

**Work-in-Progress: Not for Quotation**

**EVALUATION DESIGN MATRIX**

	<b>Evaluation Question</b>	<b>Research Question</b>	<b>Method</b>
1.0	Was the needs assessment of the Metro Botabek Project correct?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were the Projects aligned with Government priorities?</li> <li>• Were the Projects aligned with ADB priorities in the country?</li> <li>• Were the Projects aligned with ADB priorities in the sector?</li> <li>• Were the Projects formulated based on a thorough diagnostic analysis, building on existing knowledge and expertise?</li> <li>• Were the views of principal stakeholders reflected in the Projects' designs?</li> <li>• Were lessons learned from previous Projects considered in Project formulation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of Government Plans and Priorities.</li> <li>• Review of ADB's CSPs (or equivalent) and ESW Reports</li> <li>• Discussions with relevant Government agencies/executing agencies (EAs)/beneficiaries.</li> <li>• Discussions with donors.</li> </ul>
2.0	Were the resources and services provided adequate to the requirements of the Projects?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were the different levels of Project funding appropriate for achieving Project objectives?</li> <li>• Did the Projects' designs provide the most suitable mix of international and domestic consultants for achieving Project objectives?</li> <li>• What was the quality of the terms of reference?</li> <li>• Was the design complementary to support from other donors?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of Projects' implementation records.</li> <li>• Meetings/Discussions with Government representatives/EAs/beneficiaries and donors.</li> <li>• Meetings/Discussions with ADB Project officers.</li> <li>• Meetings/Discussions/or any form of communication (questionnaire) with consultants, if feasible.</li> </ul>
3.0	Were the outcomes of the Projects, as defined in the appraisal reports/report and recommendation of the President (RRP), achieved or are expected to be achieved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the Project outcomes as achieved lead (or will lead) to the attainment of Project goals?</li> <li>• Did the implementation arrangements work well?</li> <li>• Was there adequate coordination with nongovernment organizations, community groups and other donors?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of Projects' implementation records.</li> <li>• Meetings/Discussions with Government representatives/EAs/beneficiaries.</li> <li>• Meetings/Discussions with ADB Project officers.</li> <li>• Meetings/Discussions/or any form of communication (questionnaire) with consultants, if feasible.</li> <li>• Socio-economic survey, if necessary.</li> </ul>
4.0	Were the Projects' outcomes achieved efficiently and will they likely be sustained?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How closely were the Projects' designs followed, and what changes were made?</li> <li>• Did ADB consultant recruitment procedures lead to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of Projects' implementation records.</li> <li>• Meetings/Discussions with Government representatives/EAs/</li> </ul>

	<b>Evaluation Question</b>	<b>Research Question</b>	<b>Method</b>
		<p>timely recruitment of suitable, qualified, and experienced experts?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How did the consultants perform?</li> <li>• Were there any feedback loops to ensure early reporting of implementation problems?</li> <li>• Was ADB supervision sufficient to support Projects' implementation?</li> <li>• Will the Projects' facilities and benefits likely to be sustained?</li> <li>• Have adequate funds been provided for operation and maintenance of project facilities?</li> </ul>	<p>beneficiaries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meetings/Discussions with ADB Project officers.</li> <li>• Meetings/Discussions/or any form of communication (questionnaire) with consultants, if feasible.</li> </ul>
5.0	Was there adequate ownership and commitment on the part of the respective Governments and the recipient agencies to implement the recommendations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the Government (central and local) provide adequate support to the Projects during implementation?</li> <li>• Was there adequate participation from Government representatives/EAs/ stakeholders in the preparation of Projects' documents?</li> <li>• Was there adequate participation from Government representatives/EAs/ stakeholders during the implementation of the Projects?</li> <li>• Was there sufficient consultation/collaboration with the Government/EAs/ stakeholders in determining recommended actions?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of Projects' implementation records.</li> <li>• Meetings/Discussions with Government representatives/EAs/ beneficiaries.</li> <li>• Meetings/Discussions with ADB Project officers.</li> <li>• Meetings/Discussions/or any form of communication (questionnaire) with consultants, if feasible.</li> </ul>
6.0	Other areas to be assessed:		
	Socioeconomic impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the urban poor benefit from the Projects? What kind of benefit did they derive from the Projects? How many urban poor households benefited? How did the Projects affect the economic and social welfare of the urban poor in the Project areas?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Records of Government/EAs</li> <li>• Meetings/Discussions with Government representatives/EAs/ beneficiaries.</li> <li>• Socio-economic/household survey data analyses.</li> </ul>
	Environment impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What was the impact of the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Records of</li> </ul>

	<b>Evaluation Question</b>	<b>Research Question</b>	<b>Method</b>
		<p>Project on unaccounted for water and solid waste management disposal sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What was the environmental impact of the drainage channels, urban roads, and bus terminals?</li> </ul>	<p>Government/EAs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meetings/Discussions with Government representatives/EAs/beneficiaries.</li> <li>• Visual inspection.</li> </ul>
	Procurement issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was the procurement process observed?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Records of Government/EAs</li> <li>• Meetings/Discussions with Government representatives/EAs/beneficiaries/NGOs.</li> <li>• Meetings/Discussions with ADB Project officers.</li> </ul>
	Risk of Corruption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were potential risks of corruption identified on time and how were they addressed?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Records of Government/EAs</li> <li>• Meetings/Discussions with Government representatives/EAs/beneficiaries.</li> <li>• Meetings/Discussions with ADB Project officers.</li> <li>• Discussions/feedback from NGOs.</li> </ul>
7.0	Key standard issues for PPER rating:		

	Evaluation Question	Research Question	Method
	<b>Relevance</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Was the economic rationale for the Project based on sound analysis?</li> <li>2. Did the stakeholders own the project design process?</li> <li>3. Did the Project identify core beneficiaries?</li> <li>4. Did the project design incorporate lessons from related projects?</li> <li>5. Did the project avoid duplication of efforts in other projects?</li> <li>6. Were project interventions well planned and appropriately sequenced?</li> <li>7. How well did the project design address local needs and priorities and formulated appropriate strategies?</li> <li>8. Were the institutional set-up and implementation arrangements for the Project appropriate?</li> <li>9. Did the Project identify relevant risks and provide safeguard and/risk mitigation measures?</li> </ol>	Key informant interviews with stakeholder representatives, focus group discussions with project beneficiaries, household surveys
	<b>Effectiveness</b>	<p>Project achievements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Did the Project achieve what it intended to achieve?</li> <li>2. What factors contributed to the success of the Project?</li> <li>3. What factors contributed to the delays in project implementation?</li> <li>4. What led to changes in scope and design of the Project and were such changes appropriate and timely?</li> </ol>	Secondary data (Government statistics at local/municipality (if it exists) level, household survey, key informant interviews with stakeholder representatives and focus group discussion with EA (MPW), BOTABEK local authorities and water companies (PDAMs).
	<b>Efficiency</b>	<p>Assumptions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Were assumptions in economic and financial analysis valid? (coverage, number of beneficiaries, prices, procurement and management costs, input costs, , risks, etc)</li> <li>2. What factors contributed to the differences in EIRR at appraisal and PPER (if any)?</li> </ol> <p>Project management and procurement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Was the procurement</li> </ol>	<p>Content analysis of project documents, Board discussion papers, interview with PCR consultants and MPW and PDAMs staff, economic reevaluation of the Project using PPER parameters</p> <p>EIRR and FIRR calculation documents, list of key assumptions at the time of appraisal, revision, and PCR; Economic and financial parameters at the time of PPER for reevaluation (yields, prices, costs, conversion factors etc)</p>

	Evaluation Question	Research Question	Method
		<p>process transparent, timely and effective?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Was the financial management in the project transparent?</li> <li>5. Were there any problems in fund disbursement for project activities?</li> <li>6. How effective was the intra and inter-agency coordination mechanism in the project?</li> </ol> <p>Policies</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. How did Government's macro and sectoral policies influence:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. beneficiary participation</li> <li>b. resource allocation for project</li> <li>c. related activities; resource generation for O&amp;M?</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>Composition and frequency of project steering committee meetings</p> <p>Clarity in roles and responsibilities of project partners (EAs, NGOs and beneficiaries); selection process used in selecting NGOs; Procurement process followed.</p> <p>Government policies (if any) on engagement of beneficiaries in public projects, resource allocation for on-going and completed projects, and O&amp;M budget allocation for water supply (and drainage) at municipality level</p>
	<b>Sustainability</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there availability of adequate and effective demand for the project's services (water supply)?</li> <li>2. Is the water tariff set at appropriate level?</li> <li>3. Is PDAMs financially viable?</li> <li>4. Are there appropriate policies and procedures present to ensure continued funding for operation and maintenance of PDAMs?</li> <li>5. Is there application of appropriate policies to ensure the maintenance of required human resources?</li> <li>6. Adequacy of policies, regulatory conditions?</li> <li>7. Political will to ensure the Government ownership of and commitment to the project?</li> <li>8. Adequacy of incentives for continued stakeholder participation?</li> <li>9. Environmental, social and technological, and natural resource risks?</li> </ol>	<p>Focus Group discussion with MPW, BOTABEK local authorities and PDAMs; household surveys (if deemed necessary from initial study and interviews)</p> <p>Key informant interviews with MPW, BOTABEK local authorities and PDAMs</p>
8.0	<b>ADB Performance</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How was the quality of ADB supervision at different stages of the Project?</li> <li>2. How effective was ADB in coordinating the Borrower and the three main EA and IAs (MoC, PPC and WSDC)?</li> <li>3. Was ADB supervision of the Project adequate? (number</li> </ol>	<p>Key informant interviews</p> <p>Quality of supervision and project review mission reports;</p> <p>Quality of communication between ADB and EAs;</p> <p>Composition and types of</p>

	Evaluation Question	Research Question	Method
		<p>of review mission, duration, timing, staff continuity, composition)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. How well and timely did ADB respond to project requests for assistance?</li> <li>5. How well did ADB respond to implementation difficulties?</li> <li>6. How well did ADB respond to procurement matters during implementation?</li> </ol>	<p>expertise of mission members</p> <p>Time spent by missions in the field (Outside Hanoi)</p> <p>Time lag between requests and actual disbursements and reasons for any delays</p>