

**Interim Review of
Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA)
for the Period July 1, 2007, to November 30, 2011¹**

Wilfrido Cruz and Tran Xuan Thao²
January 29, 2012

¹ Evaluation commissioned by the International Development Research Centre (of Canada).

² Wilfrido Cruz is a consultant in Environmental Economics, based in Manila, Philippines, and Washington, DC, USA; Tran Xuan Thao is an education specialist and Vice Rector, Tan Tao University, Long An, Vietnam.

Table of Contents

Contents

List of Acronyms	3
Executive Summary	4
I. Introduction	6
1. Background of the Evaluation	6
2. Methodology	6
2.1 Sources of Information	6
2.2 Approach to the Evaluation	7
II. Evaluation of Progress toward Achieving EEPSEA Goals	8
1. Output Indicators	8
1.1 Research Output Indicators	8
1.2 Training Output Indicators	10
2. Assessment of Outcomes and Impact	11
2.1 Indicators of EEPSEA Program Outcomes	11
2.2 Indicators of EEPSEA Program Impact	15
3. Feedback from Interviews	16
3.1 Feedback on Research	16
3.2 Feedback on Training	17
III. Impacts, Constraints, and Opportunities Identified in Interviews	18
1. High-visibility Policy Conferences and Cross Country Research Projects	18
2. Changes to the Biannual Workshop	19
3. More Involvement of Policy-makers and Local/Regional Resource Persons	20
4. Support for a Network of EEPSEA Alumni	20
5. Building on the Success of Regional and National Training Activities	21
6. Promoting Awareness of Emerging Sustainable Development Concerns, especially Gender Issues	22
7. New Challenges from Donors' Perspective	23
IV. Findings and Recommendations	24
Main Findings	24
Recommendations	25
Appendices	30
Appendix 1: Terms of Reference for the Evaluation	30
Appendix 2. Country, Regional, and Donor Interviews	32
Appendix 3: Interview Guides	33
Appendix 4: EEPSEA Results-Based Management Logframes	35
Appendix 5: Distribution of EEPSEA Projects 2007-2011 by country	38
Appendix 6: List of Cross Country Projects	39
Appendix 7: EEPSEA Publications 2007-2011	42
Appendix 8: Researcher-respondents stated impacts of their EEPSEA research	43
Appendix 9: Number of Small Research Grants 2007-2011 by Country	43
Appendix 10: Regional Courses 2007-2011	45
Appendix 11: In-country Training Courses 2007-2011 by country	46
Appendix 12: Regional Training Partnerships 2007-2011	47
References	48
Bio-Data of External Evaluators	49

List of Acronyms

ADB	Asian Development Bank
ADBI	Asian Development Bank Institute
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
EEPSEA	Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia
ERIA	Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
LCV	Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam (terminology used by ERIA)
MRC	Mekong River Commission
SANDEE	South Asian Network for Development and Environmental Economics
SEAMEO	Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization
SEARCA	Southeast Asian Regional Center for Graduate Study and Research in Agriculture
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
WB	World Bank

Executive Summary

This interim review was commissioned by IDRC to assist EEPSEA and its donors in evaluating the progress of the EEPSEA program in the past five years. Specifically, it is intended to help in their coming discussions on the direction for EEPSEA programs beyond this funding cycle (ending in mid-2012). Following the approach outlined in our terms of reference, a series of interviews with various stakeholders and key actors in environmental programs in the region (government officials, university and research institute officials, representatives of regional agencies and donors), as well as program participants and alumni, was conducted from November 7 to December 20, 2011. In addition to these interviews, annual reports and a participant survey conducted by EEPSEA provided information for the review.

Section II presents our assessment of progress in EEPSEA's research and training activities. During the review period, EEPSEA has delivered a remarkable array of research and training products. There have been almost one hundred research grants and nine cross-country research projects, covering a wide range of topics, from micro-oriented valuation of environmental services of conservation areas to region-wide issues of adaptation to climate change. Individual research grants traditionally have been the strength of the program, but during the review period, within a short span of only 2-3 years, EEPSEA has developed a portfolio of cross country research activities that have already resulted in several high-visibility, high impact products.

Following priorities defined in its last programming exercise, EEPSEA's research effort in less capable countries in the region, such as Cambodia and Laos has also substantially grown. Progress in this area is closely linked to increased effort in organizing national level training courses to select countries and to providing them with opportunities for small research projects.

The program of regional training courses, including EEPSEA's flagship training course, the Regional Short Course in Environmental Economics, and a half dozen special topic training courses were well received. Tracking surveys (implemented by EEPSEA in October 2011) show that many graduates of these courses have gone on to serve as researchers in the grants program and to contribute to their academic institutions or government agencies with enhanced skills.

Section III lists the various impacts, constraints, and opportunities that EEPSEA researchers, participants, partners, and donors discussed with us during the interviews. An underlying theme that we saw in the interviews was a recognition and appreciation of the key role that EEPSEA has been playing in promoting capacity-building in the region. These interviews provided valuable information and insight for our evaluation.

Section IV contains our findings and recommendations:

1. *Convene annual policy conference.* Based on the success of the Policy Impact Conference convened in Hanoi in February 2010, EEPSEA should consider organizing an annual policy conference, based on research completed during the year. In terms of highlighting program impact, this annual policy conference could also serve as a new “flagship”

activity of EEPSEA.

2. *Reduce number of research workshops.* EEPSEA's traditional schedule of having two Research Workshops per year needs to be modified, given the wide range of new activities and research products that EEPSEA now manages. A change to a system of having only one Research Workshop a year would be practical and cost-effective. The scheduling of the research grants themselves would be made more flexible, and the need for international resource persons to serve as research advisers would be reduced.
3. *Organize an alumni network.* This could serve as a source of resource persons and country level advice. More importantly, it can also provide feedback and support to current EEPSEA projects and will enhance country and regional “ownership” of the various topics and activities of EEPSEA programs. In addition to the direct contribution of such a network, fostering the expansion of open discussion of timely policy issues closely parallel donors’ region-wide priorities, to enhance openness and transparency in policy deliberations.
4. *Continue to expand cross country research.* Cross country research can have high policy impact, but the cost of organizing and managing them are much greater than with the individual research grant. It will help EEPSEA significantly if regional or national partners can take care of most of the administrative aspects and if funding needs are shared. However, EEPSEA should be prepared to lead on the environmental economics methods to be used in the research.
5. *Enhance Involvement of Policy-makers.* While some research projects already involve policy makers or natural resource managers early in the process of identifying and developing the research approach, EEPSEA should encourage researchers to explore this at the start of each research project. Involving government officials is particularly important in countries where the government bureaucracy is a significant constraint.
6. *Base training programs in a country or regional host institution.* This would enhance the institutionalization of the training program in the region, at the same time allowing the program secretariat in Singapore to focus on what is becoming an increasingly complex research program.
7. *Initiate More Research on Gender Issues in Sustainable Development.* The one area of work where EEPSEA has lagged is in promoting more research regarding gender-related issues in environmental and natural resource management. By contrast, support for various support programs (including research) on promoting gender equality and related issues in sustainable development is of high priority among EEPSEA’s donors and capacity building partners. To accelerate progress in this area, EEPSEA will have to step up its research programming on the theme of gender issues and sustainable development.
8. *Promote more focused partnerships with other regional organizations/donors.* During the review period, EEPSEA has actively worked with various regional organizations, on both research and training activities. One modification that EEPSEA should consider would be to focus its work with one or two key partners, to develop a multi-year, high profile program. Two potential regional partners are ASEAN and MRC.

I. Introduction

1. Background of the Evaluation

Intended users/use. This evaluation was commissioned by IDRC to assist EEPSEA and its donors in evaluating the progress of the EEPSEA program from July 1, 2007, to the present. Specifically, it is intended to help in their coming discussions on the direction for EEPSEA programs beyond this funding cycle (ending in mid-2012). (For details, please refer to Appendix 1, Terms of Reference of the Evaluation.)

Need and purpose. The context of this review is the coming round of discussions and end-of-cycle evaluation of EEPSEA in mid-2012. Donors specifically were interested in getting some early feedback from the countries involved in the program, regarding the priorities and activities that are most relevant to the region in general and to their country needs in particular. As an external evaluation, the main contribution of this report will be in presenting an independent perspective, based primarily on the evaluators' in-depth discussions with a wide range of stakeholders in the region, including national officials, training and research participants, university professors and administrators, and representatives of regional and international organizations.

Values and principles guiding information collection, interviews, and confidentiality. Due to the limited time available for this review, the primary information gathering activity was based on key-informant interviews. Group interviews were organized during the November 2011 Biannual workshop in Phnom Penh, covering 7 country groups of EEPSEA researchers and trainees. Individual interviews were then conducted from December 5-20, 2011, in 5 countries: Indonesia, Laos, the Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam. Equal weight has been given to the feedback from all interviews, and the evaluation authors, as interviewers, have tried to represent respondent views as directly and accurately as possible, while preserving individual confidentiality.

Secondary information, based on EEPSEA progress reports and tracking surveys, were helpfully provided by the EEPSEA secretariat. While EEPSEA provided these documents, the interpretation and presentation of these secondary data sources is guided solely by the authors' independent assessment and judgment. Other documents were program strategy papers from donors and regional partners.

Capacity-building intentions. An underlying goal of the evaluation is to support EEPSEA's efforts at capacity-building to enhance research capability in the universities, government agencies, and other institutions in the region.

2. Methodology

2.1 Sources of Information

Following the goals outlined in the terms of reference, a series of interviews with various

stakeholders and key actors in environmental programs in the region (government officials, university and research institute officials, representatives of regional agencies and donors), as well as program participants and alumni, was conducted from November 7 to December 20, 2011. The information gathered during these interviews together with the annual reports and participant survey conducted by EEPSEA make up the main data source for the evaluation.

Interviews. Two sets of interviews were conducted as the main source of information for this review. The first set of interviews was made up of group discussions with senior EEPSEA resource persons and with country researchers from Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Laos, the Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam. These were conducted as focus group sessions, with the topics being (a) their impressions of current EEPSEA activities in their countries and (b) their suggestions on what EEPSEA should be doing or how to improve current activities. The groups were composed of staff and participants who attended the November 2011 Biannual Meeting in Phnom Penh.

The second set of interviews was conducted from November 7, 2011, to December 20, 2011. There were a total of 45 respondents, composed of officials and representatives of government agencies, universities, research organizations, NGOs, and donor agencies. Appendix 2 lists these interviews.

Annual reports and policy impacts report. For the review period, three annual reports and one progress report are available, spanning the period July 1, 2007, to March 31, 2011. Each report provides detailed information on the research grants and research program for the fiscal year, as well as a list of all the training courses and policy meetings convened during the period. In addition, *From Paper to Policy*, a report focusing on policy impacts of research from 2000 to 2011, provides information on the policy impact of select research products for the last decade. (See References for the list.)

Tracking survey and survey results. A survey of EEPSEA training participants during the review period was conducted by the EEPSEA secretariat for its own monitoring and planning needs, and the results were also made available to us. A total of 95 trainee-respondents completed the questionnaires. EEPSEA researchers were also surveyed, and 62 completed questionnaires were returned.

Other documents. Evaluators also benefited from a review of various program and strategy documents guiding the work of donors in the region (e.g., SIDA, CIDA, and IDRC programming documents available on their websites) and relevant international research and development institutions (e.g., ADB, ADBI, ASEAN, ERIA, WB). As appropriate these sources are cited within the report text.

2.2 Approach to the Evaluation

The valuable source of information for this evaluation was the individual and group interviews conducted by the authors. A set of basic questions was used to guide the interviews, and there was detailed discussion of issues and suggestions based on the responses and comments of respondent. This provided an in-depth treatment of specific

topics. (Refer to Appendix 3)

While the face-to-face interviews provided substantial information and feedback, the approach has the basic limitation of small sample data collection: in-depth information gathering comes at the cost of having a limited number of potential respondents. For this reason, the interview approach was augmented by using information from the reports noted above, especially those provided by EEPSEA secretariat and the results of a tracking survey of researchers and trainees.

Because of the limited number of interviews, care was taken to preserve confidentiality of responses. Thus some comments or recommendations, even if mentioned by respondents with specific detail are presented in less specific terms. To the extent possible, the evaluators conducted interviews jointly. The exceptions were interviews conducted by W. Cruz in the Philippines and T. Thao in Vietnam, due to time and resource constraints.

II. Evaluation of Progress toward Achieving EEPSEA Goals

As brief background, the goal and approach of EEPSEA (Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia) follows:

To support training and research in environmental and resource economics. Its goal is to strengthen local capacity in the economic analysis of environmental problems so that researchers can provide sound advice to policy-makers. The program uses a networking approach to provide financial support, meetings, resource persons, access to literature, publication avenues, and opportunities for comparative research ...³

In this assessment of EEPSEA progress we follow the topics of the program logframe, but for presentation purposes we list the progress indicators starting with output indicators, followed by outcomes, and conclude with impact indicators. (Refer to Appendix 4 for the EEPSEA program evaluation logframe.)

1. Output Indicators

1.1 Research Output Indicators

Overall Research Program

Over the period July 2007 to December 2011, EEPSEA has delivered a remarkable array of research and training activities. Within its research program, there have been a total of 97 research grants, with more than a third of these given to female researchers, and with up to 22 individual grants approved in some years. There were also nine cross-country grants approved during the period, involving 40 sub-projects at the national level. (Refer to

3 EEPSEA Progress Report, July1, 2010-March 31, 2011

Appendix 5.)

These numbers represent substantial increases in the total research program effort compared to those for the previous five years: the number increased by more than one-third.⁴ With regard to the specific area of cross-country research, this was a relatively new area of EEPSEA research during the previous review period (2005 to 2008). At that time there were only a few projects, dealing with climate change adaptation and valuation for biodiversity conservation.

Thus, with respect to research output, EEPSEA progress was significant in two areas:

(a) Within a short span of only 2-3 years, it has developed a portfolio of cross-country research activities that have already resulted in several high-visibility, high-impact products. In addition to the Research Grants, starting in FY 08 EEPSEA initiated a series of collaborative, region-wide studies on the broad topic of Climate Change Impacts and Adaptation in SEA. This sub-program of research has produced several reports for national policy-makers, and it has also created a region-wide impact when the 2009 mapping study on climate change vulnerability was released. The research results were widely reported in the media and various high-level policy meetings were convened for its presentation and discussion.

In addition to the first set of topics, several new specific topics were addressed. There were regional studies on climate change, drinking water supply improvement, protected area funding and management constraints, and willingness to pay for conservation of endangered species in four countries. There were also two additional regional studies on climate change.

In terms of increasing policy relevance, the cross-country research program has the potential to provide EEPSEA with many opportunities to have high impact results. However, while these are potentially productive and high-impact projects, the cost of organizing and managing them are much greater than with the individual research grant. Different administrative and funding modalities are available, and EEPSEA has actually been utilizing different approaches, as can be seen from the list of cross country projects in Appendix 6.

(b) There was also progress with the individual research grants program. Aside from the large increase in number of projects, there was also increased effort to enhance the research program's contribution to national policy dialogue. The period saw an increased focus on preparation of policy recommendations and organization of outreach conferences. There were 35 research reports and 36 policy briefs published from 2007-2011, and a stand-alone policy impact conference, highlighting 40 projects where EEPSEA research contributed to policy change, was convened in Hanoi in February 2010.

In addition to internal publications and popular media articles, the annual reports list a total of 31 articles published in environmental economics or related professional journal for July 2007 to March 2011. (Refer to Appendix 7.)

⁴ Based on data from EEPSEA Annual Reports, various years listed in References, and Jeffrey Vincent, 2008, Evaluation of EEPSEA, January 1, 2005 to June 30, 2008.

Special Research Areas/Themes

Increased Effort in Less Capable Countries. Previous reviews and the current work program of EEPSEA identified the need to have a special focus on the less capable countries in the region, specifically Cambodia and Laos, and to a lesser extent, Vietnam.

In the overall research program, both Cambodia and Laos lag in terms of research grants awarded. Appendix 5 shows that these two countries have only 5 research projects (of the total 97 projects) for the review period. This reflects the low level of research capability, as university and government researchers are not able to compete effectively with researchers from other countries for the available grants. It should be noted that EEPSEA does not set aside research project “quotas” for the various countries in the region. Instead, in cases where it is clear that select country researchers (or provincial researchers in the more capable countries) are at a disadvantage in the regional competition, EEPSEA assists them in two ways. First, it provides country training opportunities to help researchers improve their skills. Second, it has a separate local level small research grants program.

This select, country small grants program has been successful in involving a growing number of Laos and Cambodian researchers. This success is due to the proactive approach taken by EEPSEA, to conduct more local training courses in these countries. As will be noted below, these additional country-level training has provided sufficient research skills for researchers to implement the small grant project.

Need to increase support for research on gender issues in sustainable development. While EEPSEA has successfully promoted new research topics or approaches, such as climate change adaptation and constrained optimization/behavioral economics, one area requiring further support is gender-relevant issues in sustainable development. EEPSEA has made a start to promote more work in this thematic area by identifying it as a key area of research in its current call for research proposals. At present, however, there is only one research project that specifically deals with gender issues: Engendering Environment and Natural Resource Economics Research Framework, a project being implemented by Philippine researchers.

1.2 Training Output Indicators

The methodology-oriented training activities, the special audience training courses, and the twice-yearly EEPSEA Workshops may all be viewed as integral part of the development of research capacity. In the first case, the training has direct input into the improvement of research capacity; in the second case the policy conferences help raise awareness and promote discussion of pressing environmental or natural management issues of the day; and in the third case, it does both.

Methodology-Oriented Training Courses

The Regional EE (Environmental Economics) Training Course. The Regional EE Training Course may be viewed as the “flagship” training activity of the program. It is offered every even year, and the admissions requirement (and process) is significantly more selective than in the other training courses. The program is meant to provide a world-class introduction to

the field of environmental economics, though the topic selection (given the available 3-week schedule) is necessarily much constrained.

The curriculum of the training course has remained fairly constant during the review period. Indeed, there have been limited topic changes over the years – the exception being the dropping of the general equilibrium/macroeconomic component of the program.

Two Regional EE courses were conducted during the review period. (Refer to Appendix 10. Regional Courses.) A total of 62 trainees attended the two courses. In addition to the Regional EE course, there were six other, methodology-oriented regional courses on: econometrics, survey method errors, water sanitation planning and policy, stated preference methods, behavioral economics, and computable general equilibrium modeling. Including the Regional EE course, the courses included a total of 280 participants. One noteworthy aspect of the participants was that *almost half of the trainees (43%) were women*.

National Training Courses for Teachers

An innovation in the training program is the National Teachers' Training in EE. This was introduced in Vietnam (FY 07), and followed up with an entire series of 8 national courses. (Refer to Appendix 11.) This program of national teachers' courses is especially relevant for low capacity countries in the region. These countries have lagged with regard to research and teaching capacity, and the national training courses serves as a major input for capacity building.

It is also important that EEPSEA has mobilized local and regional resource persons to serve as lecturers and advisers for these national seminars.

Special Audience Courses

EEPSEA has had a fair amount of success with new courses designed for special audiences – for journalists and for members of the judiciary. In the future, we think another sector to consider for training courses are legislators or parliamentarians and their technical staff.

This is another area where EEPSEA's environmental economics teaching or awareness-raising focus has a positive contribution to related development objectives of its donors and partners. In this case, these types of training events will involve new (high profile) sectors and likely help improve the level of discussion and openness in development issues in general.

2. Assessment of Outcomes and Impact

2.1 Indicators of EEPSEA Program Outcomes

Outcome 1 – Increased capacity of SEA researchers to analyze environmental problems

On Indicator 1.a (number of researchers trained by EEPSEA) and Indicator 1.b (number of training courses offered by EEPSEA), during the review period, a total of 280 participants received training from three Regional Courses on Environmental Economics and from six special methods seminars.

On Indicator 1.c (number of EEPSEA-trained researchers occupying key positions in universities, government, and international organizations) -- at the time of their participation in EEPSEA courses, many of the EEPSEA trainees occupied key positions in university faculties, government agencies, and some in regional organizations. It was not possible to get data on their current positions from the EEPSEA tracking survey summary tables. However, from our interviews, we received feedback that many past participants continued to work at universities and government agencies.

Outcome 2 – Increased analytical capacity of researchers in weaker countries (Laos and Cambodia) in tackling environmental problems

Regarding Indicator 2.a (number of training courses for researchers in weaker countries) and Indicator 2.b (number of researchers receiving training in weaker countries), there were special programs for the two countries: 6 local training courses were organized, and a total of 141 researchers were able to attend these courses in both countries (source: Table 12 of *EEPSEA Internal Review and Donor Report*). In addition, female participants made up about 10% of trainees in Cambodia and about 20% of trainees in Laos. This proportion is less than average for all EEPSEA training, and suggests the need for increasing female participation in these countries in future training.

On Indicator 2.c (number of research projects approved), 11 small grants were approved for research researchers from Laos, but there were none for Cambodia.

From our interviews in the two countries, we observed that key university and government officials were EEPSEA training participants or researchers. For example, in Laos the permanent secretary of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment herself is an EEPSEA alumna and was a former member of the EEPSEA advisory council. About 10 members of her staff have attended an EEPSEA course, and several have gone on to pursue advanced degrees in environmental economics or management. One of the leading researchers in the Faculty of Economics of National University was an EEPSEA trainee and had completed EEPSEA research projects.

Outcome 3 – Increased capacity of national institutions and researchers in applying a holistic view of environmental economics (incorporating social sustainability and gender equality issues)

On Indicator 3.a (number of new universities/colleges teaching environmental courses and number of new courses in environmental economics), we did not have data on number of new universities or colleges teaching environmental economics courses. However, from the tracking survey of trainees, more than a quarter of respondents reported that they had contributed toward establishing a new degree program in their school.

With regard to number of EEPSEA researcher working with multi-disciplinary research teams (Indicator 3.b), the EEPSEA tracking survey respondents reported that more than two-thirds of them work with such multi-disciplinary teams.

On Indicator 3.c (proportion of women involved in EEPSEA activities), the outcome has been impressive: women made up 43% of training participants, 35% of researchers, 33% of

senior lecturers in the regional environmental courses. Indeed, in the advisory committee of EEPSEA, there were 3 female members of a total of 5 from 2007-2011. However, the current advisory committee now has 4 male members, with one seat vacant.

In terms of increasing research on gender issues in sustainable development, 30% of researchers in the tracking survey reported having addressed gender in their EEPSEA research. However, this was not different from the percentage that also addressed gender issues in non-EEPSEA research, suggesting that, compared to other research programs, there was no additional incentive to include gender issues in EEPSEA research.

We were not able to find data on Indicator 3.d (number of EEPSEA researchers acting as resource persons in training courses sponsored by other regional organizations).

Outcome 4 – increased quality of knowledge/research produced

On Indicator 4.a (number of peer-reviewed journal publications from EEPSEA research), in addition to internal publications and popular media articles, the annual reports list a total of 31 articles published in environmental economics or related professional journal for July 2007 to March 2011. (Refer to Appendix 7.)

It was not possible, given the time frame for this review, to check what proportion of these journal publications were peer reviewed. However, the 5-6 journal publications a year, in the context of a research program with about 20 projects starting and closing yearly, suggests that one in about 4 projects are published in journals. (Note that the journal publication rate is actually higher for this 4 year period if we include the 8 articles published in FY 2008, in a special issue of ASEAN Economic Bulletin, edited by the former EEPSEA Director.)

In addition, the average journal publication rate of about 8 (including the ASEAN Economic Bulletin articles) compares favorably with the publication rate for the two previous review periods. Given that almost all other research outputs, not published in external journals, are published in one of the EEPSEA reports, this is a noteworthy accomplishment.

Due to time constraints, we were not able to do an independent survey of the amount of citations of EEPSEA funded research (Indicator 4.b). However, from the tracking survey of EEPSEA researchers, 22 or 37% reported that their research had been cited in other publications or in popular media.

On Indicator 4.c (number of research presented in international conferences), 33 respondents or more than half in the survey of researchers, reported presenting their study in some policy meeting or dialogue, and 40 presented theirs in a conference. However, we are not able to determine what proportion of these conference presentations were international.

Outcome 5 -- Enhanced interaction between researcher and policy makers

On Indicator 5 (number of courses for policy makers where environmental economics cases are presented), we were not able to find the total number of courses, but according to the donors' report, during the review period, there was one regional course with 30 senior policy makers from 9 countries and a series of "Environmental Economics for Decision-Making" co-organized with SEARCA, where researchers presented their work to illustrate the use of environmental economics tools. In addition to these regional courses, there were several national workshops for policy-makers.

Outcome 6 -- Increased regional collaboration and knowledge sharing

Regarding Indicator 6.a, the number of cross country research projects is 40. On Indicator 6.b (number of regional EEPSEA participants acting as resource persons in another country's courses), EEPSEA has compiled an outstanding group of about a dozen regional resource persons from its own alumni pool. Most of them are from Indonesia, Philippines, and Thailand, and there is at least one each from China and Vietnam. During the interviews, we met several EEPSEA participants who are lecturers in their universities in Cambodia, China, Laos, and Vietnam and who are potential regional resource persons. However, their main constraint is their limited capacity to make presentations in English.

Outcome 7 -- Increased sustainability

On Indicator 7.a (number of national associations/local organizations collaborating with EEPSEA on joint training activities), EEPSEA has forged strong relationships with national institutions or organizations in four countries in the region: Indonesia (Indonesian Regional Science Association), China (Environmental Economics Program in China), Philippines (Resources and Environmental Economics Foundation of the Philippines), and Vietnam (Vietnam Association of Environmental Economics).

Several joint activities have been conducted with these national partners, and the Environmental Economics Program in China, in particular, has strong potential to independently provide high quality research and training programs within China in the future. In addition to these organizations, EEPSEA has strong ties to many academic departments and institutions in the region and have conducted joint training with these.

On Indicator 7.b (number of regional organizations co-funding research/training courses), the EEPSEA partners in cross country research projects include the Climate Change and Water program of IDRC, WorldFish, and SANDEE. In training programs, EEPSEA has on-going cooperation with SEARCA, and specific training projects with a range of regional partners, listed in Appendix 12, Regional Training Partnerships.

On Indicator 7.c (number of institutions teaching Environmental Economics through EEPSEA's influence), it is possible to identify such teaching institutions but difficult to determine the extent of their dependence upon EEPSEA for continuing their activities. With so many graduates of its regional training courses and related national activities providing either the initial source of teachers or periodic contributions to the "pipeline" of teachers for existing programs, our assessment is that EEPSEA is one of the most important and influential contributor to sustained environmental economics teaching capacity in the region.

2.2 Indicators of EEPSEA Program Impact

It is difficult to find information to evaluate progress toward the first type of impact noted in the EEPSEA program logframe (improved environmental performance resulting from the application knowledge-based policies). However, it is possible to assess progress in terms of the second type of impact listed (improved design and implementation of policies affecting the environment). In this case, the indicators include: input into discussions, design, and implementation of policies/management rules affecting the environment at relevant levels (local, sectoral, and national) of decision making.

Specific examples demonstrating how research results were used to introduce or improve environmental policies were summarized in the EEPSEA publication, *From Paper to Policy*, and EEPSEA's *Internal Review and Donor Report*. Of the 40 examples of policy reforms based on EEPSEA research projects in the first report, half were policy reforms made during the current review period. We list below some examples for different countries:

Vietnam

Preservation of My Son World Heritage Site (2008): cost-benefit analysis and differential pricing analysis for the site contributed to a conservation plan for My Son, adopted in December 2008.

Trade Liberalization and Industrial Pollution (2008): the results of research on the impact of trade liberalization and industrial pollution in Vietnam elevated the level of policy discussions among government officials and international organization representatives.

Philippines

Designing of Raw Water Fee Scheme in Cagayan De Oro (2009): the project led to the adoption of a water fee scheme to manage groundwater extraction in Cagayan de Oro City.

Oil Spill Valuation Results Used to Seek Damage Compensation (2007): valuation results were used in negotiations with the National Power Corporation, on the amount of compensation for damages suffered by affected coastal families and for damage to marine resources.

Thailand

Biogas – from Pollution to Energy Production (2008): the study provided the information for government to develop a system allowing pig farmers to sell excess biogas energy to the national grid, helping Thailand meet its renewable energy targets.

Indonesia:

Coal Mining Study in Kalimantan, Indonesia (2008): the study led to a local regulation to limit the use of public roads by coal trucks.

Malaysia

Determining Timber Resources Rates (2008): the results of the study helped in the formulation of appropriate and equitable rates for timber rents in the country.

China

Wetland Case Study Used to Develop Irrigation Reconstruction Plan (2009): the Heilongjiang provincial government used the study to assess the economic and environmental feasibility of an irrigation reconstruction project.

Cross-country/Regional Projects

Climate Change Vulnerability Mapping (2008): Following EEPSEA consultations in the region, it was found that there was significant interest among policy-makers, NGOs and donors on climate change adaptation strategies. In response to this need, EEPSEA launched a climate change vulnerability mapping assessment project in seven countries – Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam, Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand and China. The resulting Vulnerability Map, showing Jakarta to be the most vulnerable city in Southeast Asia, led senior Indonesian policy-makers and government officials to make a declaration to mitigate the risks associated with climate change. (Source: EEPSEA *Internal Review and Donor Report*.)

Lastly, in addition to information from the reports, the EEPSEA survey of researchers provided data on their self-assessment of the policy contribution of their research. (Refer to Appendix 8.) Many of them, about 53%, reported being able to present their results at a policy forum or dialogue. Also, about 65% were able to present their research results in local and regional conferences.

3. Feedback from Interviews

3.1 Feedback on Research

On Promoting Research and Policy Discussion

Many of the interview respondents ranked the program among the best in the region in promoting both environmental economics research and training. While it is not possible to list all individual comments from the interviews, it was clear from the discussions that respondents generally viewed EEPSEA activities positively.

Aside from the financial resources that EEPSEA makes available for research, three other less tangible contributions were mentioned. First, EEPSEA's ability to provide funding for research is, of course appreciated in the region. However, in some countries (e.g., Thailand, Indonesia) funding itself is not always the main constraint as national or international financial resources may be available. In this case, research expertise and inter-agency coordination is a bigger constraint, and EEPSEA's *ability to mobilize research interest and cooperation among agencies* is the major contribution.

A second type of contribution was mentioned by researchers involved in a cross-country research project. They mentioned that although communication among country teams can be difficult they had gained from *the exchange of ideas and experiences* in their project discussions.

The third case is relevant for less open countries in the region. In this example, it was

pointed out that because of EEPSEA's track record for professional and objective approach, researchers associated with EEPSEA are able to ask policy questions that cannot be raised in projects implemented only by local institutions. As noted by one respondent, "We are not able to challenge the system, but EEPSEA can." This ability *to provide a more open forum for policy discussion* is something that does not develop overnight. It's the product of long-term cooperation, and mutual trust and understanding. More importantly, it can actually contribute to the broader goal of EEPSEA's donors and partners, to nurture openness for research and policy making in all countries in the region.

On Impact in Less Capable Countries

Several respondents noted the important contribution that EEPSEA's country-level research support has provided. This has led to increased support for local researchers, with high quality resource persons.

Local and regional resource persons may also be helpful for programs in the LCV countries. In the past few years, EEPSEA has been able to involve an increasing number of local or regional resource persons to serve as trainers and research advisers. Many respondents recognized the value of having able local or regional resource persons involved in the country projects, both in training and research advising. They especially emphasized the advantage that resource persons can have if they can speak the local language.

Related to the contribution of local resource persons, respondents said that EEPSEA's translation program for its research publications and training materials has been extremely helpful, especially among the less capable countries and the less developed regions of advanced countries.

On Global Environment Topics

Many respondents, especially those in government agencies, appreciated the contribution of EEPSEA in supporting a wide range of research on high priority global environmental issues, such as climate change-related resource management issues and biodiversity conservation. For example, the climate change studies were singled out by several respondents as the most relevant, with high visibility and impact in the region.

Several government officials, especially those from Indonesia and Vietnam, emphasized the importance of developing research capability in these global environment research areas. Improved capacity in this area is needed for their own country project discussions and to assist them in continuing international dialogue.

3.2 Feedback on Training

Several respondents pointed out the long term contribution of EEPSEA in the region to the teaching of environmental economics in particular and to increased awareness of sustainable development issues in general. Due to EEPSEA's teaching programs and development of training materials, the subject has been incorporated into the curricula of many programs at universities in the region (not only for economists). This is an example of a tangible impact of

an activity whose output is difficult to quantify.

There was also positive feedback on the expansion of national training programs for teachers and for special audiences. While the regional short course in EE is an excellent program, these are often accessible only to highly qualified trainees. The national program opens up potential participation in EEPSEA projects for a broader range of participants.

With regard to the special audience course, it was noted that training for some audiences may have wide impact in terms of awareness-raising on sustainable development issues. This may be especially true in the case of training for journalists, who may have many opportunities to write about what they have learned from EEPSEA courses.

Lastly, EEPSEA's efforts at preparing local teaching materials and at translating other publications were recognized as a key training contribution. In some countries language is seen as a barrier. In many cases that makes EEPSEA training course inaccessible for many since the language of communication and instruction is English. Training materials from training courses need to be shared with colleagues or students back home. However, the language barrier can be a major problem. EEPSEA already has an active resource material translation project, and it may be useful to study how more local institutions may be involved in translation projects.

III. Impacts, Constraints, and Opportunities Identified in Interviews

This section focuses on the comments and suggestions of the respondents in our interviews. They cover a wide range of topics. However, an underlying theme that we saw in the interviews was a recognition and appreciation of the key role that EEPSEA has been playing in promoting capacity-building in the region. The respondents had many suggestions, but these should be viewed primarily as a “wish-list” since they often did not consider their corresponding resource requirements.

1. High-visibility Policy Conferences and Cross Country Research Projects

Among the many EEPSEA activities during the review period, the one that respondents noted as having the most impact was the Hanoi policy impact conference, including the presentation of the results of the climate change vulnerability mapping exercise. Respondents mentioned that there is widespread interest to highlight policy outreach in the research activities, but that this is difficult to do for the individual researcher.

In the impact conference, EEPSEA adopted a high-visibility regional approach and provided an excellent forum for presentation of country research results. For this EEPSEA compiled the result of research projects that had the most policy impact in their countries, and presented these in a high level conference. It was also significant that EEPSEA added a region-wide presentation to the event: as part of the conference, EEPSEA organized a session to launch the results of the Climate Change Vulnerability Map in Vietnam and results of the

Cross-Country Project on Adaptation Behavior. This event was attended by government officials, senior university researchers, donor and international organization representatives, and other stakeholders.

The two main topics in this event highlight how EEPSEA can convene high impact policy meetings based on (a) its long term track record of quality country-level policy research and (b) strategic focus on pressing regional sustainable development issues. While there will not be the decade-long set of country policy impact examples in the future, the opportunity exists for EEPSEA to convene similar high level policy conferences in the future. This may be organized as an annual regional event and the venue may rotate among countries in the region.

Another key issue was the emphasis that has been given to expanding the cross country research projects. In terms of increasing policy relevance the cross-country research program has the potential to provide EEPSEA with many opportunities to have high impact results. However, while these are potentially productive and high-impact projects, the cost of organizing and managing them are much greater than with the individual research grant. Different administrative and funding modalities are available, and EEPSEA has actually been utilizing different approaches, as can be seen from the list of cross country projects in Appendix 5. The different approaches include: one organization (EEPSEA) undertakes all organizing and managing tasks for the different country studies; EEPSEA cooperates with one or two partner organizations and cooperatively manages the projects; EEPSEA serves as the lead organization and involves other organizations in supporting roles.

2. Changes to the Biannual Workshop

The biannual workshop has traditionally been an integral part of the EEPSEA research grants cycle. Research projects that are starting up and those that are in-progress are presented in the workshop for discussion and improvement. Most of the resource persons involved in the Regional EE Training Course are also engaged as advisers for the research grant. Therefore, these same resource persons often also serve in the biannual workshop. In addition to the research presentations, several topics of current methodological or policy interest are also included in the program. Thus, the workshops tend to have too many objectives and have fairly complicated programs (also requiring significant organizational and coordination resources).

Based on our assessment, one adjustment to consider may be to have only one research workshop each year. There are a number of reasons for such a change. First, the current system of research workshops has proved to be financially costly. In addition, over the years there have been an increasing number of other EEPSEA program activities, and less time is available for organizing two high profile workshops each year. (This was not the case in the early years of EEPSEA when there fewer courses and conferences to organize.)

However, the most important reason for a change would be a modified or flexible research approach. The two workshops per year system is linked to the one-year time frame for the original research grants approach. (Most projects, in fact, will typically take more than a year to complete, from approval time to final report; however, the template for the research cycle is one year.)

When the program was first designed there was the intent that a research project should be presented in a workshop then reviewed 6 months later in the next workshop. However, if EEPSEA were to shift to a more flexible research schedule, this would not require a uniformly timed review process. At the same time, if more regional advisers and government officials are involved, including having advisers from the same country as the researcher, then it may facilitate a continuous mentoring process, with overall coordination taking place at an annual workshop.

A second adjustment for the Biannual Workshop would be to reduce or eliminate the presentation of current policy or methodological topics during the research workshop. This would be particularly relevant if EEPSEA decides to have an annual policy impact conference, as suggested above. Thus, the workshop would be much more focused on the methods and results of the individual research projects.

3. More Involvement of Policy-makers and Local/Regional Resource Persons

In some research projects, policy-makers are already involved by individual researchers early in the process of identification of the topics, until the discussion of policy implications at the close of the study. However, while other research projects are also high quality, sometimes strategic policy dialogue is missing.

Respondents recognized that involvement of policymakers in the research activity early on in the process is very important. This is especially true in countries where the government bureaucracy is a significant constraint, such as in Vietnam. In these cases, policymakers need to be involved (in a sense, have “ownership”) of the projects from the very beginning. One approach may be to involve one or two senior government officials to be part of a project advisory board and have them participate from the preparation phase to the policy recommendation phase of the project. This is often difficult to do for individual researchers, but EEPSEA can facilitate this process by inviting government officials as external advisers to projects. They may also be invited to participate in the research workshops.

4. Support for a Network of EEPSEA Alumni

Current EEPSEA activities already include significant amounts of cooperation with regional agencies and support of national associations. As was pointed out in one of the country discussions, ideally EEPSEA should have a liaison office in every environment ministry to provide advice and assist in organizing activities. Of course, resources are not available for something like this, but on-going coordination by such agencies with local networks of EEPSEA researchers and alumni would be feasible.

However, there is no formal network of EEPSEA training and research alumni. Many respondents noted that there is significant opportunity to form such a network of EEPSEA trainees and researchers. EEPSEA would have to initiate this and provide seed money, and it could be organized as an alumni network and hosted by a university in the region.

Such a network would have a broad range of potential contributions in support of EEPSEA activities. It could sponsor a regular “forum” within countries for continuing exchange of ideas, and could invite other economists, as well as government officials and other stakeholders.

Network members would also be able to have on-going coordination with government agencies in their countries and could assist in providing information to them. For example, it was pointed out that many government agencies, especially in the less capable countries, need support for background papers and advice on country perspectives on international agreements and programs, such as REDD, CDM, carbon trading, the Montreal Protocol, and marine resources treaties.

Finally, an indirect, but no less important, product of alumni networking is that could promote more open discussion and even have debate of policy issues. This would probably be difficult to do in less open economies, but in this case it would be feasible because it would be within the program of EEPSEA. This dimension is relevant in terms of international and regional priority for promoting more openness and policy dialogue, and it features prominently in the program strategies of international donors, including EEPSEA’s donors and partners.

5. Building on the Success of Regional and National Training Activities

The Regional training course has been successful, but over the years the content of the course have not significantly changed while observed priority topics in environmental and natural resource management have evolved. The results of the interviews indicate that there is increasing interest on new research topics, and this might be the basis for modifying the training curriculum. Based on this, the authors propose the following additional topics for consideration:

- The economic framework for identifying the characteristics of global vs. national environmental problems and the concepts underlying the need for global environmental financing (as distinct from international development assistance).
- The introduction of an explicit, multi-disciplinary sustainable development framework to individual sub-topics of renewable/nonrenewable resource economics and industrial/municipal pollution management. Aside from traditional notions of environmental sustainability and economic growth, this framework would include concepts of social inclusion and poverty alleviation. This last set of concepts will have special implications for gender issues.
- Additionally, growing awareness of the importance of national level policy framework for environmental management suggests re-introducing some sectoral and macroeconomic topics for environmental management. This is already happening through the special methods courses on CGE modeling, and renewed interest (in ASEAN) on sectoral environmental valuation and accounting may also be addressed.

Regarding the program of national courses for teachers, this may be made the focal point of capacity building in countries in the region that have lagged with regard to research and teaching capacity. These countries include Laos, Cambodia, and to a lesser extent, Vietnam – the LCV countries, following ERIA's terminology.

Since the countries are clustered in Indochina, a regional center for this might be established in one of the countries of the area, such as Vietnam, with an in-country host institution, such

as a university or regional environmental agency. This could then be the center for training activities and alumni networking and support. Thus, the research program, research workshop, and policy impact conferences may continue to be managed directly out of Singapore, but most of the regional coordination for training courses could be run out of a country or regional host institution. This could provide some cost savings and would also contribute to increasing “institutionalization” of EEPSEA training within the region.

EEPSEA may also look into another model for training, such as setting up an EEPSEA training center in the region just as SEAMEO has done in education. SEAMEO has a center in each partner country that runs training programs in a particular area of education for all the other countries in the system.

Despite progress in some countries (China, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Thailand) there is still need to ensure a continuing “pipeline” of training for teachers. For this reason, similar national courses would continue to be organized in these countries, although the frequency of such courses may decline.

Aside from national training courses for teachers, training for special audiences have also been successful, and interview respondents recognized the potential value of working with these new sectors. So far, EEPSEA has organized training for members of the judiciary and for the media. The authors note that another target audience that might be considered are legislators or parliamentarians and their legislative research staff.

The national training courses may also serve as entry point to involve more officials and technical staff from government agencies. At present, government staff find it difficult to qualify to attend the Regional short course, often because they do not have advanced degrees. Yet, many of them are potential links to connect EEPSEA with the government and policy makers. To address this constraint, they may be invited to national courses, and depending upon their performance they may be admitted to the Regional Course. In addition, EEPSEA may consider having senior government officials to speak or participate in national courses, especially when national priorities are being discussed. It would also help to involve them regularly as advisers.

6. Promoting Awareness of Emerging Sustainable Development Concerns, especially Gender Issues

Gender aspects of sustainable development were not viewed as a pressing concern by some country and regional respondents, although several did recognize that this would help in improving long term management of natural resources and in identifying new ways of involving women in natural resource management projects.

However, the authors consider this lack of understanding of the issue as a normal constraint since there is often limited support for studies on development perspectives that are unfamiliar. In addition, there may be an over-simplification of the issues involved with the new topic: for example, some researchers view gender concerns primarily as topics on domestic violence or on the role of women in micro-finance projects. This suggests that the role of gender issues, as a fundamental component of the need for social inclusion and poverty alleviation in sustainable development, is still not widely understood.

While it may be true that lack of access for women in Southeast Asia may be more subtle (relative to regions such as the Middle East and south Asia), it is no less pervasive. For this reason, both regional and international development agencies have encouraged more programs to address gender issues, including both awareness-raising and policy research. For example, ASEAN has included this in its priority program area:

ASEAN leaders recognize and reaffirm the importance of women and their participation in development. ASEAN Member Countries have been supportive of efforts to promote the status of women and have participated actively in the regional and international arena pertaining to women's advancement⁵

The need to encourage research in this area is similarly supported by ADB and was the main theme in the World Bank's most recent *World Development Report*. As in the case of climate change adaptation, this topic presents EEPSEA with an opportunity to take the lead in integrating an important (but less understood) theme in applied environmental economics research. Because of EEPSEA's existing network and experience in convening regional, multi-audience conferences, it is well-placed to initiate work in this area, through a series of exploratory studies and conferences. In addition, since this topic is of high priority among many regional and international donors, additional financial support may be available.

7. New Challenges from Donors' Perspective

From donor perspectives, EEPSEA research has had huge impact, relative to modest budget needs. However, in the next phase of activities a systematic shift to a new approach may be needed. Elements of this new approach could include: enhanced "ownership" of the research program, based on joint development of priority research themes with national agencies and regional partners, and increased links to prominent think-tanks or research institutes in the region.

In terms of developing future programs of research themes, this "new approach" should consider:

- more comparative, cross-country research;
- bigger, multi-year research projects, with more direct links to policymakers.

In terms of specific themes, climate change adaptation and vulnerability issues will continue to be important especially since these are priorities for many national agencies, as noted, for example, in interviews in Indonesia and Thailand. Gender aspects of sustainable development should also be considered, and future progress in this area may require that EEPSEA convene meetings to discuss ways to move forward on this topic or engage new resource persons, to assist in identifying a research agenda.

Because of the increasing industrialization and urbanization in most countries in the region, new emphasis also may be given to urban and industrial environmental management problems. Lastly, a regional study to assess the policy impact of EEPSEA research grants may be part of the program to develop a new research approach.

⁵ From the official website of ASEAN.

IV. Findings and Recommendations

In this section, we consolidate the many comments and suggestions raised during the interviews we conducted, and we have added our own evaluation to distill the following findings and recommendations. Thus, while the recommendations are based primarily on our assessment, they build on the contributions of our respondents, many of whom actively participate in current programs or are alumni or partners of EEPSEA.

Following the key questions in our Terms of Reference (see Appendix 1), we first list our main findings on (a) EEPSEA's progress toward achieving the goals and outcomes, (b) our thoughts on the key environmental problems for research and training, and (c) ways in which EEPSEA's work may be more responsive to donors' strategic programs.

In the recommendations section, we list specific suggestions that respond to the last question in the TORs: what are our key advice for EEPSEA research programming, capacity building, and knowledge sharing, regarding: (a) cross country research, (b) enhancing policy influence, (c) capacity building in Laos and Cambodia, (d) initiating more work on gender issues in sustainable development, and (e) improving partnerships with other regional organizations and donors in the region.

Main Findings

Our broad finding is that EEPSEA has delivered on its research and training goals during the review period. Thus, our main approach in this synthesis is to suggest additional ways to improve on what is already a very productive program. (In a sense, EEPSEA is a victim of its own success since observers expect it always to do more.) In addition, we attempt to take a practical perspective by focusing on recommendations that, on balance, should not entail much more resources beyond the level of funding historically available to EEPSEA.

Regarding our view on the key environmental problems that should concern EEPSEA, we list four areas of work:

- EEPSEA's current emphasis on climate change implications and adaptation is well placed since this is an area of work that can only continue to become more important in the next few years. In addition to EEPSEA's current focus on climate change vulnerabilities and adaptation, it should develop a greater focus on the opportunities for reducing risk and vulnerability *through policy reform* by governments and affected communities in the region.
- A second theme to consider would be improved policies to address pressing urban and industrial environmental problems, especially solid waste management and flooding. Currently, the majority of EEPSEA research deal with natural resource issues, but the massive growth of cities and industries in low-lying areas in many countries has created increasing problems of pollution and flooding in urban areas.

- Third, sustainable development and water resource management in the Mekong river basin presents a major environmental challenge to four of the countries in EEPSEA’s program. Of these countries, Laos and Cambodia require special focus. In addition, there is already a potential regional partner that EEPSEA might work with in the Mekong River Commission. (This last point is discussed further in the partnerships section, below.)
- Fourth, there is increasing recognition that, in addition to environmental sustainability, the challenge of sustainable development requires addressing problems of social inclusion, specifically the role of gender. EEPSEA is currently working on a research project on the role of gender in environmental management, but more needs to be done. (Gender issues are further discussed in a specific recommendation, below.)

Regarding the challenge to make EEPSEA more responsive to donors’ strategic programs, the best opportunities for complementarity and cooperation are in the program areas that are addressed by all. EEPSEA is already actively working on environmental management, disaster risk management and mitigation, and on mainstreaming environmental considerations in development – themes that are also included in donors’ strategic approach. In addition to these, EEPSEA should consider increasing its effort in the following common themes:

- Promoting ownership and openness in development activities. EEPSEA currently has the capability and the opportunity to encourage more open discussion of policies, while directly involving local stakeholders. Our recommendations, below, on organizing local networks of alumni and on basing training program in a host country, can contribute to this effort.
- Increasing understanding and response to gender equality concerns. This is closely linked to the theme of sustainable development, and EEPSEA should invest resources in developing more training and research activities on this topic. (A separate recommendation, below, on gender issues provides more detail.)

Recommendations

The first three recommendations follow from our general assessment, above. The next five specifically respond to the questions in our Terms of Reference, regarding ways to move forward on research programming, capacity building, and knowledge sharing.

1. Convene Annual Policy Impact Conferences

During the review period the most notable, high-impact activity was EEPSEA's policy impact conference, convened in February 2010, in Hanoi, Vietnam. EEPSEA should build on the success of this initial “policy impact” conference. This conference was designed to showcase the achievements of EEPSEA-funded research conducted in 2000-2009. The conference was able to attract the participation of a broad range of stakeholders, including key donor representatives and high-level policymakers from all the countries in Southeast Asia.

The policy impact conference highlighted the results of 40 selected “impact stories,” based on EEPSEA research

Of course, an annual policy conference would not have the range of studies and policy impacts of the Hanoi event, which drew upon the results of a decade of research. Instead an annual conference could have two components. The first could present recent research results from the current program. The second component could then focus on getting feedback from the participants on (a) practical responses to the policy implications of the presentations and (b) recommendations on ways to move forward, including identifying priorities for follow up and future research. In terms of highlighting program impact, this annual policy conference could also serve as a new “flagship” activity of EEPSEA, especially if the role of the Biannual Workshop is modified (as discussed below).

2. Reduce Number of Research Workshops (Biannual Workshops) to one per year

As discussed at length in the previous section, the biannual workshop has been the “traditional” event that brings together current researchers, the Regional Course resource persons, EEPSEA staff and advisory council, and donor representatives (in the May edition). The schedule includes presentation of research progress and small group/individual working sessions to help improve research design or implementation. In addition to the research presentations, topics of current methodological or policy interest are also included in the program. Thus, the workshops tend to have mixed objectives and have fairly complicated programs (also requiring significant organizational and coordination resources).

One adjustment to consider would be to have only one research workshop each year. It would also not be a high-visibility meeting, as it is essentially a venue to improve work in progress. The logistical demands of organizing two of these meetings a year have been formidable, so reducing the number to one would free up significant time and resources for other activities. Though logistical considerations are considerable, the most important reason for a change would be a modified or flexible research approach, including de-linking the role of Regional Course lecturer from research grant adviser. If EEPSEA were to shift to a more flexible research schedule, this would not require a uniformly timed review process. At the same time, if more local and regional advisers are involved, smaller in-country meetings in addition to one annual research workshop would be sufficient for advising and follow-up.

A second modification for the Biannual Workshop would be to reduce or eliminate the presentation of current policy or methodological topics in its agenda. This would be particularly relevant if EEPSEA decides to have an annual policy impact conference, as suggested above. Thus, the workshop would be much more focused on the methods and results of the individual research projects. The high visibility, high impact meeting would be the policy conference.

3. Organize an Alumni Network

As every major education institution knows, involving alumni in a network can provide many benefits, both to the trainee and to the training program, long after the individual course or training has ended. EEPSEA already has a very active program of support for national

institutions and associations, and indirectly this program helps in keeping training and research alumni involved. However, there could be significant additional benefits if EEPSEA initiates direct coordination and support for alumni, through an alumni network.

Many respondents noted that having a program of involving alumni in follow up conferences or having them as resource persons themselves can provide substantial help to a wide range of EEPSEA activities. For example, a functioning network can provide feedback and support to current EEPSEA projects. It will also serve as a proponent or advocate for the program and will enhance country and regional “ownership” of the various topics and activities of EEPSEA programs. Like the training courses, it should be feasible for an alumni network support program to be based in a host country in the region, possibly at the same institution where the training program would be based. Such a networking activity, however, will require some initial funding from EEPSEA, but over time the support may be generated within the network itself.

In addition to the direct contribution of such a network, fostering the expansion of open discussion of timely policy issues will closely parallel donors’ region-wide priorities, to enhance openness and transparency in policy deliberations.

4. Continue Expansion of Cross Country Research

During the review period, EEPSEA's portfolio of cross-country research projects significantly increased, and these produced several high-visibility results. The most notable was EEPSEA's initiatives on climate change adaptation topics. Thus, in terms of increasing policy relevance, there is no question that the cross-country research program will provide EEPSEA with many opportunities to have high impact projects. While these are potentially productive and high-impact projects, the cost of organizing and managing them are much greater than the individual research. While partnerships ideally would spread the burden of coordination and project support, the difficulties of coordination often make such partnerships difficult to implement in practice.

There are at least 3 aspects or roles in undertaking this type of collaborative research: (a) technical, (b) administrative (including day-to-day project implementation and monitoring), and (c) funding. Since the research cooperation that EEPSEA will continue to develop in the future will involve environmental economics as the primary approach or methodology (and since there is still limited environmental economics capacity in the region), the technical aspect is where EEPSEA’s comparative advantage will remain for the near future. Thus, EEPSEA will likely have a major contribution to the technical aspect of collaborative research. However, there will be need for flexibility with regard to its contribution to the administrative and the financial aspects. Ideally it would be a good if the regional or national research partner could take care of the bulk of administrative and implementation arrangements, with EEPSEA focusing on technical issues. Lastly, with regard to funding, it would be best if there were sharing of financial resources, but this is often a constraint especially when local research institutions are involved.

5. Enhance Involvement of Policy-makers

While some research projects already involve policy makers or natural resource managers early in the process of identifying and developing the research approach, it would be helpful for EEPSEA to encourage researchers to explore this at the start of each research project.

Depending upon the research topic, there may be substantial interest in the project, especially on topics that are high priority for government.

Involving government officials is particularly important in countries where the government bureaucracy is a significant constraint. In these countries, it may be helpful to invite policymakers to comment and make suggestions during the preparation phase of project development. In some cases, this may be difficult to do for individual researchers, and EEPSEA may be able to facilitate the process by inviting government officials as external advisers or by inviting them to participate in the research workshops. Another approach may be for EEPSEA to convene small project meetings or attach a session to one of its in-country courses where government officials could be invited to provide comments on the research plan and to assist in identifying data sources. While this may entail additional work at the start of the project, it will help facilitate the policy outreach phase, and will enhance the research program's influence on policy discussions at the national level.

6. Base National Training Courses in Country or Regional Host Institution

The program of national courses for teachers, including special audience courses, could be made the focal point of capacity building in countries that have lagged with regard to research and teaching capacity. A regional center for this might be established in one of the countries of the area, such as Vietnam, with an in-country host institution, such as a university or regional development or environmental agency. Alternatively, EEPSEA could work closer with the SEARCA/SEAMEO network. This could be a cost-effective and efficient way to manage training activities and alumni networking and support. Aside from the potential administrative benefits, this would also contribute to increasing “institutionalization” of EEPSEA training within the region. The EEPSEA research activities – the research program, research workshop, and policy impact conferences – may continue to be managed directly out of Singapore.

7. Initiate More Research on Gender Issues in Sustainable Development

The one area of work where EEPSEA has lagged is in promoting more research regarding gender-related issues in environmental and natural resource management. By contrast, support for various support programs (including research) on promoting gender equality and related issues in sustainable development is of high priority among EEPSEA's donors and capacity building partners.

This is not to say that EEPSEA has not placed importance on gender equality. In its internal management and in both its training and research activities, EEPSEA excels in the direct involvement of women. On average, training courses have 40% or more women participants, and more than one-third of research grants were awarded to female researchers. One of the three senior economists in its regional staff is a prominent female professor in a leading Thai university. And, of course, the EEPSEA director, *herself*, is a woman. The problem is that although many studies have looked at some aspect regarding the role of women, only one research project deals specifically with gender issues: “Engendering Environment and Natural Resource Economics Research Framework,” a project being implemented by Philippine researchers.

EEPSEA's mandate of research capacity building in environmental economics should be

placed squarely within the broad perspective of sustainable development, including focusing not only on sustainable resource or environmental management and economic growth but also on the broader concerns for promoting social inclusion. To accelerate progress in this area, EEPSEA will have to step up its research programming on the theme of gender issues and sustainable development. One specific step is to engage a specialist on gender issues to assist the secretariat in developing a research program. As part of this effort, a workshop may be convened to generate interest, resources, and participation from EEPSEA partners, government officials, and potential researchers.

8. Promote more focused partnerships with key regional organizations/donors

During the review period, EEPSEA actively worked with various regional organizations, on both research and training activities. This approach complements the strategy of EEPSEA's donors, to promote capacity building partnerships in the region, so it should continue for future programming. One modification that EEPSEA should consider would be to identify one or two key partners to develop a multi-year, high profile program with.

This more focused approach is already taking place in the training program, with SEARCA having a substantial role in several, on-going EEPSEA training programs. Such longer term, multi-activity cooperation with a key regional organization should lead to more effective and efficient collaboration.

In the area of research programming, EEPSEA should consider developing a longer term partnership with ASEAN. Although we were not able to meet with the environment staff of ASEAN during our interviews (our visit coincided with the South Africa climate talks, which the environment staff attended), the head of the environment unit was at the Phnom Penh workshop in November 2011. (He is also now a member of EEPSEA's advisory council.) His presentation provided an overview of the environment unit's agenda, including green national income and sectoral accounting, trade and environment interactions, and transboundary environmental issues – topics that may be the basis for future research with EEPSEA.

EEPSEA also should explore similar programmatic cooperation with another (sub-regional) organization, the Mekong River Commission. The MRC was formed by Cambodia, Lao PDR, Thailand and Viet Nam to improve the joint management of the shared water resources and sustainable development of the Mekong River. Following its mandate, the MRC has focused its current programs and expertise on the *technical* aspect of water resource management. EEPSEA's strength on the *environmental economics* side would complement this and provide an opportunity to develop a productive program.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Terms of Reference for the Evaluation

The evaluator/s shall undertake an assessment of progress toward the outcomes of the current phase and advice on what the next phase proposed for EEPSEA should be based on after evaluation of current strategy, and research and training needs of the researchers in the region.

The key questions to be addressed by this review are the following:

- 1) To what extent has EEPSEA made progress towards achieved its goal and outcomes as developed in the program strategies and outlined in the program logframe (annex 1)
2. What are the key regional environmental problems where environmental capacity building should be directed?
- 3) How can EEPSEA programming be made more responsive to donors' (SIDA, CIDA, and IDRC) strategic Programs for SEA?
- 4) What key advice would you give for future programming on environmental economics research, research capacity building and knowledge sharing in SEA considering potential for:
 - a. Cross-country research projects – modalities for implementation (eg one lead vs. partner organization, centre administered, etc.)
 - b. National level –Influence on policy discussions from local research
 - c. Development of capacity /influence in low capacity countries (Lao PDR and Cambodia)
 - d. Gender Sensitivity of Environmental Economics Research
 - e. Partnerships with other regional organizations/donors in the region;

Methodology

The methods and assessment frameworks employed for this review should facilitate the collection and analysis of data, be relevant to the questions outlined in section 4 above, and make optimal use of existing data.

The section below offers some preliminary ideas on the methodology:

1. *Document review*: including program logframe and monitoring documents, annual reports, a selection of outputs such as journal articles, policy briefs and training material, and previous program evaluations. A self-assessment of EEPSEA performance will be prepared and provided to the consultants for their reference.
2. *Interviews*: with recipients, donors and key stakeholders.
3. *Field visits or face-to-face meetings*: visit to select projects and meetings with select researchers and stakeholders in Southeast Asia.

4. *Surveys or other data collection methods*: the results of a Monitoring and Evaluation survey designed based on the logframe will be provided to evaluators and should be the main source of data. The evaluators might decide to solicit input from additional stakeholders both internal and external to the program to seek to triangulate the data from other sources.

Review Outputs

The expected outputs of this review are:

- Presentation of preliminary findings
- Draft report
- Final report prepared by the consultants of no more than 25 pages that responds to the questions outlined in these TORs, and incorporates feedback obtained on the draft report. The report should be formatted as per the guide on formatting evaluation reports.
- An executive summary of no more than 4 pages
- Appendices with details on the methodology, informants, etc.

Timeline and Milestones

The following outlines the timeline and milestones envisaged for the review.

- Document review and data collection – By Mid-December, including participation at the November 8-10 EEPSEA biannual workshop
- Presentation of preliminary findings - 20th of December 2011
- Submission of draft report by 30th December 2011
- Submission of final report by 15th January 2012

Appendix 2. Country, Regional, and Donor Interviews

Country/ Organization	Number of Respondents by Type of Affiliation
Indonesia	Government: 1 University: 3 Regional/International Organization: 3
Cambodia	Government: 2 University: 1 Regional/International Organization: 1 Other: 2
Laos	Government: 3 University: 4 Regional/International Organization: 1
Philippines	Government: 1 University: 3 Regional/International Organization: 3 Other: 2
Thailand	Government: 3 University: 3 Regional/International Organization: 5
Vietnam	Government: 1 University: 3 Other: 1

Notes:

1. In Number of Respondents by Type of Affiliation, “Other” refers to NGO or non-profit foundation.
2. Interviews in Laos, Indonesia, and Thailand were done by W. Cruz and T. Tran. W. Cruz carried out the interviews in the Philippines, and T. Thao did the ones in Vietnam.

Appendix 3: Interview Guides

I. For Donors and Regional Organizations

1. On the research program – In previous years EEPSEA grants have focused largely on national issues, for example –

forest resource management,
cost benefit analysis of pollution control methodologies and policies,
damage valuation,
application of valuation methods for environmental services,
and coastal resource management.

Are these the priority areas for the region or your institution? As EEPSEA plans its future research program, are there new priority topics that it should promote?

2. What do you think is the value or contribution of having more environmental economics research? How can EEPSEA researchers assist in decision-making or policy discussions? Any specific suggestions on how researchers can better coordinate or work with government or NGOs?

Are there other topics that would be of high priority to you (at the local, country, or regional level)? For example, high priority topics in regional environmental discussions.

3. On training activities – does your institution have researchers or a researcher unit? If not, where do you get inputs for policies and projects?

What type of training activities would be most helpful for your office or institution?

4. Any suggestions, comments on other topics, such as –

- Cross country research projects (if relevant, who should lead them)

- How can research have greater impact on policy discussion, policy making

- Do you think EEPSEA should support more research that focuses on gender relevant aspects of resource and environmental management?

- How to promote more regional partnerships, with other organizations, donors

- What are specific needs of low capacity countries? How can EEPSEA be more responsive to these training and research needs?

II. For Government and University Informants

1. On the research program in general -- In previous years EEPSEA grants have focused largely on national issues, for example:

forest resource management,
cost benefit analysis of pollution control methodologies and policies,
damage valuation,
application of evaluation methods for environmental services,
and coastal resource management.

Are these the priority areas for your country or institution? As EEPSEA plans its future research program, are there new priority topics that it should promote?

2. For government officials – what do you think is the value or contribution of having more environmental economics research? How can EEPSEA researchers assist in decision-making or policy discussions? Any specific suggestions on how researchers can better coordinate or work with government or NGOs?

Are there other topics that would be of high priority to you (at the local, country, or regional level)? For example, high priority topics in the national environmental management plan.

3. On training activities – For government officials, does your unit have researchers or a researcher unit? If not, where do you get inputs for policies and projects?

For both government and academic respondents – What type of training activities would be most helpful for your office or institution?

Appendix 4: EEPSEA Results-Based Management Logframes

RESULTS	INDICATORS	ASSUMPTIONS/RISK INDICATORS
Impact		
1. Improved environmental performance resulting from the application of knowledge-based policies 2. Improved design and implementation of policies affecting the environment	Input into discussions, designs, and implementation of policies/management rules affecting the environment at relevant levels (local, sectoral, and national) of decision making.	There is political stability (Low)
Outcomes		
1. Increased capacity of SEA researchers to analyze environmental problems	1.a # of researchers trained by EEPSEA; 1.b # of training courses offered by EEPSEA 1.c # of EEPSEA-trained researchers occupying key positions in universities, government and international organizations	There is continued commitment of governments to improve environmental management (low) That people trained in EE stays in the country/their research institution to use their knowledge (low-medium)
2. Increased analytical capacity of researchers in weaker countries (Lao PDR and Cambodia) in tackling environmental problems.	2.a # of training courses for researchers in the two countries; 2.b # of researchers receiving training in the two countries 2.c # of research projects approved	
3. Increased capacity of national institutions and SE Asian researchers in applying a holistic view of environmental economics (incorporating social sustainability and gender equality issues).	3.a # of new universities/colleges teaching environmental courses and # of new courses in environmental economics; 3.b # of research projects with multi-	

	<p>disciplinary team;</p> <p>3.c proportion of women in research projects; training courses, conferences attended, resource persons, advisory committee</p> <p>3.d # of EEPSEA researchers acting as resource persons in training courses sponsored by other regional organizations</p>	
4. Increased quality of knowledge/research produced	<p>4.a# of peer reviewed journal publications from EEPSEA research</p> <p>4.b# of citations of EEPSEA-funded research</p> <p>4.c# of research presented in international conferences</p>	
5. Enhanced interaction between researchers and policy makers	5. # of courses offered for policy makers where EE case studies are presented;	
6. Increased regional collaboration and knowledge sharing	<p>6a. # of cross-country research projects</p> <p>6b # of SEA acting as resource persons/trainors in another country's courses</p>	
7. Increased sustainability	<p>7.a # of national associations/local organizations collaborating with EEPSEA on joint training activities</p> <p>7.b # of regional organizations co-funding research/training courses</p> <p>7c. # of institutions teaching Environmental Economics through EEPSEA's influence</p>	

Outputs		
1. Competitive research grants to researchers	1. # of research grants approved	<p>1. There is a good chance of finding qualified managers, teachers, peer reviewers and research advisors from Asia to work with EEPSEA (low)</p> <p>2. There are qualified researchers who are in a position to communicate with policy makers at national/regional levels (low)</p>
2. Regional training courses and in-country training courses	2. # of regional training courses and in-country courses with # of participants	
3. Training courses and Small research grants from weaker countries	3. # of research grants in weaker countries and # of researchers trained	
4. Biannual Workshops	4. # of participants to biannual workshops	
5. Travel Grants	5. # of travel grants for conference participation (regional and international)	
6. Support and strengthening of national associations	6. # of grants to national associations	
7. Collaboration with other regional organizations	7. # of training courses organized with other regional organizations and # of participants	
8. Training courses for other 'users' of EE research (e.g. media, justices, natural resource managers, etc.)	8. # of courses offered to other users of EE research and # of participants	
9. Publication	9. # of Research reports; technical reports; policy briefs; books, practioners series produced by EEPSEA	

Appendix 5: Distribution of EEPSEA Projects 2007-2011 by country

Country	Number	%
Cambodia	4	4
China	24	25
Indonesia	12	12
Lao PDR	1	1
Malaysia	2	2
Mongolia	1	1
Philippines	14	14
Sri Lanka	4	4
Thailand	11	11
Vietnam	24	25
Total	97	100

Source: EEPSEA, *Internal Review and Donor Report*

Appendix 6: List of Cross Country Projects

Title	Country
Climate Change Adaptation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of Household Vulnerability and Adaptation Behaviors to Typhoon Saomai, Zhejiang Province, China 	China
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adaptive Behavior Assessment Based on Climate Change Event: Jakarta's Flood in 2007 	Indonesia
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adaptive Capacity of Households, Community Organizations and Institutions for Extreme Climate Events in the Philippines 	Philippines
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adaptive Capacity of Households and Institutions in Dealing with Floods in Chiang Mai, Thailand 	Thailand
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adaptation Behaviors of Communities and Households to Extreme Climate Events in Quang Nam Province, Viet Nam: Towards a Set of Possible Adaptation Measures 	Vietnam
CCW-EPPSEA	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building Capacity to Adapt to Climate Change in Cambodia 	Cambodia
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building Capacity to Adapt to Climate Change in the Philippines 	Philippines
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building Capacity to Adapt to Climate Change in Vietnam 	Vietnam
Protected Area	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of Fiscal Gap and Financing of Cambodia's Protected Areas 	Cambodia
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fiscal Gap and Financing of China's Protected Areas 	China
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An Assessment on Resource Gap of Protected Areas in Indonesia 	Indonesia
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fiscal Gap and Financing Analysis of National Protected Areas in Lao PDR 	Lao PDR
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of Fiscal Gap and Financing of Malaysia's Protected Areas 	Malaysia
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fiscal Gap and Financing Protected Areas in the Philippines 	Philippines
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Cross-Country Analysis of Southeast Asia's Protected Areas: Fiscal and Resource Gaps (Project Coordination) 	Philippines
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fiscal Gap and Financing of Thailand's Protected Areas 	Thailand
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resource Assessment and Gap Analysis of Protected Areas of Vietnam 	Vietnam

Title	Country
EEPSEA - World Fish	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Climate Change Impacts, Vulnerability Assessments, Economic and Policy Analysis of Adaptation Strategies in Selected Coastal Areas in Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam 	Indonesia
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Climate Change Impacts, Vulnerability Assessments, Economic and Policy Analysis of Adaptation Strategies in Selected Coastal Areas in Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam (Palawan) 	Philippines
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Climate Change Impacts, Vulnerability Assessments, Economic and Policy Analysis of Adaptation Strategies in Selected Coastal Areas in Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam (Batangas) 	Philippines
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Climate Change Impacts, Vulnerability Assessments, Economic and Policy Analysis of Adaptation Strategies in Selected Coastal Areas in Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam (Project Coordination) 	Philippines
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Climate Change Impacts, Vulnerability Assessments, Economic and Policy Analysis of Adaptation Strategies in Selected Coastal Areas in Indonesia, Philippines and Vietnam 	Vietnam
SANDEE-EEPSEA	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An Empirical Research on the Impacts of Climate Change on Crop Yields and Migration in China 	China
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linking Climate Change, Rice Yield and Overseas Contract Working: The Philippine Experience 	Philippines
WATER FILTERS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Willingness to Pay for Drinking Water Quality Improvement in Cambodia: Using Hypothetical Baselines in Stated Preference Studies 	Cambodia
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Value of Rural Drinking Water Quality Improvement of Jingzhou City in Hubei Province, China 	China
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using Hypothetical Baselines in Stated Preference Studies: The Case of Improving Water Quality in Metro Cebu 	Philippines
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Household Demand for Improved Drinking Water Quality: A Case Study of Thailand 	Thailand
BEHAVIORAL ECONOMICS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Self-protection and Insurance Against Natural Disaster in Southeast Asia: Cambodia Context 	Cambodia
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Self-protection and Insurance Against Natural Disaster in Southeast Asia: A Case Study in China 	China
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risk Preferences and Cooperative Behavior Responses to Flood Disaster: Evidence from the Mekong River Basin in Thailand 	Thailand
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risk attitudes, ambiguity attitudes and disaster risk reduction in Mekong Delta, Vietnam 	Vietnam
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Self-protection and Insurance Against Natural Disaster in Southeast Asia (Project Coordination) 	Vietnam
CGE MODELING	

Title	Country
• A General Equilibrium Analysis of the Impact of Climate Change Adaptation in the Indonesian Agriculture	Indonesia
• Economic Development, Carbon Emissions, and Inter-Regional Disparity: A CGE Analysis of Agriculture Expansion in Papua, Indonesia	Indonesia
• Valuing the Impact of Rationalizing Fuel Subsidy on Malaysian Macroeconomic Performance, Income Distribution and Poverty Incidence	Malaysia
• Economy-Wide Estimates of Climate-Induced Impacts on Philippine Agriculture: A Computable General Equilibrium Analysis	Philippines
EEPSEA-CBMS	
• Support to Local Governments to Improve Environment Management in Kota Pekalongan, Indonesia	Indonesia
• Support to Local Governments to Improve Environmental Management in the Philippines Using CBMS	Philippines
• Support to Local Governments in Vietnam to Improve Climate Change Responses Using CBMS Data and Mapping	Vietnam

Source: EEPSEA, Progress Report, July 2010 – March 2011

Appendix 7: EEPSEA Publications 2007-2011

	2007-08	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	Total
Research Reports	8	10	13	4		35
Policy Briefs	6	9	11	10*		36
Technical Papers	8	2	8	3		21
Special Papers	3	3	-	3		9
Climate Change Papers	1	2	-	4		7
Practitioner Series	-	2	-	1		3
Total	26	28	32	25		

**includes 6 Policy Briefs in Climate Change Series*

Source: EEPSEA, *Internal Review and Donor Report*

Appendix 8: Researcher-respondents stated impacts of their EEPSEA research

	Frequency	Percent
Presented research at any policy forum or dialogue session	33	53
Consulted as an expert or resource person in policy discussions related to research	28	47
Used research report as case study material in teaching	41	67
Used research to formulate environmental regulation	13	21
Research has been used to support a national policy or proposal	16	27
Invited to share research as a speaker at conferences/workshops	40	65
Research has been cited in newspapers or other print media	22	37
Invited by other funding institutions to develop projects based on EEPSEA research	18	30

Source: EEPSEA. *Summary for Survey of EEPSEA Trainees*

Appendix 9: Number of Small Research Grants 2007-2011 by Country

Country	Number	Per cent
China	4	17
Lao PDR	11	46
Philippines	5	20
Vietnam	4	17
Total	24	100

Source: EEPSEA, *Internal Review and Donor Report*

Appendix 10: Regional Courses 2007-2011

Regional Training Courses	No. of Participants	% Female
3-week Environmental Economics	62	43.5
Method courses		
a. Econometrics	27	51.9
b. Survey Method Errors	31	45.2
c. Water Sanitation Planning and Policy for Developing Countries	25	24.0
d. Stated Preference Methods	29	41.4
e. Behavioral Economics	50	52.0
f. Computable General Equilibrium Modeling	21	28.6
Media Training for EEPSEA Researchers	7	71.40
Total	280	43.20

Source: EEPSEA, *Internal Review and Donor Report*

Appendix 11: In-country Training Courses 2007-2011 by country

In-country Training Courses	No. Participants	% Female
Cambodia		52
• Environmental Economics Course for NGOs	23	
• Environmental Economics Training for Lecturers and Researchers	29	
China		26
• Environmental Economics Training for EE Teachers	26	
Indonesia		95
• Environmental Economics Training Course for EE Lecturers	25	
• Climate Change Vulnerability Map for SEA	70	
Lao PDR		89
• EE Overview and Research Methods	32	
• EE and Research Proposal Writing	12	
• EE Teachers Training Course	20	
• EE Overview and Research Survey Design	25	
Philippines		51
• Training Course for EE Teachers	21	
• Media Workshop on Understanding Climate Change	30	
Thailand		28
• Thailand-Lao PDR Teachers' Training	28	
Vietnam		52
• 2 nd Vietnam Teachers' Training Course	27	
• Vietnam Teachers' Course & SRG	25	
Total (All Countries)	393	3

Source: EEPSEA *Internal Review and Donor Report*.

Appendix 12: Regional Training Partnerships 2007-2011

Training Courses	Partner Institutions	No. of Participants	% Female
Environmental & Natural Resources Economics for Public Agencies	FAO	30	46.7
Economic Development, Poverty Reduction, Environment and Climate Change	UNEP/UNDP	30	40.0
Asian Justices Forum	AECEN	30	43.3
EEPSEA-SEARCA 5 th Executive Forum on Natural Resource Management	SEARCA	20	50.0
EEPSEA-SANDEE-ICRAF PES Course	SANDEE	22	54.5
Achieving Environmentally Sustainable Economic Growth in PNG	UNEP/UNDP	80	40.0
2 nd International Training on Responding to Changing Climate: Knowledge-based Strategies in Managing Risks in Agriculture	SEARCA	31	45.2
Training on Climate Change Adaptation for Six ASEAN Countries	SEARCA	28	39.3
SEARCA-EEPSEA Forum-Workshop on Economic Instruments Applied in Environmental & Natural Resource Management in Southeast Asia	SEARCA	20	35.0
Total		291	43.0

Source: EEPSEA *Internal Review and Donor Report*.

References

- CIDA. *Southeast Asia Regional Program*. Website:<http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca>, Canadian International Development Agency, website:<http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca>, n.d.
- EEPSEA. *Summary for Survey of EEPSEA Trainees*. Draft Internal Report, Singapore: Environment and Economy Program for Southeast Asia, 2011.
- EEPSEA. *Annual Report July 1, 2007 - June 30, 2008*. Singapore: Environment and Economy Program for Southeast Asia, 2008.
- EEPSEA. *Annual Report July 1, 2008 - June 30, 2009*. Singapore: Environment and Economy Program for Southeast Asia, 2009.
- EEPSEA. *Annual Report July 1, 2009 - June 30, 2010*. Singapore: Environment and Economy Program for Southeast Asia, 2010.
- EEPSEA. *From Paper to Policy: Building Environmental Economics Research Impact, EEPSEA 2000-2009*. Singapore: Environment and Economy Program for Southeast Asia, 2010.
- EEPSEA. *Internal Review and Donor Report: 2007-2011 (Draft)*. Draft, Singapore: Environment and Economy Program for Southeast Asia, January 2012.
- EEPSEA. *Progress Report July 1, 2010 - March 31, 2011*. Singapore: Environment and Economy Program for Southeast Asia, 2011.
- EEPSEA. *Summary for Survey of EEPSEA Researchers*. Draft Internal Report, Singapore: Environment and Economy Program for Southeast Asia, 2011.
- SIDA. *Strategy for Regional Development Cooperation with Asia Focusing on Southeast Asia until 30 June 2015*. Swedish International Development Agency, n.d.
- Vincent, Jeffrey. "Evaluation of EEPSEA, January 1, 2005 to June 30, 2008." Singapore, 2008.

Bio-Data of External Evaluators

TRAN XUAN THAO

Tran Xuan Thao is a senior educational specialist. He owns expert knowledge and experience of the system of higher education both in Vietnam and in the U.S. He completed his M.A. in TESOL at the University of Canberra, Australia, and his Ph.D. in educational administration at the University of Pennsylvania, U.S.A. From 1977 to 1995, he started his professional career as an English teacher trainer and later became chair of the Department of English at Hue College of Education. He also served as a member of the Hue College Council and Academic Committee. During his term, he set up a strategy to respond to the shortage of English teachers at senior high schools and provided training and re-training programs for over 1,000 teachers, through both traditional and in-service training, in Central Vietnam. From 1999 to 2010, he was the Director of the Fulbright Program in Vietnam. One of his responsibilities was to chair the annual Fulbright independent selection committees and peer-review panels to select the best students and professors from both Vietnam and the U.S. to participate in the Program. Also during these years, he initiated and developed an affiliation network of over 100 colleges and universities throughout Vietnam. Through the network, he co-hosted dozens of conferences and workshops on social themes to promote mutual understanding across cultures, among which are the two training workshops on social work and gender issues at Hanoi University of Pedagogy for 30 social workers across Vietnam. At both workshops, he served both as co-organizer and keynote speaker. His other legacy is the network of Vietnam's Fulbright alumni that includes over 1,000 Vietnamese and U.S. scholars.

During 2009-2010, he was an invited member of the Higher Education Accreditation Board of the Vietnam National University, Hanoi. During the two terms, he served as an external board examiner to oversee and review evaluations of both department and college levels.

He has won prestigious grants, scholarships and awards, including two full grants from the Australian Government, the Fulbright Scholarship, and the Superior Honor Award from the U.S. Department of State for sustained thoughtful, creative management of the Fulbright Program in Vietnam.

Tran Xuan Thao

Vice Provost, TAN TAO UNIVERSITY

Address: TanTao University Ave., Tan Duc Ecity, Duc Hoa, Long An Province, Vietnam - Telephone: (072) 376 9216 Email: thao.tran@ttu.edu.vn or txtupenn@alumni.upenn.edu

Jan. 27, 2012

WILFRIDO CRUZ

Manila, Philippines, and Washington, DC, USA
Email: wdcruz@gmail.com

Wilfrido Cruz is an environmental economist with more than thirty years of experience in project development, training, and economic and sector work on a broad range of topics -- including strategic environmental planning, sustainable agriculture and forestry, biodiversity conservation, climate change, and conservation financing. He has completed numerous assignments in Africa, South and Southeast Asia, and in Latin America, working for the World Bank and other international development agencies.

From 1991 to 2001, he was senior environmental economist at the World Bank Environment Department and the World Bank Institute, and worked on sustainable development and strategic environmental assessment projects. He currently works as an independent consultant and has recently been involved in Bank-assisted projects on local government environmental regulation and compliance, biodiversity conservation, and water utility privatization.

From 1989 to 1991, he was a senior economist at the World Resources Institute in Washington, D.C. At WRI he coordinated pioneering studies on the environmental impact of structural adjustment lending and on incorporating measures of natural resource depletion in the national income accounts of the Philippines and Costa Rica.

Before moving to Washington, D.C., Dr. Cruz was the executive director of the Center for Policy and Development Studies, the University of the Philippines' premier policy research institute for agricultural and natural resource management. He has a doctoral degree in agricultural economics from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, specializing in natural resource economics and econometrics. He is a recipient of the Sir John Crawford Award, an award presented by the Australian Agricultural and Resource Economics Society for outstanding contribution to Asian agricultural policy.

January 2012