



ASIAN PRODUCTIVITY ORGANIZATION

WSM-16  
Doc. No. 2-A

57th Workshop Meeting of Heads of NPOs  
19–21 October 2016, Putrajaya, Malaysia

## **EVALUATION OF 2015 PROJECTS**

## **Evaluation of APO Projects Implemented in 2015**

This document prepared by the Secretariat covers the onsite evaluation of APO multicountry projects (Categories A and B) by participants, resource persons, and representatives of the implementing organizations and a report on individual-member country projects (Category C). It includes:

- A. Evaluation of face-to-face projects;
- B. Evaluation of e-learning courses; and
- C. Highlights of in-country/Category C project activities covering Individual Observational Study Missions (I-OSMs), Bilateral Cooperation between NPOs (BCBN), Technical Expert Services (TES), Demonstration Company Projects (DMPs), and In-country Training Programs for Institutional Strengthening of NPOs through the Development of Productivity Practitioners (DON).

Delegates to the Workshop Meeting of Heads of NPOs (WSM) are invited to review this report and endorse it for submission to the 59th Governing Body Meeting (GBM) in 2017.

## Table of Contents

Evaluation of APO Projects Implemented in 2015 .....	1
Onsite Evaluation.....	4
A. Evaluation of Face-to-Face Projects.....	4
A-1. Participants.....	5
A-1-1. High Points .....	6
A-1-2. Low Points .....	6
A-1-3. Suggestions for Improvement .....	7
A-2. Resource Persons .....	7
A-2-1. High Points .....	7
A-2-2. Low Points .....	8
A-2-3. Suggestions for Improvement .....	8
A-3. Implementing Organizations .....	8
A-4. Conclusion .....	8
B. Evaluation of e-Learning Courses .....	9
B-1. Participants.....	10
B-1-1. High Points.....	11
B-1-2. Low Points and Suggestions for Improvement .....	11
B-2. Resource Persons .....	11
B-3. Implementing Organizations .....	11
B-4. Conclusion .....	12
C. Highlights of In-country/Category C Project Implementation.....	12
C-1. I-OSMs.....	13
C-2. TES.....	13
C-3. BCBN.....	14
C-4. DMPs .....	14
C-5. DON .....	15
C-6. Issues in Project Implementation .....	15
C-6-1. I-OSMs.....	15
C-6-2. TES.....	15
C-6-3. BCBN.....	16
C-6-4. DMPs .....	16
C-6-5. DON.....	17
C-6-6. NFP .....	17
Annex 1. Evaluation Form for Participants.....	18
Annex 2. Evaluation Form for Resource Persons .....	20
Annex 3. Evaluation Form for Implementing Organizations.....	21
Annex 4. List of TES Projects Implemented in 2015.....	22

## List of Tables

Table 1. Number of Multicountry Projects Evaluated and Number of Participants.....	4
Table 2. Number of Projects Evaluated by Department and Project Type.....	5
Table 3. Summary of Responses on Face-to-Face Projects Evaluated .....	5
Table 4. Summary of High Points in Face-to-Face Projects Evaluated .....	6
Table 5. Typical Low Points in Face-to-Face Projects Evaluated .....	6
Table 6. e-Learning Courses Included in the Evaluation and Number of Participants .....	9
Table 7. Comparison of 2013, 2014, and 2015 e-Learning Courses .....	10
Table 8. Summary of Responses to e-Learning Courses Evaluated.....	10
Table 9. Category C Projects: Activities and Estimated* Beneficiaries, 2013–2015.....	12
Table 10. I-OSMs, 2015.....	13
Table 11. Experts Assigned Under TES, 2015 .....	13
Table 12. BCBN, 2015.....	14
Table 13. DON, 2015 .....	15

## Onsite Evaluation

### A. Evaluation of Face-to-Face Projects

The time coverage of evaluation of face-to-face projects included in this report was from 1 January to 31 December 2015. The evaluation was administered through end-of-project questionnaires intended to obtain feedback from participants on:

1. Program Content
2. Program Schedule
3. Time Allocation
4. Time Management
5. Methodology Used
6. Physical Arrangements
7. Resource Speakers/Persons
8. Field/Observational/Company Visit(s)
9. Overall Evaluation

This evaluation covers 56 multicountry projects, although 61 multicountry projects were implemented in 2015. Due to their specific, unique natures, 5 projects were excluded. Research projects, for example, are not included as they are one-year ongoing projects with different arrangements such as no end-of-project questionnaire and no site visits. The GBM, WSM, Liaison Officers' Meeting, and annual Green Productivity Advisory Committee meeting are also not evaluated in this report. The breakdown of multicountry projects included in this evaluation and the number of participants by project type are shown in Table 1. Data for 2013 and 2014 are included for comparison.

**Table 1. Number of Multicountry Projects Evaluated and Number of Participants**

Project Type	No. of Projects			No. of Participants		
	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015
<b>Training Course (TRC)</b>	15	9	<b>15</b>	329	176	<b>333</b>
<b>Workshop (WSP)</b>	21	27	<b>27</b>	441	572	<b>569</b>
<b>Observational Study Mission (OSM)</b>	6	11	<b>7</b>	101	228	<b>136</b>
<b>Study Meeting (STM)*</b>	1	0	<b>0</b>	18	0	<b>0</b>
<b>TIA</b>	0	1	<b>1</b>	0	12	<b>21</b>
<b>Study Mission to Non-MCs (SMN)</b>	0	3	<b>3</b>	0	40	<b>41</b>
<b>Seminar (SEM)*</b>	1	0	<b>0</b>	19	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Conference (CON)</b>	3	2	<b>2</b>	112	100	<b>56</b>
<b>Forum (CON)</b>	0	4	<b>1</b>	0	122	<b>24</b>
<b>Total</b>	47	57	<b>56</b>	1,020	1,250	<b>1180</b>

\*These types of projects were renamed "workshop" from 2014.

The total number of multicountry projects implemented in 2015 remained almost the same compared with 2014. Among 56 projects evaluated, 16 were implemented by the Agriculture

Department including six workshops and six training courses; 29 were implemented by the Industry Department including 12 workshops and nine training courses; and 11 were implemented by the Research and Planning Department (R&P) including nine workshops. Table 2 summarizes the number of projects by department and project type.

**Table 2. Number of Projects Evaluated by Department and Project Type**

Department	TRC	WSP	OSM	TIA	SMN	CON	Forum	Total
<b>Agriculture</b>	6	6	2	0	0	0	2	16
<b>Industry</b>	9	12	5	0	1	1	1	29
<b>R&amp;P</b>	0	9	0	1	1	0	0	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>56</b>

Participants, resource persons, and representatives of implementing organizations were asked to evaluate the projects through a structured questionnaire at the end of the project. Some of the common points made by participants, resource persons, and implementing organizations are given below.

### A-1. Participants

Approximately 95% of all participants who attended the APO multicountry projects included in this evaluation gave their feedback in the questionnaires. The questionnaire template is attached in Annex 1 for reference. The feedback received from participants is summarized in Table 3.

**Table 3. Summary of Responses on Face-to-Face Projects Evaluated**

Area Evaluated	More than expected			As expected			Less than expected		
	(%)			(%)			(%)		
	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015
<b>Program content</b>	42	50	<b>48</b>	54	47	<b>50</b>	4	3	<b>2</b>
<b>Program schedule</b>	27	33	<b>33</b>	69	65	<b>65</b>	4	2	<b>2</b>
<b>Time allocation</b>	25	30	<b>28</b>	67	64	<b>66</b>	8	6	<b>6</b>
<b>Time management</b>	35	39	<b>34</b>	58	56	<b>58</b>	7	5	<b>8</b>
<b>Methodology used</b>	38	42	<b>41</b>	58	55	<b>56</b>	4	3	<b>3</b>
<b>Physical arrangements</b>	42	47	<b>42</b>	54	50	<b>54</b>	4	3	<b>4</b>
<b>Resource persons</b>	53	55	<b>59</b>	43	43	<b>38</b>	4	2	<b>3</b>
<b>Field/company visit(s)</b>	46	49	<b>47</b>	43	41	<b>43</b>	11	10	<b>10</b>
<b>Overall evaluation*</b>	48	53	<b>55</b>	51	45	<b>45</b>	1	2	<b>0</b>

\*This does not refer to an average of the answers for all items in the questionnaire, but refers only to the specific item "Overall Evaluation" in the questionnaires filled in by participants.

The feedback from participants indicated that their overall level of satisfaction with 2015 APO multicountry projects had increased compared with 2014 and 2013. Specifically, in the

overall evaluation, 55% indicated that APO multicountry projects in 2015 were “more than expected.” On the other hand, the rate of “less than expected” dropped from 2% to 0%. A notable improvement from 2014 was satisfaction with the resource persons, with a 4% increase in those responding “more than expected.”

#### ***A-1-1. High Points***

The top three common high points cited by participants were good resource persons, good program content, and good site visits. A summary of high points is shown in Table 4. In 39 of 56 projects, participants appreciated the resource persons as they were competent, knowledgeable, and experienced and helped to generate interactive discussion. In the breakdown by department, the most notable high point of good resource persons remained valid. To elaborate, 88% of Agriculture projects, 59% of Industry projects, and 73% of projects handled by R&P were cited as having good resource persons. Participants in 31 of 56 projects noted that the program content was comprehensive with timely topics. In 23 of 56 projects, site were appreciated for helping participants to gain a practical understanding of the subject. The participants also indicated that the high points of APO multicountry projects included knowledgeable, experienced resource persons, timely topics and comprehensive program design, good site visits, practical examples of classroom learning, good methodology used, useful country presentations, and group workshop/exercises where participants had opportunities to become involved in group discussions and sharing of experiences.

**Table 4. Summary of High Points in Face-to-Face Projects Evaluated**

<b>High Points Noted</b>	<b>No. of Projects</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Good resource persons</b>	39	70
<b>Good program contents</b>	31	55
<b>Good site visits</b>	23	41
<b>Total no. of projects</b>	<b>56</b>	

#### ***A-1-2. Low Points***

The main low points cited were tight program schedules in 33 out of 56 projects, site visits in 30 out of 56 projects, and physical arrangements in 19 out of 56 projects. Table 5 presents a summary of the top three low points noted in multicountry projects evaluated.

**Table 5. Typical Low Points in Face-to-Face Projects Evaluated**

<b>Low Points Noted</b>	<b>No. of Projects</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Tight program schedules</b>	33	59
<b>Site visits</b>	30	54
<b>Physical arrangements</b>	19	34
<b>Total no. of projects</b>	<b>56</b>	

Participants felt that there was insufficient time for adequate coverage of the subject, limited time for group discussion, and lack of time to interact with resource persons. Site visits were limited in number, irrelevant to the project topics, and involved long travel times. It was also noted that participants were not satisfied with the time allocation for site visits. The top two low points remained the same as for 2014. The most typical low point of tight program

schedule, which was repeated every year, could be due to the nature of APO projects and financial constraints in hosting projects of long duration.

The other low points mentioned by participants were physical arrangements such as Internet access, audio systems at venues, and poor transport to site visits.

### ***A-1-3. Suggestions for Improvement***

Although there were some suggestions specific to each project, general comments from participants suggesting improvements are summarized below. They are given in the order of frequency of occurrence:

- Site visits: Programs should include more site visits to showcase practical examples in the topic area. During site visits, some time for interaction and Q&A sessions should be provided. The traffic conditions for site visits should also be considered when deciding on hosts for site visits.
- Program schedule: To avoid tight schedules, the topics may be reduced or the entire program duration should be extended.
- Advanced/follow-up course: Several requests were made to continue the program annually and organize follow-up projects with more advanced content for those who completed the basic course.
- Time allocation: Time allocation should be balanced among the modules; more time for site visits was suggested.
- Physical arrangements: The accommodations and the venue of the project should be the same for the safety and comfort of participants; Internet access should be ensured.
- Program content: More practical knowledge/case studies should be included.
- Experts: More case studies should be presented.
- Networking: Establish e-networks of participants.
- Organize a forum for knowledge and best practice sharing.
- Develop group networks to synergize changes in the region; use more social media networks to sustain communication.

### **A-2. Resource Persons**

Resource persons were asked to give feedback on participants, country paper and presentation quality, and physical arrangements and make suggestions for improvement and follow-up activities. Their evaluation form is in Annex 2. Comments by resource persons showed that overall most projects were well organized and of high quality.

#### ***A-2-1. High Points***

The most notable high points commented on by resource persons were the participants' positive learning attitudes and interactive engagement during the entire project. To elaborate, participants showed good performance with positive, hard-working, cooperative attitudes. They were actively involved in group activities and knowledge-sharing sessions with high levels of interest. The participants mostly represented good combinations from appropriate sectors with different expertise and knowledge. The resource persons felt that the majority of country papers were outstanding, but a few were too general. The resource persons were mostly satisfied with the physical facilities and good logistic arrangements. They also appreciated the APO and implementing organizations for their smooth coordination.



### ***A-2-2. Low Points***

The main low points included overloaded programs with many topics; being unable to go deeper into the contents due to the lack of time; limited time for interactions and group discussion sessions; and inadequate site visits.

Resource persons also pointed out that while most of the participants were engaged in all activities during the lectures and group work, some could not engage as fully as others due to their lack of English proficiency. In addition, participants' levels of knowledge varied and some lacked the prerequisite familiarity needed to understand specific topics. Overall, the mix of participants was good, although participants who already have direct relationships to and experience in the subject should be selected.

### ***A-2-3. Suggestions for Improvement***

Resource persons made the following recommendations:

- Follow-up action: The courses should be followed up by more advanced ones to provide participants with deeper knowledge. This could involve formulating national projects to include various stakeholders and organizing follow-up practical courses. The resource persons also suggested setting up an online discussion forum for participants and for all NPOs to share success stories or best practices.
- Country papers: Some country papers were submitted too late and thus there was too little time to assess the papers and provide advice. It was also noted that some were too general.
- Site visits: Site visits should be more relevant to achieve the best results.

### **A-3. Implementing Organizations**

Implementing organizations were asked to give feedback on participants, difficulties in implementing projects, and suggestions for improvement and follow-up (refer to Annex 3 for the evaluation form used by implementing organizations).

Generally, implementing organizations were impressed by enthusiastic participants who were very cooperative and committed to the program. In most cases, the programs went very smoothly and were successfully implemented without major issues. Communication with the Secretariat was also smooth. Nine of the 56 projects faced problems of last-minute withdrawals, no-shows, and late arrivals, which caused unnecessary cost to the implementing organizations. One implementing organization suggested the Secretariat needed to consider implementing a policy on charging participants who withdraw from projects without a valid reason. Similar to requests made by participants, it was noted that extended program duration would be desirable and follow-up on action plans was recommended.

### **A-4. Conclusion**

Based on feedback from participants, resource persons, and implementing organizations, more than half of the participants had very positive experiences with multicountry face-to-face projects, and 55% rated the projects as "more than expected." This rating was a substantial improvement over the overall rating in the 2013 and 2014 evaluations. However, the inadequacy of site visits remained an issue over the last three years as pointed out by participants in 10 out of 56 projects. The resource persons cited the generally positive

attitudes and enthusiasm of participants, who generally had a good mixture of experience in and knowledge of the subject. The same assessments were shared by the implementing organizations. The last-minute withdrawals or no-shows of participants were the only issue that affected some implementing organizations.

Some of the suggested recommendations to improve projects as well as to address associated issues included: extending program duration; increasing the number of site visits; and allocating more time for group discussions. One of the recommendations commonly shared by participants, resource persons, and implementing organizations was increasing the duration of some projects and organizing follow-up programs that would scale up learning to a more advanced level. There were also suggestions for the establishment of online discussion platforms for the sharing of best practices, success stories, and progress on action plans.

## **B. Evaluation of e-Learning Courses**

Similar to face-to-face projects, the videoconference (VC)-based e-learning courses were evaluated through end-of-project questionnaires to obtain participants' feedback from these perspectives:

1. Program Content
2. Program Schedule
3. Time Allocation
4. Time Management
5. Methodology Used
6. Physical Arrangements (conduciveness/suitability of the VC venue, quality of audio, and quality of video)
7. Resource Speakers/Persons
8. Field/Observational/Company Visits
9. Overall Evaluation

Three VC-based e-learning projects were implemented and evaluated in 2015. This was the first time for the APO to conduct e-learning courses through its in-house facilities instead of using the Tokyo Distance Learning Center facilities as in previous years. The e-learning courses evaluated, number of participating countries, number of sessions, and number of participants in each course are presented in Table 6.

**Table 6. e-Learning Courses Included in the Evaluation and Number of Participants**

<b>Project Title</b>	<b>No. of Participating Countries</b>	<b>No. of Sessions</b>	<b>No. of Participants</b>
<b>e-Learning Course on Business Excellence for the Service Industry</b>	13	2	225
<b>e-Learning Course on Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) for Greater Market Access</b>	11	2	212
<b>e-Learning Course on Nonchemical Pest Management in Agriculture</b>	10	2	218
<b>Total</b>			<b>655</b>

In comparison with 2014, the number of courses and total number of participants decreased as it was the first year to test the in-house e-learning facilities. The number of participating countries increased. Compared with 2013, the number of courses and the number of participants decreased, but the number of participating countries remained about the same. Details are summarized in Table 7.

**Table 7. Comparison of 2013, 2014, and 2015 e-Learning Courses**

	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>
<b>No. of courses</b>	5	4	3
<b>No. of sessions per course</b>	2 and 3	2	2
<b>No. of participants</b>	1,174	852	655
<b>Average no. of participants per course</b>	234	213	218
<b>No. of participating countries</b>	14	12	14

Participants, resource persons, and representatives of implementing organizations evaluated the e-learning courses through a structured questionnaire distributed at the end of the courses. Some of the common points noted by participants, resource persons, and implementing organizations are summarized below.

### **B-1. Participants**

Overall, approximately 88% of participants who attended APO e-learning courses in 2015 gave feedback via the questionnaires. The feedback received is summarized in Table 8.

**Table 8. Summary of Responses to e-Learning Courses Evaluated**

<b>Area of Evaluation</b>	<b>More than expected (%)</b>			<b>As expected (%)</b>			<b>Less than expected (%)</b>		
	2013	2014	<b>2015</b>	2013	2014	<b>2015</b>	2013	2014	<b>2015</b>
<b>Program content</b>	36	44	<b>36</b>	59	51	<b>60</b>	5	5	<b>4</b>
<b>Program schedule</b>	33	32	<b>28</b>	63	66	<b>68</b>	4	2	<b>4</b>
<b>Time allocation</b>	30	30	<b>28</b>	63	65	<b>68</b>	7	5	<b>4</b>
<b>Time management</b>	35	35	<b>37</b>	60	63	<b>59</b>	5	2	<b>4</b>
<b>Methodology used</b>	35	40	<b>33</b>	61	56	<b>59</b>	4	4	<b>8</b>
<b>Physical arrangements</b>	39	34	<b>36</b>	56	61	<b>59</b>	5	5	<b>5</b>
<b>Resource persons</b>	41	51	<b>47</b>	54	43	<b>48</b>	5	6	<b>5</b>
<b>Overall evaluation*</b>	37	39	<b>38</b>	60	59	<b>60</b>	3	2	<b>2</b>

\*This does not refer to an average of the answers for all items in the questionnaire, but refers only to the specific item "Overall Evaluation" in the questionnaires filled in by participants.

From the overall rating, more than one-third of participants believed that the e-learning courses were "more than expected," while 60% rated them "as expected." This level of satisfaction remained practically unchanged compared with the 2014 evaluation. Although

the ratings for time management and resource persons increased slightly, it was notable that ratings for program content and methodology used dropped significantly compared with 2014 and 2013 as the percentage of “more than expected” decreased and that of “as expected” increased. For other areas of evaluation, the percentage of participants who responded “more than expected” decreased, along with an increase in the number of those giving the rating “as expected.”

### ***B-1-1. High Points***

e-Learning courses were generally appreciated for effectiveness while maintaining low cost. In all e-learning courses, participants appreciated the program content and design, which included the appropriate coverage of topics. The experience of exchanging ideas among participants from various countries was widely appreciated. Another high point noted by participants was that the APO managed to engage very relevant, energetic resource persons who provided informative materials. Good time management during all sessions was noted. Some programs included site visits, which according to participants was a unique, useful feature of e-learning courses organized by the APO.

### ***B-1-2. Low Points and Suggestions for Improvement***

Typical low points for almost all e-learning projects were technical issues such as occasional interruption in VC connectivity and poor quality of video due to Internet disconnection. Difficulty in understanding the presentations of resource persons because they spoke too fast was pointed out by some participants.

The following were suggestions to improve future courses:

- Arranging interpreters to assist local participants to understand the lectures and discussions in the courses.
- Providing more practical examples and case studies including the use of video clips during lecture sessions to aid in understanding the material better.
- Including field visits and hands-on training session in the field.
- Providing advanced courses of the training program would be a help.
- Extending the training period from three to five days.
- Using social media to connect participants and resource persons.
- Providing accommodations for local participants from distant locations/other cities.

### **B-2. Resource Persons**

Overall, resource persons’ feedback indicated that no major problems were encountered and the e-learning courses were well organized. The materials for group presentations were of good quality, i.e., informative, detailed, and inclusive. Management of the VC facilities in terms of time and quality was satisfactory. Resource persons also suggested that an updated version of the courses including one-day field visits should be repeated in the following year.

### **B-3. Implementing Organizations**

Implementing organizations noted that most of participants were punctual, cooperative, and committed to the presentations and group exercises. The participants were very attentive in most of the offline and online session activities. Resource persons prepared good

presentations and gave appropriate answers to participants. Technical problems occurred but were minor.

For further improvement, the following suggestions were made:

- Developing a localized course or customized course covering the specific needs of each country would be helpful.
- Face-to-face follow-up training courses should be organized to enhance the practical skills of participants. Site visits should be organized to gain hands-on experience in follow-up programs.
- The course should provide additional time for coverage of more popular subjects with practical examples.

#### B-4. Conclusion

Overall, the APO’s e-learning courses received positive feedback from participants for good time management and physical arrangements. Participants also appreciated the interactive sessions with resource persons and groups of participants from other countries. Relevant, energetic resource persons with informative materials were also cited as a high point by participants. These were also the high points noted in the previous year’s evaluation. The views of all three parties were unified on organizing follow-up programs on more advanced topics and linking the e-learning to face-to-face follow-up training courses.

#### C. Highlights of In-country/Category C Project Implementation

In 2015, Category C projects implemented included I-OSMs, TES, BCBN, DMPs, DON (In-country Training Program for Institutional Strengthening of NPOs) and NFP. There were approximately 3,950 beneficiaries of Category C projects. Table 9 summarizes Category C activities and beneficiaries, and the sections that follow provide a summary of each project.

**Table 9. Category C Projects: Activities and Estimated\* Beneficiaries, 2013–2015**

Category C project	No. of Experts Assigned			No. of Projects/Missions/ Member Countries			Participants/ Beneficiaries		
	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015
<b>I-OSM</b>	NA	NA	NA	9 missions	8 missions	7 missions	84	93	76
<b>TES</b>	36	40	51	35	36	44	2800+ *	2400+ *	3000+ *
<b>BCBN</b>	NA	NA	NA	5 projects	8 projects	6 projects	15	27	24
<b>DMP</b>	4	2	5	9 Missions	14 Missions	7 Missions	100	615	390
<b>DON</b>	12	9	10	4	5	5	98	98	240
<b>NFP</b>	NA	NA	4	NA	NA	3	NA	NA	217
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>3,097+</b>	<b>3,233+</b>	<b>3,947+</b>

\*Estimated from information received from NPOs.

## C-1. I-OSMs

In total, 23 requests from nine members for organizing I-OSMs in the industry and service sectors were received in 2015. Of these, seven study missions benefited 76 participants from six member countries, with an average duration of about four days. Delegates attending all the missions totaled 76. Table 10 presents the full details including participating country, host country, and subject.

**Table 10. I-OSMs, 2015**

Host Country	Participating Country	Subject	No. of Members	Actual OSM Days
India	IR Iran	Preparing a Long-term Outlook, Strategic Plan, and Investment Policy Statement for a Group of Steel Manufacturers	12	6
Japan	Sri Lanka	Quality Customer Service through Productivity Enhancement	4	3
Vietnam	Mongolia	Production, Service, and Agricultural Sectors	6	4
ROC	Philippines	Best Practices in Agritourism	26	4
ROC	Vietnam	Productivity and Quality Enhancement	7	5
Malaysia	Sri Lanka		15	4
ROK/ Japan	India	Zero Quality Defect Manufacturing in SMEs	6	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>6 NPOs</b>		76	31

Note: The APO supported up to six participants per mission.

## C-2. TES

A total of 70 TES requests were received in 2015. Of these, 57 (including multiphase) or 81% were approved. Out of 57 projects, 14 were cancelled by the NPOs and three were carried over to 2016.

In 2015, 51 TES experts were assigned, with two carried over from 2014. The numbers of experts by nationality are given in Table 11. The most experts assigned from within the APO membership were from Japan and Malaysia (nine each), and the most from outside the APO membership were from the USA (five). The list of TES projects implemented in 2015 is attached as Annex 4. Expert services received an average evaluation score of 80 (full score = 100) for the quality of service provided to members who utilized them. Based on information provided by NPOs, more than 3,000 participants/professionals/employees benefited through lectures, presentations, consultations, and training conducted by the experts.

**Table 11. Experts Assigned Under TES, 2015**

Country	No. of experts	Country	No. of experts
Japan	9	Hong Kong	1
Malaysia	9	Indonesia	1
Singapore	6	ROK	1
ROC	5	New Zealand	1
USA	5	Philippines	1
Germany	3	Romania	1
India	3	UK	1

<b>Australia</b>	2	Vietnam	1
<b>Bangladesh</b>	1		
<b>Total experts assigned: 51</b>			

### C-3. BCBN

A total of twenty-four delegates including self-financed participants from six APO members/NPOs took part in the BCBN Program and visited nine member countries. Details including participating and host countries, subject, and number of days for each BCBN mission are given in Table 12.

**Table 12. BCBN, 2015**

<b>Participating Country</b>	<b>Host Country</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>No. of Members</b>	<b>Actual BCBN Days</b>
<b>Nepal</b>	Fiji	Strengthening the National Productivity and Economic Development Centre in Nepal	3	3
<b>ROK</b>	Japan & ROC	Study on Innovative, Successful Business Models	5	3
<b>Thailand</b>	Singapore	Future Planning and Management	3	3
<b>Malaysia</b>	ROK & ROC	Innovation and Competitiveness Strategies for Enhancing Technological Readiness	5	3
<b>Fiji</b>	Indonesia	Productivity and Entrepreneurship Development	5	5
<b>Pakistan</b>	Malaysia & Mongolia	Mission to Observe Competitiveness and Industrial/SME Sector Improvement Programs in Mongolia and Malaysia	3	5
<b>Total</b>			<b>24</b>	

### C-4. DMPs

The mission of an APO Productivity Demonstration Company is to convey success stories on the development and implementation of productivity improvement initiatives undertaken by all stakeholders. The following projects were implemented:

1. The Mongolia Productivity Organization (MPO) started a demonstration project on material flow cost accounting (MFCA) where four companies, Erin International LLC, Gungervaa LLC, Munkhiin Useg LLC, and Yarmag Hungun Beton LLC, were involved in learning about and adopting this environmental management tool to manage their use of materials and resources and increase the efficiency and transparency of material flow. With the instruction of the resource person, the companies learned to analyze their water consumption, material use and losses, and manage waste. The MPO also organized training courses and seminars to raise the awareness of MFCA/material management in the companies.
2. The Department of Small and Medium Enterprise Promotion of Lao PDR (DOSMEP) collaborated with the China Productivity Center (CPC), the APO's designated Center of Excellence on Green Productivity, to establish a demonstration site on solar energy. A

10-kW on-grid photovoltaic system was set up at the Ministry of Industry and Commerce of Lao PDR. The resource person also worked with local think tanks, government agencies, and companies to identify potential applications of renewable energy in rural areas.

3. The National Productivity Council of India cooperated with the CPC to promote the applications of waste management, recycling, and renewable energy. The Gujarat Pollution Control Board and Ecoli Waste Management learned about the technologies introduced by the ROC delegation; the two sides also exchanged views on their recycling policies.

Due to the disastrous earthquake in April 2015 and the follow-up recovery work, the National Productivity and Economic Development Centre decided to discontinue its demonstration company project on knowledge management for Nepal TV.

### C-5. DON

Five in-country projects were organized as DON two-week training courses in 2015 to continue building a critical mass of productivity and quality practitioners. Details on participating countries, number of experts, and number of participants are given in Table 13.

**Table 13. DON, 2015**

Country	Date	No. of Experts Assigned	No. of Participants
<b>Bangladesh</b>	16-28 August 2015	2	25
<b>Mongolia</b>	5-16 October 2015	2	24
<b>Sri Lanka</b>	12-23 October 2015	2	120
<b>Fiji</b>	16-27 November 2015	2	22
<b>IR Iran</b>	19-23 December 2015	2	49
<b>Total</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>240</b>

### C-6. Issues in Project Implementation

#### C-6-1. I-OSMs

In 2015, I-OSMs were implemented at the request of NPOs after acceptance of I-OSM applications. Seven study missions benefited 76 professionals from seven member countries. Six countries, the ROC, India, Japan, ROK, Malaysia, and Vietnam hosted I-OSMs from other member economies. The main concerns and subject areas were industry and service, especially in quality customer service, agritourism, quality enhancement, health-sector productivity, zero quality defects, etc.

To strengthen the I-OSM Program for enhancing mutual partnerships among member countries, all NPOs were encouraged to host two or three missions in 2016 depending on their strengths in relevant subject areas.

#### C-6-2. TES

TES projects are executed at the request of NPOs after submission, review, and acceptance of applications. The review and screening are carried out by the TES Committee of the Secretariat. Due to budget constraints and to balance TES utilization among member



countries, three TES slots were assigned to each APO member in 2015. However, it was noted that Bangladesh, the ROK, and Lao PDR did not utilize the TES Program. Although the status improved compared with 2014, the utilization of TES should be spread more equally among member countries. APO members are recommended to utilize all assigned slots to receive maximum benefit under this scheme.

It was also observed that the relevancy and appropriateness of TES applications based on the priority areas stipulated in the Project Notification in 2014 improved, although some applications had insufficient information and details. Thus, NPOs are reminded to screen and review their TES applications carefully before submission to the Secretariat. The nonsubmission of TES evaluation reports remained a critical issue. All beneficiary NPOs are requested to submit detailed TES evaluation reports in a timely manner. These reports are important for the Secretariat to review and improve its TES Program and to receive feedback on the quality of services provided by experts.

### ***C-6-3. BCBN***

The BCBN Program allows NPOs to learn from each other to address their unique needs and requirements. It also facilitates the dispatch of those involved in the productivity movement from an NPO or similar organizations in one member country to another. In 2015, various topics were requested by NPOs under the BCBN Program, including strengthening of NPOs, innovation and business excellence, future planning and management models for the public and private sectors, entrepreneurship, and competitiveness and SME development. The ROC hosted two missions and one each was hosted by Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, the ROK, Malaysia, Mongolia, and Singapore. The BCBN Program benefitted 24 delegates from NPOs and other stakeholders. The implementation of this type of program requires proper coordination between the parties involved. Issues such as late confirmation of program timing and preagreement between the hosting and requesting NPOs before submitting the BCBN proposal created additional waiting time and workload for the Secretariat. It is suggested that NPOs consult closely with the Secretariat on any plan to implement BCBN, mainly due to budget allocation. The timely submission of post-BCBN reports was another continuing issue from previous years. Therefore, NPOs are requested to submit the reports on time with sufficient details as spelled out in the Project Notification.

### ***C-6-4. DMPs***

In 2015, two DMPs started in 2014 were completed, including the Application of Productivity and Quality Management in the Service Industry in Mongolia and the Application of Knowledge Management and Innovation for Community Development with Focus on the Plantation Sector in Sri Lanka. The Sri Lankan DMP involved community development, plantations, and the health sector and concluded in a significant dissemination seminar with more than 200 attendees to witness the process and results of the project. The MPO developed Shunkhlai LLC, a petroleum product importing, storage, distribution, and retailing company, as a demonstration company that applied an integrated management system with focuses on ISO 9001, 14001, and 45001; the MPO also developed strategies to speed up its ISO management system consultancy process.

In general, the expert visits went smoothly with the great support of the NPOs, and the dissemination activities and materials were well planned and carried out. However, for the reimbursement of expenses for the dissemination activities and materials, NPOs are strongly encouraged to keep and submit meticulously all the records, receipts, and invoices with

details (and third-party references if the transaction was done for in-house facilities and services) so that the Secretariat can keep good track of the development of the dissemination activities and materials and the transparency of the expenditures.

The three DMPs for India, Lao PDR, and Mongolia initiated in 2015 are still underway. The expert visits for each project are going well with good initial outputs, but the NPOs are encouraged to discuss with the experts and plan the details of the visits well in advance so that the preparations and arrangements can be made in a timely manner.

#### ***C-6-5. DON***

Bangladesh, Fiji, IR Iran, Mongolia, and Sri Lanka benefited from the DON Program in 2015. Records show that around half of DON applications reached the Secretariat before the deadline. However, most of the proposals received did not clearly mention the specific requirements of NPOs in order to build a critical mass of productivity practitioners. This resulted in certain challenges in terms of making the design of programs more difficult in addition to the possibility of delays, particularly at the preparation stage. An important element for future projects under the DON Program will be improved communication and coordination among NPOs and local stakeholders at the preparation stage. During the implementation of DON projects, some countries stated that the programs needed to be streamlined to accommodate the constraints on timing and resources in addition to facilitating an effective learning process, i.e., to ensure a proper understanding and at the same time meet the practical needs of participants. It was also found that the language barrier is a challenge during the implementation stage. It is therefore suggested that speakers ensure proper knowledge and information transfers by carefully using appropriate ways of communication such speaking at a certain speed while checking the understanding of the participants from time to time.

#### ***C-6-6. NFP***

Three projects were implemented in 2015 in Bangladesh, Cambodia and Nepal under the NFP with a total of 217 participants benefiting. This program was launched in June 2015 to support participants of multicountry projects and NPOs to implement a national follow-up to any of the multicountry projects implemented in 2014 and 2015. Overall feedbacks from participants and NPOs on national projects were very positive. This scheme allowed participants who were not fluent in English to participate in the projects as the materials were translated to local language. It also allowed greater number of participants to attend. The apparent low availment of this assistance window was attributed to the limited time for preparation of the proposal and implementation by NPOs. Participants and NPOs are encouraged to avail of the assistance provided under this program to facilitate greater multiplier effect of multicountry projects in each country.

## Annex 1. Evaluation Form for Participants



### INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION BY PARTICIPANTS

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Code: \_\_\_\_\_ Dates: \_\_\_\_\_

Venue: \_\_\_\_\_

*Dear Participants:*

*The purpose of the evaluation is to determine how and to what extent you have benefited from the project, and how future activities on the subject and similar fields may be improved/pursued. Please assist us by filling in this form.*

1. Please tick (  $\sqrt{\quad}$  ) the appropriate boxes. Please also write your comments and suggestions, if any, in the appropriate box under Remarks.

Item	More than expected	As expected	Less than expected	Remarks
Program content (subjects/topics covered)				
Program schedule				
Time allocation				
Time management				
Methodology used				
Physical arrangements				
Resource speakers				
Field/observational/ company visit(s)				

<b>Overall evaluation</b>				
---------------------------	--	--	--	--

2. What were the high and low points of the program?

a) High points

---

---

b) Low points

---

---

3. What specific knowledge/skills/attitude have you gained by participation in this project?

---

---

4. How would you utilize/disseminate the knowledge/skills gained after returning home?

---

---

5. What are your suggestions for improvement if this project is implemented again?

---

---

6. What are your suggestions for follow-up activities, including suggestions for organizing a similar related program(s)?

---

---

7. Other comments and suggestions (if any).

---

---

**Name** (Optional):.....

**Country** (Optional):.....

## Annex 2. Evaluation Form for Resource Persons



### EVALUATION BY RESOURCE PERSONS

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Code: \_\_\_\_\_ Dates: \_\_\_\_\_

Venue: \_\_\_\_\_

*Dear Resource Speaker:*

*The APO is seeking your cooperation in evaluating the captioned project. This evaluation will be very helpful for future improvement if this project is implemented again or for future activities on similar related subjects.*

1. Comments on participants (level, attitude, language proficiency etc.):
  
2. Indicate the names of participants, if any, with outstanding knowledge and performance (1–2 names):
  
3. Comments on country/individual papers and presentations:
  
4. Comments on physical and logistic facilities:
  
5. Suggestions for improvement if this project is implemented again:
  
6. Suggestions for follow-up activities, including suggestions for organizing a similar related project(s):
  
7. Other comments and suggestions:

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

### Annex 3. Evaluation Form for Implementing Organizations



#### EVALUATION BY IMPLEMENTING ORGANIZATIONS

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Code: \_\_\_\_\_ Dates: \_\_\_\_\_

Venue: \_\_\_\_\_

The APO is seeking your cooperation in evaluating the captioned project. Please complete the following questions briefly.

1. Participants' arrival (no-shows, delays):
  
2. Participants' attendance and cooperation during the program:
  
3. Difficulties in implementing the project:
  - a. During preparation:
  
  - b. During the project:
  
4. Suggestions for improvement if this project is implemented again:
  
5. Suggestions for follow-up activities:
  
6. Other comments:

\_\_\_\_\_  
for Implementing Organization

#### Annex 4. List of TES Projects Implemented in 2015

	Subject	Venue	Expert	Timing	
				Start	End
1	Global Supply Chain Management for Iranian Industries	IR Iran	Prof. Yasuhiro Monden	5-Jan-15	8-Jan-15
2	Productivity Improvement in the Water Sector	IR Iran	Mr. Yosuke Matsumiya	14-Feb-15	18-Feb-15
3	Cultivation and Productivity/Quality Improvement of Orchids to Cater to the Export Market - 2015	Sri Lanka	Dr. Yao-Chien Alex Chang	10-Mar-15	14-Mar-15
4	Performance Excellence for Public Higher Education Institutions	Philippines	Dr. Luis M.R. Calingo	16-Mar-15	20-Mar-15
5	TOT on Energy Audit	Nepal	Mr. R. Virendra	20-Apr-15	24-Apr-15
6	Knowledge Management: Empowering International Cooperation in the Agriculture and Fisheries Sector	Indonesia	Mr. Praba Nair	4-May-15	6-May-15
7	Development of Energy Management System on ISO 50001	Pakistan	Mr. Ng Ha Wai Howie	4-May-15	15-May-15
8	Innovative Postharvest Management for Agribusiness	Pakistan	Mr. Chan Seng Kit	4-May-15	8-May-15
9	Developing Consulting Schemes on Lean Manufacturing	Vietnam	Mr. Shaharum Ashaari	8-Jun-15	12-Jun-15
10	Productivity Facilitator for Integrated Community Development (ICD)	Indonesia	Dr. Mohan Dhamotharan	15-Jun-15	19-Jun-15
11	Training Programme on National Productivity Awards (NPA) Assessment for Judge Panel Members	Sri Lanka	Mr. Sunil Sahadevan	15-Jun-15	20-Jun-15
12	Human Performance Technology Consultant Training Program	China, Rep. of	Mr. Sung Tak Kim	22-Jun-15	24-Jun-15
13	Training Course on Green Productivity and Environmental Management Accounting	Fiji	Mr. Yun Fung Yap, Alex	29-Jun-15	3-Jul-15

	Subject	Venue	Expert	Timing	
				Start	End
14	Workshop on Estimating Productivity and TFP for Short, Medium and Long Term (2015–2025) Based on Methodology Used by the Conference Board (TCB)	Malaysia	Dr. Abdul Azeez Erumban	29-Jun-15	3-Jul-15
15	Heading into the 21st Century World	Thailand	Mr. Michael Jackson	8-Jul-15	9-Jul-15
16	Training Program on 3D Printing and Future Manufacturing	India	Mr. Ian Gibson	20-Jul-15	24-Jul-15
17	Developing Consulting Schemes on Lean Manufacturing	Vietnam	Mr. Shaharum Ashaari	27-Jul-15	31-Jul-15
18	Training Course on Performance Management for Trainers and Middle-level Managers	Indonesia	Dr. Dindo Maamo Campilan	3-Aug-15	7-Aug-15
19	Conducting Industrial Engineering (IE) Training Programmes for NPS Staff	Sri Lanka	Mr. Kelvin Chan	24-Aug-15	5-Sep-15
20	Industry 4.0: The Future Revolution of Productivity and Competitiveness	Thailand	Prof. Wolfgang Baltus	2-Sep-15	2-Sep-15
21	Industry 4.0: The Future Revolution of Productivity and Competitiveness	Thailand	Mr. Ralf Opierzynski	2-Sep-15	2-Sep-15
22	Management Excellence in the Public Sector (Healthcare)	Japan	Ms. Joyce Johan Chang	9-Sep-15	11-Sep-15
23	Recovered Paper, Policy, and Technology Sharing	Indonesia	Prof. Hsiao-Kang Ma	14-Sep-15	18-Sep-15
24	Recovered Paper, Policy, and Technology Sharing	Indonesia	Prof. Perng	14-Sep-15	18-Sep-15
25	Developing a Strategic Plan for Productivity Promotion Programs in Vietnam and Capacity Building for the Vietnam National Productivity Institute	Vietnam	Dr. Vu Minh Khuong	14-Sep-15	16-Sep-15
26	TOT on Productivity Tools and Techniques for Instructors from 22 Provinces	Indonesia	Mr. Mohd. Lizuan Latif	28-Sep-15	2-Oct-15
27	TOT on Productivity Tools and Techniques for Instructors from 22 Provinces	Indonesia	Mr. Sharil Goh Fadhil	28-Sep-15	2-Oct-15
28	Corporate Social Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting	Thailand	Mr. Hiroshi Ishida	28-Sep-15	2-Oct-15
29	Top Executive Conference (TOPEX) and Workshop on KM and Innovation	Fiji	Dr. Laurence Prusak	2-Oct-15	8-Oct-15



	Subject	Venue	Expert	Timing	
				Start	End
30	International Conference on Using Technology and Voice of the Customer to Make Service Anticipatory and Proactive	China, Rep. of	Mr. John Goodman	12-Oct-15	15-Oct-15
31	Seminar on Sharing the Experiences of Encouraging Young Entrants in Agriculture	China, Rep. of	Mr. Seita Fujiwara	13-Oct-15	16-Oct-15
32	Seminar on Sharing the Experiences of Encouraging Young Entrants in Agriculture	China, Rep. of	Mr. Masaki Nakagawa	13-Oct-15	16-Oct-15
33	Food and Beverage Consultant Retraining Program	China, Rep. of	Dr. Takeshi Shimmura	19-Oct-15	21-Oct-15
34	TOT on Strengthening Capacity of Productivity Practitioners on Management Consultancy for SMEs	Indonesia	Mr. Rosmi Bin Abdullah	19-Oct-15	23-Oct-15
35	TOT on Strengthening Capacity of Productivity Practitioners on Management Consultancy for SMEs	Indonesia	Ms. Norhasimah Ibrahim	19-Oct-15	23-Oct-15
36	Cross-sharing and Exchange of Best Practices in Capability Development	Singapore	Ms. Lisa Higgins	19-Oct-15	23-Oct-15
37	1st Malaysian Productivity-Linked Wages Conference (My-PLiC)	Malaysia	Mr. Isep Gojali	22-Oct-15	23-Oct-15
38	2nd Malaysian Productivity-Linked Wages Conference (My-PLiC)	Malaysia	Mr. Yasuhiko Inoue	22-Oct-15	23-Oct-15
39	Cleaner Production Certification Scheme Development	Malaysia	Dr. Young Ku	26-Oct-15	28-Oct-15
40	Training Course/Workshop on Key Performance Indicators, Productivity Measurement, and Analysis	Indonesia	Mr. Aurel Brudan	9-Nov-15	20-Nov-15
41	TOT in Productivity Management for the Academic/Education Sector	Mongolia	Ms. Rauzah Zainal Abidin	9-Nov-15	13-Nov-15
42	Bilateral Resource Recycling Development (3Rs)	Thailand	Ms. Ying-Ying Lai	9-Nov-15	10-Nov-15
43	TOT on Productivity Management for the Academic/Education Sector	Mongolia	Mr. George Wong	16-Nov-15	20-Nov-15
44	Training Course/Workshop on Key Performance Indicators, Productivity Measurement, and Analysis	Mongolia	Ms. Cristina Tareta	16-Nov-15	27-Nov-15
45	Localizing the APO's Center of Excellence Program:	Philippines	Dr. Robin Mann	19-Nov-15	4-Dec-15

	Subject	Venue	Expert	Timing	
				Start	End
	Enhanced Adoption of the Business Excellence Framework in the Public Sector				
46	4th SR Asia International Conference on Global Partnerships for Sustainable Development	Indonesia	Mr. Birendra Raturi	25-Nov-15	27-Nov-15
47	4th SR Asia International Conference on Global Partnerships for Sustainable Development	Indonesia	Ms. Sumaya Rashid	25-Nov-15	27-Nov-15
48	4th SR Asia International Conference on Global Partnerships for Sustainable Development	Indonesia	Mr. Osamu Uno	25-Nov-15	27-Nov-15
49	National Consultations and Conference on the Rice Industry	Cambodia	Dr. V. Bruce J. Tolentino	7-Dec-15	9-Dec-15
50	International Forum on the Innovation of Catering Management	China, Rep. of	Prof. Hiroshi Izawa	7-Dec-15	9-Dec-15
51	Training-cum-Energy Auditing	Mongolia	Mr. B.P. Bhandary	7-Dec-15	18-Dec-15

Note: Projects are listed by date of implementation.

TOT, training of trainers.