AN ACT ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL EVALUATION FOR RESULTS POLICY (NERP)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Philippines in Congress assembled:

1 **Section 1. Short Title.** – This Act shall be known as the “National Evaluation for Results
2 Policy (NERP) Act.”

3
4 **Sec. 2. Declaration of Policy.** – It is the policy of the State to improve the overall effectiveness
5 of public policies, strategies, programs, projects, and other interventions to strengthen good
6 governance, transparency and accountability and learning through the use of evaluation
7 findings and promote evidence-based decision making. The NERP aims to contribute to the
8 achievement of inclusive development and poverty reduction goals by institutionalizing the
9 legal framework for the regular conduct of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) for results of
10 proposed, ongoing and completed development interventions.

11 **Sec. 3. Policy Objectives.** – The NERP intends to achieve the following specific objectives:

12
13 a.) Support for evidence-based decisions to ensure the timely provision by concerned
14 instrumentality to government policymakers, managers and other stakeholders of
15 transparent, impartial, independent and useful evidence- based information and
16 knowledge to strengthen the policymaking and decision- making processes;

17
18 b.) Promotion of learning and program improvement. Ensure the utilization, dissemination
19 and feedback of evaluation findings, and learnings for the continuous improvement of the
20 design, planning, programming, budgeting and implementation of public policies,
21 strategies, programs, projects, and other interventions;

22
23 c.) Transparency and Accountability. Ensure the accountability to various stakeholders and
24 taxpayers by government departments, agencies and various instrumentalities for public
25 expenditures and the delivery of development results or intended benefits.

26

1 **Sec. 4. Definition of Terms.** – The terms used in this Act are defined as follows:
2

- 3 a) **Evaluation** refers to the systematic and impartial assessment or review of a completed
4 or ongoing development intervention, i.e. policy, strategy, program or project, its design,
5 implementation and results. It aims to determine the relevance and fulfillment of
6 objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. An evaluation
7 should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of
8 lessons learned into the decision– making process. Evaluation should not be confused
9 with implementation monitoring and reporting, audit, inspection, investigation or
10 assessment of individual performance. Evaluation and monitoring are two separate
11 functions that fulfill different purposes and cannot be treated almost as if they were
12 synonyms;
13
- 14 b) **Monitoring** refers to the systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide
15 internal management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention
16 such as a project or program with indications of the progress made in implementing
17 activities towards intended results. The main purpose of monitoring is to enable project
18 management to keep track of what is happening and to check that progress is being made
19 towards the achievement of objectives. More effective monitoring could prevent projects
20 and programs from failing. Systematic monitoring, based on a monitoring framework, is
21 of great importance for evaluations, as it provides a significant part of the data on which
22 evaluation is based. Monitoring should be linked directly to project management on a
23 regular basis as the function provides key information useful for management;
24
- 25 c) **Results** refer to changes in a state or condition that derive from a cause-and-effect
26 relationship. There are three types of such changes—outputs, outcomes and impacts—
27 that can be set in motion by a development intervention. The changes can be intended or
28 unintended, positive and/or negative.
29
- 30 d) **Outputs** refer to the specific goods and services produced by budgeted and implemented
31 policies, strategies, programs, projects, and other interventions. Outputs are the results
32 of the completion of implementing activities. Refer specifically to Major Final Outputs
33 (MFO) defined as goods or services that a department, agency or government
34 instrumentality is mandated to deliver to external clients through the implementation of
35 the National Expenditure Program (NEP) or approved government budget;
36
- 37 e) **Outcomes** refer to the actual finite and measurable changes in the behavior of target
38 individuals, groups, or organizations and/or improvements in systems, the quality of
39 processes and services as an immediate effect of specific interventions. Refer more
40 specifically to Organizational Outcomes and Sector Outcomes. Organizational Outcomes
41 are the short- to medium-term benefits to the clients and community as a result of
42 delivering MFOs. Sector Outcomes are the longer-term benefits for the sector from
43 initiatives of the department/agency or government instrumentality;
44
- 45 f) **Impacts** refer to the fundamental, broad sectoral and higher-level societal changes (both
46 intended and unintended, positive or negative) that take place long after target individuals,

1 groups, systems or organizations have experienced the outputs and outcomes of specific
2 interventions. Refer more specifically to Societal Goals defined as the societal benefits
3 sought from sector-based economic activity or the intended desirable impacts of MFOs
4 on society;

5
6 g) **PAPs refer to the acronym for Programs, Activities and Projects.** It shall pertain to
7 the list of priority programs and projects that contribute to the societal goals, sector
8 outcomes, organizational outcomes and outputs spelled out in the Philippine
9 Development Plan (PDP). Programs are special undertakings by a
10 department/agency/instrumentality implemented within a definite period and intended to
11 result in some pre- determined goods and services. Refer also to a group of similar
12 projects. Projects are activities implemented within a specific period by a
13 department/agency/instrumentality to achieve the purpose for which it is established or
14 created or to deliver its MFOs;

15
16 h) **Results-Based Management System (RBMS)** refers to a management strategy that
17 focuses on performance and the achievement of results, i.e. outputs, outcomes, and
18 impacts. Refers specifically to Results Based Performance Management (RBPMS) as
19 established under AO No.5 series of 2011. RBPMS serves as the single performance
20 management system for the whole of the Executive Branch in place of the multiple and
21 disparate performance management systems that were currently being implemented. It
22 consists of a set of comprehensive performance indicators that cut across societal and
23 sectoral performance, down to organizational and individual performance. The logical
24 framework, the Organizational Performance Indicators Framework (OPIF) and the
25 Results Matrix (RM) are the underlying frameworks for the RBPMS, which will be used by
26 all government agencies mandated to exercise broad oversight over the performance of
27 all agencies in the government;

28
29 i) **Organizational Performance Indicators Framework (OPIF)** refers to a strategic
30 budgeting management framework. An approach to expenditure management or
31 budgeting that directs resources for major final outputs (MFOs) toward results and
32 measures performance by key quality, quantity, timeliness, and cost indicators;

33
34 j) **Logical Framework (logframe)** refers to a management tool used to improve the design
35 and planning of development interventions, most often at the project level. It involves
36 identifying strategic elements (inputs, outputs, outcomes or effects, and impact or goal)
37 and their causal relationships (also called results chain), performance indicators,
38 monitoring sources, and the assumptions or risks that may influence success and failure.
39 The logframe thus facilitates planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of a
40 development intervention. Results Chain: The causal sequence for a development
41 intervention that stipulates the necessary sequence to achieve desired objectives
42 beginning with inputs, moving through activities and outputs, and culminating in
43 outcomes, impacts, and feedback;

44
45 k) **Results Framework** refers to a management tool that illustrates how the results
46 statements at the PDP level (sector and sub-sector outcomes) will link to the OPIF

1 logframes (outputs and organizational outcomes) at the organizational level. OPIF
2 Agency Logical Framework (OPIF logframe): a planning and budgeting tool used to
3 establish the link of MFOs that department/agency delivers or produces through the
4 implementation of PAPs to the sector outcomes and societal goals it seeks to influence.
5 As part of the results framework, it shows the focus of resource allocation, spending,
6 monitoring, reporting and evaluation of results based on a set of performance indicators;
7 and
8

- 9 l) **Regional Project Monitoring and Evaluation System (RPMES)**, as established through
10 EO 376 (dated Nov. 1989, refers to a scheme for monitoring and evaluating projects at
11 the national, regional, provincial/city and municipal levels, with the extensive and active
12 participation of various government agencies, local government units (LGUs) and
13 nongovernment organizations (NGOs). The RPMES primarily aims to facilitate project
14 implementation, and devolve project facilitation, problem-solving, monitoring and
15 evaluation to the regional, provincial/city and municipal levels.
16

17 **Sec. 5. Coverage.** — The NERP shall apply to the following:
18

- 19 a) departments, agencies, state universities and colleges (SUCs), government-owned
20 and/or controlled corporations (GOCCs), government financial institutions and other
21 instrumentalities of the Executive, Legislative and Judicial branches of the National
22 Government; and
23
24 b) all public policies, strategies, programs, projects, and other development interventions
25 formulated and implemented by the above entities and funded by local and foreign funds
26 including those contracted to and executed, produced and delivered by private sector and
27 civil society organizations.
28

29 **Sec. 6. Evaluation Principles.** The credibility, quality and usefulness of evaluations will be
30 ensured through adherence to the following core principles:
31

- 32 a) Adherence to international good practice and evaluation standards. The national
33 evaluation policy will be consistent with internationally accepted evaluation norms,
34 standards and good practices in the context of RBM approaches.
35
36 b) Evaluation ethics. Ethical standards will apply to the managers of evaluations and
37 individual evaluators. Organizations and persons engaged in evaluation activities shall
38 abide by the Code of Conduct and Ethical Standards for Public Officials and Employees
39 (Republic Act 2 No. 6713).
40
41 c) Independence of evaluation process. There will be separation of evaluation management
42 and implementation responsibility from line management functions for policies, strategies,
43 programs and projects. Evaluators will be selected from a wide and diversified pool
44 according to agreed criteria. Evaluation reports will provide critical assessment and an
45 independent perspective, be informative, and recommend actionable follow-up.
46

- 1 d) Ensuring professionalism in the conduct and management of evaluation. Evaluations will
2 be undertaken by qualified technical experts and evaluators with the needed knowledge,
3 skills and abilities in evaluation as well as expertise and relevant experience on the
4 subject area they are evaluating. Evaluators will adhere to the highest technical
5 standards, and respond to all criteria of professionalism, including the responsible
6 handling of confidential information.
7
- 8 e) Transparency of evaluation process. Evaluation findings, conclusions, recommendations
9 and lessons learned will be disseminated to constituents, Congress and other oversight
10 agencies and partners concerned, to inform decision-making and support organizational
11 learning.
12

13 **Sec. 7. Evaluation Criteria.** - In all evaluations, however, the evaluation criteria must be
14 applied in an unambiguous and, above all, transparent way. Evaluation criteria refer to
15 different result levels founded on the logical framework or result chains.

16 At the minimum, evaluations of national government policies, strategies, programs, and
17 projects shall assess and report on the following five (5) internationally accepted set of criteria,
18 namely: effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact and sustainability.
19

20 **Sec. 8. Creation of the National Evaluation Council (NEC).** - A National Evaluation Council
21 (NEC) is hereby established as the lead agency for the full development and operationalization
22 of the NERP. The membership of the NEC shall ensure adequate representation of the
23 executive, legislative and judicial branches of the government. The NEC shall also ensure that
24 sufficient participation of experts and other stakeholders from the academe, private sector and
25 civil society are taken into consideration in its decisions. Its organizational and staffing pattern
26 shall be in accordance with existing DBM policies, rules and regulations.
27

28 **Sec. 9. Composition of the National Evaluation Council (NEC)** - The NEC shall have eight
29 (8) voting members which shall consist of the following:

- 30 a) A career Undersecretary of the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) in
31 charge of monitoring and evaluation to be appointed by the NEDA Secretary and Director
32 General as his/her official representative to the NEC;
33
- 34 b) A career Undersecretary of the Department of Budget and Management (DBM) in charge
35 of government performance reporting, monitoring and evaluation and/or improvement as
36 Co-Chairperson, to be appointed by the DBM Secretary as his/her official representative;
37
- 38 c) The head of the Presidential Management Staff (PMS) or his/her official representative;
39
- 40 d) A career Deputy Secretary General/ Director General in charge of policy planning,
41 research and/or evaluation in the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the House
42 Speaker as his/her official representative;
43
- 44 e) A career Deputy Secretary General/ Director General in charge of policy planning,
45 research and/or evaluation in the Philippine Senate, to be appointed by the Senate
46 President;

- 1
- 2 f) A Deputy Court Administrator in charge of performance monitoring and evaluation of the
3 judicial branch, to be appointed by the Court Administrator as his/her official
4 representative;
- 5
- 6 g) A Commissioner of the Commission on Audit (COA) to be appointed by the COA
7 Chairperson as his/her official representative; and
- 8
- 9 h) The head of the Philippine Statistical Authority (PSA) or his/her official representative.

10

11 **Sec. 10. Functions of the NERP National Evaluation Council (NEC).** - The NEC shall
12 perform the following functions to operationalize the NERP:

- 13 a) provide overall policy direction and coordination on the implementation of the National
14 Evaluation for Results Policy (NERP), including its agenda, plans and strategies in all
15 branches of the government;
- 16
- 17 b) develop the basic guidelines for the systematic, impartial and credible evaluations of
18 national policies, strategies, programs and projects. Knowledge management and
19 learning from evaluation
- 20
- 21 c) serve as the national government's repository for M&E reports;
- 22
- 23 d) review the evaluation reports to ensure these meet international standards and good
24 practices;
- 25
- 26 e) disseminate the findings, recommendations and lessons learned from evaluations for use
27 in decision making by government policy makers and managers of programs and projects
28 in the executive, legislative and judicial branches of the government;
- 29
- 30 f) develop and strengthen institutional capacities for evaluation so that a critical number of
31 institutions are able to promote and facilitate quality evaluations;
- 32
- 33 g) build individual capacities for evaluation by organizing and conducting evaluation training
34 courses for evaluators, managers, and users of evaluation;
- 35
- 36 h) strengthen the enabling environment for evaluation by ensuring that all government
37 departments, agencies and instrumentalities understand and appreciate the value of
38 evaluation;
- 39
- 40 i) facilitate or manage the conduct of high-level evaluations (policy and strategy) and special
41 evaluation studies, on top of those independent evaluations conducted by departments,
42 agencies and instrumentalities;
- 43
- 44 j) prepare the annual National Evaluation Report for submission to Congress, NEDA Board,
45 oversight agencies and other government agencies and instrumentalities.
- 46

- 1 k) facilitate the development of national and regional M&E professional associations; and
- 2
- 3 l) work for the development and eventual recognition of evaluation as a profession.
- 4

5 The NERP NEC shall meet every quarter or as often as necessary. It may authorize the
6 creation of technical committees, advisory bodies and other mechanisms to ensure high-
7 quality evaluations

8

9 **Sec. 11. Creation of the NERP NEC Secretariat and its Functions.** - In the interim, the
10 Monitoring and Evaluation Staff of the NEDA shall serve as the NEC Secretariat. Within six
11 (6) months after the enactment of this policy, the NEC Secretariat shall be formally organized
12 to provide technical, managerial and administrative support to the NEC. The NEC Secretariat
13 shall be headed by an Executive Director.

14

15 Subject to the approval of the NEC and to existing government laws and regulations on
16 government organization, staffing, services and divisions as needed to effectively support the
17 NEC's functions and responsibilities shall be created.

18

19 The NEC Secretariat shall have the following functions:

- 20
- 21 a) recommend for the NEC's approval, evaluation policies, principles, standards, criteria,
22 strategies and guidelines for the effective implementation of the NERP;
- 23
- 24 b) recommend to the NEC the format and content of evaluation plans and reports;
- 25
- 26 c) monitor and report on progress and results of evaluation activities undertaken by the NEC
27 and covered entities;
- 28
- 29 d) serve as a repository of all evaluation plans and reports of the national government and
30 its departments, agencies and instrumentalities;
- 31
- 32 e) upload in its website within 15 days from completion all final evaluation reports for public
33 policies, strategies, programs, and projects of the national government and its agencies
34 and instrumentalities;
- 35
- 36 f) notify the key stakeholders of the national government within 15 days from completion
37 about final evaluation plans and completed evaluations of public policies, programs,
38 projects and services;
- 39
- 40 g) provide hard and soft copies of final evaluation reports to the following stakeholders of
41 the Philippine Congress: the House Speaker; the Senate President; the concerned
42 chairpersons and committee secretaries of congressional committees with jurisdictions
43 over public policies, programs, projects and services being evaluated; and the support
44 offices of the House of Representatives and the Philippine Senate performing budget and
45 policy research and technical assistance to the members of Congress;
- 46

- 1 h) prepare a consolidated report of individual evaluations, disseminate completed evaluation
2 reports and gather management replies and feedback (to the evaluation findings,
3 conclusions and recommendations);
4
- 5 i) conduct capacity-development activities on evaluation with partners from the government,
6 private and civil society sectors and donors and development partners;
7
- 8 j) provide Secretariat support to the NEC;
9
- 10 k) recommend sanctions and incentives; and
11
- 12 l) prepare a consolidated report of individual evaluations for the NEC's appropriate action.
13

14 **Sec. 12. National Evaluation Agenda (NEA)** - All departments, agencies and
15 instrumentalities of the national government from the Executive, Legislative and Judicial
16 branches shall formulate and maintain a continuously updated six-year evaluation agenda, to
17 coincide with the timeframe of the Philippine Development Plan (PDP) and Public Investment
18 Program (PIP). The evaluation agenda shall specify public policies, strategies, programs,
19 projects and services to be subjected to impact, thematic, project or self-evaluations and their
20 timelines.
21

22 The NEC, with the assistance of its Secretariat, shall review the six-year evaluation agenda of
23 national government agencies and instrumentalities to identify high- priority evaluations for
24 integration in the National Evaluation Agenda.
25

26 **Sec. 13. Creation of Independent Evaluation Units (IEUs) of Covered Entities.** - The head
27 of any national government department, agency or instrumentality shall establish capable
28 Independent Evaluation Units (IEU) initially at the central level subject to existing policies,
29 rules, and regulations of the DBM on organizational and staffing pattern changes. The head
30 of the IEU reports directly to the head of the department, agency or instrumentality.
31

32 To support the work of the independent evaluation unit, the head of the national government
33 department, agency or instrumentality shall establish a senior-level M&E advisory committee
34 for support and oversight of M&E initiatives of the entity covered by the NEP.
35

36 **Sec. 14. Utilization of Evaluation Findings and Recommendations.** - The heads of
37 departments, agencies and instrumentalities shall submit reports on their management
38 response and other actions on the findings, conclusions and recommendations of completed
39 evaluations, to the NEC and its Secretariat, the Speaker of the House and the Senate
40 President and to the relevant committee chairpersons and support offices of the two branches
41 of Congress.
42

43 The heads of departments, agencies and instrumentalities of the executive, legislative and
44 judicial branches of the national government shall ensure that Evaluation findings
45 recommendations and lessons learned are used to guide and improve the design, planning,

1 programming, budgeting, implementation and oversight of public policies, strategies,
2 programs and projects.

3
4 The NEC and its Secretariat and the evaluation units and M&E advisory committees of the
5 entities covered by this policy shall monitor the actions of the national government and its
6 agencies and instrumentalities, on evaluation findings and recommendations.

7
8 **Sec. 15. Funding for Operationalization of the NERP.** – The national government and its
9 departments, agencies and instrumentalities in the Executive, Legislative and Judicial
10 branches shall allocate at least three percent (3%) of their annual budgets for the
11 implementation of the NERP. Such funds shall be used for:

- 12 a) evaluation capacity development;
13 b) ongoing salaries, recruitment and training to ensure an adequate supply of internal
14 personnel competent in evaluation.
15 c) operations and maintenance; and,
16 d) external evaluation professional service fees.

17
18 **Sec. 16. Implementing Rules and Regulations.** – Within sixty (60) days from the effectivity
19 of this Act, the NEDA and the DBM, in coordination with other concerned agencies, shall
20 formulate the rules and regulations to effectively implement the provisions of this Act.

21
22 **Sec. 17. Amendment.** - The findings, recommendations and learnings from the formative and
23 summative evaluations, in addition to the feedback of various stakeholders including but not
24 limited to the NEC and its Secretariat, neutral evaluation units of entities covered by the NER
25 and private sector and civil society organizations including international donor agencies shall
26 guide proposed amendments of the NEP including the basic guidelines for NEP's
27 implementation formulated by the NEC.

28
29 **Sec. 18. Repealing Clause.** – All laws, decrees, orders, rules and regulations or other
30 issuances or parts thereof inconsistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed or
31 modified accordingly.

32
33 **Sec. 19. Separability Clause.** – If any portion or provision of this Act is declared
34 unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act or any provision not affected thereby shall remain
35 in force and effect.

36
37 **Sec. 20. Effectivity.** – This Act shall take effect after fifteen (15) days following the completion
38 of its publication either in the Official Gazette or in a newspaper of general circulation in the
39 Philippines.

40
41 *Approved,*