

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT

ON

SELECTED TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

FOR

STRENGTHENING EVALUATION CAPACITY

IN

DEVELOPING MEMBER COUNTRIES

July 2001

ABBREVIATIONS

ADB	–	Asian Development Bank
CMED	–	Central Monitoring and Evaluation Division
DMC	–	developing member country
EA	–	Executing Agency
M&E	–	monitoring and evaluation
MPI	–	Ministry of Plan Implementation
NASC	–	Nepal Administrative Staff College
NEDA	–	National Economic and Development Authority
NPC	–	National Planning Commission
NPCS	–	National Planning Commission Secretariat
OED	–	Operations Evaluation Department
OEM	–	Operations Evaluation Mission
PEIS	–	postevaluation information system
PEU	–	Performance Evaluation Unit
PPMS	–	project performance management system
PRC	–	People’s Republic of China
RME	–	results monitoring and evaluation
SLIDA	–	Sri Lanka Institute of Development Administration
TA	–	technical assistance
TCR	–	technical assistance completion report
TPAR	–	technical assistance performance audit report

NOTES

- (i) The fiscal year (FY) of the Governments of Nepal, Philippines, and Sri Lanka ends on 31 December.
- (ii) In this report, “\$” refers to US dollars.

CONTENTS

	Page
BASIC TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE DATA	ii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	v
I. BACKGROUND	1
A. Rationale	1
B. Objectives and Scope of the TAs	2
C. TA Completion Reports	4
II. ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION PERFORMANCE	4
A. Design of the TAs	4
B. Engagement of Consultants	6
C. Organization and Management	6
D. Implementation Schedule and Financing Arrangements	7
E. Supervision	8
III. EVALUATION OF OUTPUTS AND IMPACT	8
A. Outputs	8
B. Impact of the TAs and Achievement of Purpose	11
C. Sustainability	12
D. Other Development Impacts	14
IV. CONCLUSIONS	14
A. Key Issues	14
B. Overall Assessment	15
C. Lessons Learned	15
D. Follow-Up Actions and Recommendations	16
APPENDIXES	20

BASIC TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA) DATA

TA 1967-NEP: Strengthening the Postevaluation Capability of the National Planning Commission Secretariat

TA Cost (\$)	Expected	Actual
Foreign Exchange	68,200	63,132
Local Currency	31,800	28,744
Total	100,000	91,876

Executing Agency: National Planning Commission

Key Dates	Expected	Actual
President's/Board Approval		22 Oct 1993
Signing of TA Agreement		22 Oct 1993
TA Completion	28 Feb 1995	30 Jun 1996
TCR Completion		16 Dec 1997

Type of Mission	Date
TA Review	Nov/Dec 1994
TA Completion	Dec 1997
Postevaluation ¹	Mar 2001

TA 2954-NEP: Strengthening the Project Performance Management System

TA Cost (\$)	Expected	Actual
Foreign Exchange	368,000	221,650
Local Currency	132,000	183,225
Total	500,000	404,875

Executing Agency: National Planning Commission

Key Dates	Expected	Actual
President's/Board Approval		19 Dec 1997
Signing of TA Agreement		17 Feb 1998
Consultant Recruitment		Mar 1998
TA Completion	Aug 1999	Dec 1999

Type of Mission	Date
TA Review	Jan/Feb 1999
TA Completion	Dec 1999
Postevaluation	Mar 2001

¹ The Operations Evaluation Mission comprised R. Keith Leonard, Evaluation Specialist (Mission Leader); C. Pokharel, Domestic Consultant (Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist in Nepal); and M. Chibba, Staff Consultant (Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist in the Philippines).

TA 1650-PHI: Strengthening Postevaluation Capacity of the NEDA

TA Cost (\$)	Expected	Actual
Foreign Exchange	90,200	85,177
Local Currency	9,800	9,789
Total	100,000	94,967

Executing Agency: National Economic and Development Authority

Key Dates	Expected	Actual
President's/Board Approval	2 Jan 1992	7 Jan 1992
Signing of Consultant's Contract		
Evaluation Systems Expert	15 Jan 1992	27 Jan 1992
Postevaluation Trainer	15 Jan 1992	28 Jan 1992
TA Completion	Jan 1993	26 Apr 1994
TCR Completion		23 Aug 1994

Type of Mission	Date
TA Fact-Finding	Dec 1991
Review 1	Sep 1992
Review 2	Apr 1993
Review 3	Dec 1993
TA Completion	Apr 1994
Postevaluation	Mar 2001

TA 2782-PHI: Pilot Implementation of the Project Performance Management System

TA Cost (\$)	Expected	Actual
Foreign Exchange	170,000	147,902
Local Currency	80,000	68,981
Total	250,000	216,883

Executing Agency: National Economic and Development Authority

Key Dates	Expected	Actual
President's/Board Approval		16 Apr 1997
Signing of TA Agreement		29 Apr 1997
Inception Report	31 Dec 1999	Jul 1997
TA Completion		24 Nov 1999
TCR Completion		24 Nov 1999

Type of Mission	Date
TA Fact-Finding	Mar 1997
TA Completion	Oct 1999
Postevaluation	Mar 2001

TA 1579-SRI: Strengthening Postevaluation Capability of the Ministry of Policy Planning and Implementation

TA Cost (\$)	Expected	Actual
Foreign Exchange	95,700	81,861
Local Currency	4,300	8,674
Total	100,000	90,535

Executing Agency: Ministry of Policy, Planning, and Implementation

Key Dates	Expected	Actual
President's/Board Approval		17 Oct 1991
TA Completion		20 Aug 1992

Type of Mission	Date
TA Fact-Finding	Sep 1991
Inception	Jan/Feb 1992
Review	Feb 1992
TA Completion	Aug 1992
Postevaluation	Mar 2001

TA 2810-SRI: Strengthening Project Performance Evaluation Capability of the Ministry of Plan Implementation, Ethnic Affairs, and National Integration

TA Cost (\$)	Expected	Actual
Foreign Exchange	322,000	291,008
Local Currency	28,000	11,657
Total	350,000	302,665

Executing Agency: Ministry of Plan Implementation, Ethnic Affairs, and National Integration

Key Dates	Expected	Actual
President's/Board Approval		16 Jun 1997
Signing of TA Agreement		Aug 1997
TA Completion	Dec 1998	Oct 1999

Type of Mission	Date
TA Fact-Finding	Mar/Apr 1997
Inception	Aug 1997
Review	Jan 1998
TA Completion	Sep 1999
Postevaluation	Mar 2001

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since 1990, the Asian Development Bank (ADB), through its Operations Evaluation Department (OED), has provided 14 technical assistance (TA) grants to build evaluation capability in seven of its developing member countries (DMCs). Three phases can be distinguished in this assistance: (i) phase 1 – an initial round of seven small-scale TAs from 1990 to 1994 to build postevaluation capability in Bangladesh, People's Republic of China (PRC), Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Thailand; (ii) phase 2 – five TAs between 1995 and 1997 to establish ADB's project performance management system (PPMS)² in PRC, Nepal, Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Thailand; and (iii) phase 3 – two TAs, both approved in 1999, to build results monitoring and evaluation (RME) capability in the PRC and the Philippines. The three phases of TAs reflect the evolution in thinking in ADB, which itself has moved from benefit monitoring and evaluation (BME) and postevaluation to a more seamless evaluation framework applicable at all stages of the project cycle. This technical assistance performance audit report (TPAR) evaluates six of these TAs, a phase 1 and 2 TA in each of three countries—Nepal, Philippines, and Sri Lanka.

In preparing this TPAR, OED was evaluating its own work. To the extent possible, independence was assured by assigning a new staff member to the task.

The purpose of the phase 1 TAs was to establish a postevaluation capability within a central agency and to provide the means for disseminating postevaluation findings to facilitate their use in decision making. There were some small differences in emphasis among the three phase 1 TAs, but their scope included (i) a review of the institutional framework and procedures for evaluation, with recommendations for improvement; (ii) the design and introduction of appropriate methodology, procedures, and techniques for postevaluation; (iii) the introduction of OED's computerized postevaluation information system (PEIS) to aid in storing, retrieving, and disseminating evaluation results; (iv) the training of staff through postevaluation case studies and short-term secondments to OED at ADB; and (v) the provision of hardware, software, and training required for operating the PEIS.

The three phase 2 TAs shared similar objectives. The objective of TA 2954-NEP: Strengthening the Project Performance Management System was to establish an accountable and result-oriented institutional framework for the programming, budgeting, and management of development projects. The objective of TA 2782-PHI: Pilot Implementation of the Project Performance Management System was to improve the effectiveness of development expenditures through the implementation of the PPMS on a pilot basis. The objective of TA 2810-SRI: Strengthening Project Performance Evaluation Capability of the Ministry of Plan Implementation, Ethnic Affairs, and National Integration was to enhance the project performance evaluation and quality assurance capability of three central agencies so as to support the Government's efforts to foster a results-oriented PPMS. The scope of the three phase 2 TAs was similar. For example, TA 2954-NEP covered (i) an institutional assessment and review of existing systems and processes; (ii) the introduction of the PPMS in the National Planning Commission Secretariat and three ministries, and the establishment of a management information system based on the PPMS to channel the results of project performance progress effectively to those involved in the project cycle and to high-level committees; (iii) training of the staff of the concerned agencies on the job and through a study tour, and the preparation of manuals; and (iv) the provision of computer facilities.

² The terms PPMS, RME, and BME are defined in a footnote to para. 3 of the main report.

The Executing Agency was the National Planning Commission in Nepal, the National Economic and Development Authority in the Philippines, and what is now the Ministry of Plan Implementation in Sri Lanka. In each country, the phase 1 TAs also provided training to staff of other government agencies, while phase 2 TAs involved 2-4 other agencies in the pilot introduction of the PPMS.

Technical assistance completion reports (TCRs) were prepared for four of the six TAs. One TCR did not provide a TA rating. Two TAs were rated generally successful and one partly successful.

The TPAR performance rating for the six TAs evaluated is given in the table below. Where TPAR ratings are below the TCR ratings, this is largely due to a lack of sustainability, limited impacts under the "other impacts" category, and failure to incorporate evaluation findings in the decision-making processes.

TA No.	Name	AMOUNT T (\$'000)	APPROVAL	Rating
1967-NEP	Strengthening the Postevaluation Capability of the National Planning Commission Secretariat	100	23 Oct 93	Partly successful
1650-PHI	Strengthening Postevaluation Capacity of the NEDA	100	7 Jan 92	Partly successful
1579-SRI	Strengthening Postevaluation Capability of the Ministry of Policy Planning and Implementation	100	17 Oct 91	Highly successful
2954-NEP	Strengthening the Project Performance Management System	500	19 Dec 97	Unsuccessful
2782-PHI	Pilot Implementation of the Project Performance Management System	250	16 Apr 97	Partly successful
2810-SRI	Strengthening Project Performance Evaluation Capability of the Ministry of Plan Implementation, Ethnic Affairs, and National Integration	350	16 Jun 97	Successful

All six TAs are assessed as relevant although relevance in terms of perceived need was higher from ADB's perspective than from that of the DMCs. Also, the TAs tended to be ad hoc interventions rather than steps in a long-term strategy to build evaluation capacity in DMCs. Phase 1 TAs produced most outputs to a generally high standard and achieved their purpose at completion. However, only in Sri Lanka has the impact been sustained. On the other hand, TA 2954-NEP and TA 2782-PHI did not achieve their purpose by completion. The purpose of TA 2810-SRI was partially achieved. Sustainability was assessed as likely only for the TAs in Sri Lanka. Most TAs score poorly on other impacts. The lack of other impacts is attributable to the lost opportunity to incorporate effectively evaluation findings into the budget, new project approval, and policy/strategy-setting processes.

Lessons learned are as follows:

- (i) The success in Sri Lanka was due to a combination of factors including (a) stability in staffing such that a very high proportion of trained staff remain in tasks for which they were trained; (b) high-level support in key places within and outside the Ministry of Plan Implementation; and (c) existence of a mandate by Cabinet decree for evaluation.
- (ii) Building performance evaluation capacity in DMCs is more complex, difficult, and time-consuming than first envisaged. The phase 2 TAs were overambitious relative to the resources provided.
- (iii) A more thorough preparation process should be adopted for future TAs to ensure high-level ownership and commitment to performance evaluation, and participation by all key stakeholders in the formulation/design process.
- (iv) For public sector capacity building to be successful, a number of conditions should exist. If these conditions are not met, an assessment must determine whether the systemic or underlying problems should be addressed first.
- (v) Building DMC capacity in performance evaluation requires a holistic approach that covers collecting data at the field and project levels, through various levels of aggregation and analysis for the end users. TA design should consider needs at all levels.
- (vi) Building capability with a primary focus on the central oversight agency may carry a risk that other entities may have weak incentives for providing performance evaluation information.
- (vii) The location of responsibility for evaluation within organizational hierarchies is also important. To ensure the required status, budget and staff support, and an ability to operate across organizational boundaries, the responsibility should be located as close as possible to the head of the organization.
- (viii) During TA design and implementation, care needs to be taken that performance evaluation systems do not become “supply-driven,” too complex, and too resource intensive to sustain.
- (ix) Establishing performance evaluation systems is a means to an end—benefits are obtained when the results are used in key operational, budget, investment, and policy/strategy decision-making processes. TA design should include specific features to encourage, facilitate, and formalize the incorporation of evaluation results in decision making.
- (x) To develop staff competency and confidence to carry out evaluation, as opposed to creating awareness of its importance and basic knowledge of the tools and techniques, a case study approach to training is needed.
- (xi) If OED is to manage future TAs to build DMC evaluation capability, more attention should be given to the professional and support staff resources and skills required in OED. Also, OED needs to work more closely with resident missions, reaching an agreement on roles and responsibilities for providing support and supervision to the TAs.

- (xii) For larger TAs, OED should follow the practice of recruiting a firm or institution, rather than individuals, to ensure efficient and effective consulting services.
- (xiii) The pace of TA implementation to build performance evaluation capacity should be driven by DMC sense of ownership and commitment, and not by deadlines imposed by the TA implementation schedule.
- (xiv) The introduction of computerized information systems is not a solution to poorly performing manual systems. Various institutional, management, and social factors need to be taken into account during computerization.

The follow-up actions proposed for ADB are as follows:

Recommendation	Responsibility for		
	Action	Monitoring	Timing
1. Where ADB has provided TA support for strengthening such activities, OEMs of OED and PCR missions of operational departments should invite the participation of DMC staff and units involved in postevaluation and performance evaluation.	OED and operational departments	OED	Immediately
2. Any future ADB support to strengthen DMC evaluation capacity should start at the project level and focus on supporting the adoption for use in ADB projects of a mandated project performance evaluation system that provides required input for the project performance report.	Operational departments	OED	3-6 months
3. A small working group should be convened comprising Nepal Resident Mission (NRM) and Headquarters staff to develop a strategy for public sector capacity building in Nepal and guidelines for related advisory TA grants, taking into account the findings of this TPAR and the Special Evaluation Study on Effectiveness of Bank Assistance in Capacity Building in Nepal.	NRM (to initiate)	NRM	6-9 months

Country-specific follow-up actions are given in paras. 65-67.

I. BACKGROUND

A. Rationale

1. The willingness and ability of agencies and institutions of developing member countries (DMCs) to monitor and evaluate projects and to effectively use the results play a crucial role in ensuring project success and development effectiveness. Also, timely and accurate information evaluating project performance can improve the quality of decisions on new project design and approval, budget allocations, and policy and strategy development. Evaluation can contribute to greater transparency and a focus on results, thereby leading to improved governance. Despite more than three decades of financial and technical assistance (TA), very few DMCs have established the capacity for ongoing project or performance monitoring and evaluation (M&E). Many countries still lack the essential requirements of good M&E: access to quality information, feedback mechanisms, and interest, commitment, and accountability.

2. The Asian Development Bank (ADB), through its Operations Evaluation Department (OED), has supported the building of DMC evaluation capacity. Building the capability for postevaluation and performance evaluation work in DMCs improves not only the performance of ADB-financed projects but also the efficiency and effectiveness of other investments in these countries.

3. Since 1990, OED has implemented 14 TAs amounting to \$3,952,000 for strengthening the evaluation capacity of various executing agencies (EAs) in seven DMCs: Bangladesh, People's Republic of China (PRC), Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Thailand. Three phases can be distinguished in this assistance: (i) phase 1 – an initial round of seven small-scale TAs over the period 1990 to 1994 to build postevaluation capability in all seven countries; (ii) phase 2 – five TAs from 1995 to 1997 to operationalize ADB's project performance management system³ (PPMS) in PRC, Nepal, Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Thailand; and (iii) phase 3 – two TAs, both approved in 1999, to build results monitoring and evaluation⁴ (RME) capability in the PRC and the Philippines. The phase 3 TAs, which are ongoing, aim to build on the phase 2 TAs to have RME more widely adopted and practiced. The three phases reflect the evolution in the thinking in ADB, which itself has moved from benefit monitoring and evaluation⁵ (BME) and postevaluation to PPMS that aims for a more seamless evaluation framework applicable at all stages of the project cycle.

³ In 1997, ADB developed an internal PPMS, which is an integrated approach to project-specific RME. PPMS comprises (i) the use of the logical framework for project design, which should improve project quality at entry; (ii) performance indicators drawn from the logical framework and a project management information system developed to report on these; (iii) monitoring and reporting against these performance indicators in the project performance report (PPR) as an ongoing monitoring and management activity during project implementation; and (iv) use of the same performance indicators in the project completion report and project performance audit report after the Project has been put into operation.

⁴ RME essentially represents a change in terminology for the same process as PPMS. The change was made because the term PPMS is largely unique to ADB.

⁵ BME comprises three activities: (i) survey and analysis of comprehensive benchmark data on beneficiaries; (ii) monitoring the delivery of benefits to beneficiaries; and (iii) studies (typically at midterm and completion) which evaluate the benefits of the project. In practice, BME became an inflexible and complicated means of monitoring and managing performance.

4. This technical assistance performance audit report (TPAR) evaluates six completed TAs⁶ comprising phase 1 and 2 TAs in three countries: Nepal, Philippines, and Sri Lanka. The three countries were selected to represent a range of performance as determined by a review of TA files. Phase 3 TAs were not considered for evaluation as they are ongoing.

5. The TPAR evaluates the TAs on the basis of relevance, efficacy, sustainability, and institutional development and other impacts. The TPAR also identifies lessons learned to assist in planning, designing, and implementing future TAs to develop DMC evaluation capability as well as follow-up actions to enhance the impact and sustainability of the TAs. The TPAR is based on the findings of the Operations Evaluation Mission (OEM) fielded in March 2001 and a review of ADB documents and files. The OEM met with representatives of the EAs, line departments, other central agencies, training providers, and consultants from the TAs. A survey questionnaire was sent to the EAs, line departments, and consultants prior to the OEM (Appendix 1 gives a summary of the responses). Copies of the draft TPAR were sent to the governments and concerned ADB staff for review. All comments received were considered in finalizing the TPAR.

B. Objectives and Scope of the TAs

6. The three phase 1 small-scale TAs had similar objectives (Appendix 2). The objective of TA 1967-NEP: Strengthening the Postevaluation Capability of the National Planning Commission Secretariat was to strengthen the capability of the Central Monitoring and Evaluation Division (CMED) of the National Planning Commission Secretariat (NPCS) and to increase the awareness of officials in the Ministry of Finance and key line ministries/agencies of the importance of evaluating the performance of completed projects/programs. The objective of TA 1650-PHI: Strengthening Postevaluation Capacity of the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) was to improve the capability of NEDA staff and that of selected implementing agencies to evaluate the performance of projects through design of a postevaluation system and procedures. The objective of TA 1579-SRI: Strengthening Postevaluation Capability of the Ministry of Policy Planning and Implementation was to improve the aid management system by strengthening the capacity for performance evaluation within the Ministry of Policy Planning and Implementation, now the Ministry of Plan Implementation (MPI) through the introduction of postevaluation. All three TAs aimed to ensure effective feedback of evaluation results into decision making.

7. The three phase 1 TAs covered the same areas: (i) a review of the institutional framework and procedures for evaluation, with recommendations for improvement; (ii) design and introduction of appropriate methodology, procedures, and techniques for postevaluation; (iii) introduction of OED's computerized postevaluation information system (PEIS) to aid in storing, retrieving, and disseminating evaluation results; (iv) training of staff through the conduct of case study postevaluations and short-term attachments to OED; and (v) provision of hardware, software, and training required for operating the PEIS. The implied outputs were (i) a revised institutional framework and procedures adopted for postevaluation, (ii) an institutional

⁶ TA 1967-NEP: *Strengthening the Postevaluation Capability of the National Planning Commission Secretariat*, for \$100,000, approved on 22 October 1993; TA 2954-NEP: *Strengthening the Project Performance Management System*, for \$500,000, approved on 19 December 1997; TA 1650-PHI: *Strengthening the Postevaluation Capability of the National Economic and Development Authority*, for \$100,000, approved on 7 January 1992; TA 2782-PHI: *Pilot Implementation of the Project Performance Management System*, for \$250,000, approved on 16 April 1997; TA 1579-SRI: *Strengthening Postevaluation Capability of the Ministry of Policy Planning and Implementation*, for \$100,000, approved on 17 October 1991; and TA 2810-SRI: *Strengthening Project Performance Evaluation Capability in the Ministry of Plan Implementation, Ethnic Affairs and National Integration*, for \$350,000, approved on 16 June 1997.

capability to conduct postevaluation, (iii) staff with the skills and experience to conduct postevaluation, and (iv) a functioning computer-based PEIS.

8. The three larger phase 2 TAs also had similar objectives (Appendix 2). The objective of TA 2954-NEP: Strengthening the Project Performance Management System was to establish an accountable and result-oriented institutional framework in Nepal at the national and selected line ministry levels for the programming, budgeting, and management of development projects. The objective of TA 2782-PHI: Pilot Implementation of the Project Performance Management System was to improve the effectiveness of development expenditures in the Philippines by enhancing the Government's capabilities in M&E through implementation of the PPMS on a pilot basis in three agencies. The objective of TA 2810-SRI: Strengthening Project Performance Evaluation Capability of the Ministry of Plan Implementation, Ethnic Affairs, and National Integration was to enhance the project performance evaluation and quality assurance capability of three central agencies so as to support the Government's efforts to foster a results-oriented PPMS as part of its efforts at administrative reform.

9. The scope of the three phase 2 TAs was also similar. TA 2954-NEP covered (i) institutional assessment and review of existing systems and processes; (ii) the introduction of PPMS to NPCA and three ministries, and establishment of a management information system based on PPMS to channel the results of project performance progress effectively to those involved in the project cycle and to high-level committees; (iii) training the staff of the concerned agencies on the job and via a study tour, and the preparation of manuals; and (iv) provision of computer facilities. TA 2782-PHI covered (i) institutional assessment of NEDA and the other two pilot departments and review of information flow processes and content; (ii) pilot introduction of PPMS in NEDA and the two departments; (iii) training in PPMS to concerned staff; (iv) preparation of a plan for further development of PPMS; and (v) provision of computer facilities. TA 2810-SRI covered (i) preparing an action plan for institutionalizing a more effective PPMS; (ii) designing system procedures to ensure the results of evaluation are made available to those involved in the earlier stages of the project cycle and to effectively link project quality assurance structures; (iii) preparing guidelines for PPMS and for setting up and reviewing indicators; (iv) establishing a documents center and strengthening the PEIS established under the preceding TA to provide a feedback system to other ministries; and (v) creating awareness about PPMS, training in PPMS tools and techniques, more advanced international training in evaluation methodologies for two MPI staff, a regional study tour, and supporting the Sri Lanka Institute of Development Administration (SLIDA) to provide future training in project performance evaluation.

10. The logical framework of TA 2782-PHI⁷ gives the outputs as (i) introduction of PPMS; (ii) capability assessment of selected agencies; (iii) strengthened capability of selected agencies; (iv) identification of organizational changes and refinement in function of selected M&E units; and (v) a program outline and strategy for broad-based implementation. As stated, the expected project impact is the ability of NEDA and the selected line ministries to implement PPMS in their future projects. The TA report for TA 2954-NEP states that the TA would be a success when the Government had developed the capability to (i) identify and prioritize projects based on clear development criteria, (ii) implement and monitor them effectively by keeping track and comparing project results with actual and expected outputs and impacts, and (iii) hold implementing agencies accountable for project outcomes.

⁷ The only one of the six evaluated TAs that had a logical framework. Incorporation of a logical framework for TAs became mandatory in January 1998, after the date of approval of all the TAs.

C. TA Completion Reports

11. Of the six TAs, two phase 1 and two phase 2 TAs had been evaluated in a technical assistance completion report (TCR). The TCRs indicated that the TAs were able to achieve most of their intended outputs and contributed to creating positive awareness of the importance of institutionalizing postevaluation systems. The TCRs highlighted the importance of conducting needs assessments as a basis for formulating programs to build institutional capacity. They also noted that government commitment and support were essential to the effective implementation of the TAs as well as long-term sustainability of TA benefits. The summary of TCR ratings is presented in Table 1 (further details are in Appendix 3).

Table 1: Technical Assistance Completion Report Ratings

TA Number	TCR Rating
TA 1650-PHI	Not rated. The TCR notes the TA made a small beginning that was of a reasonably good quality but needs to be sustained.
TA 1967-NEP	Generally successful
TA 2782-PHI	Partly successful
TA 2810-SRI	Generally successful

12. The TCR for TA 1967-NEP rated the TA as generally successful. Despite the noted problems with staff transfer, the TCR expressed the view that, as a result of the preparation of a manual and the establishment of the PEIS, the TA had helped establish a lasting postevaluation base in CMED. The OEM found that this capability has not been sustained. The TCR did not assess the achievement of the objective to feed postevaluation findings back to project planners and policy makers in a timely way. As this TPAR points out, it is only through the use of evaluation results that benefits are obtained. Although the TCR for TA 1650-PHI had no rating for the Project, the OEM concurs with its general findings. In particular, the TCR judged that the inclusion of system development and training within the same TA was too ambitious for the resources provided. The TCR also noted that, although a small beginning of a reasonably good quality had been made, sustainability was not certain. Specifically, it noted that a special commitment was required on the part of NEDA management if the momentum was to continue. The TCR did not comment on the important area of using evaluation findings and incorporating them in decision making. The TCR for TA 2782-PHI provided a very good evaluation of the TA and fully justified the assessment of partly successful. The TCR for TA 2810-SRI also had a sound basis for supporting its rating of generally successful. Most TCRs did not give the reasons for implementation delays and cost deviations.

II. ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION PERFORMANCE

A. Design of the TAs

13. OED designed the TAs in consultation with key staff of the EAs. For the phase 1 small-scale TAs, this was an appropriate level of preparation. However, the phase 2 TAs, which were larger and more complex, should have undergone more detailed preparation. Both groups of TAs aimed to review existing arrangements for evaluation, implement improved systems, and provide training within their scope. The OEM finding is that this was overambitious in light of the resources available and the implementation period, particularly for phase 2 TAs (para. 34). The pressure to produce TA outputs did not allow time for governments to fully understand the budgetary and staffing consequences of the proposals developed during TA implementation. In some cases, governments did not develop a sense of ownership of the new systems (para. 38). The diagnosis and process/institutional design should have been part of an extended preparation phase for the larger TAs. The study tours aimed at creating awareness could usefully have taken place at the same time as TA preparation, perhaps under a small-scale TA. The TAs themselves should have been limited to the introduction of agreed upon new processes with the main focus on comprehensive training.

14. The phase 2 TAs involved selected line ministries/departments in the pilot introduction of performance evaluation. These institutions were reportedly not involved in TA formulation. They became aware of the TAs only after implementation started. Clearly, this is not a sound basis on which to build commitment and hence sustainability. TA formulation needs to involve all major stakeholders.

15. Phase 2 TAs focused on strengthening performance evaluation capability at only one or two levels of the evaluation process: a central agency and selected ministries or departments. Strengthening data collection at the regional, district, project, or field level was not part of the TA scope. Consequently, the TAs had problems in getting data to feed into improved systems (para. 21). At the other end, the demand and use of postevaluation and performance evaluation information were not adequately assessed and taken into account in TA preparation. Generally, information for postevaluation and performance evaluation is yet to formally enter the project approval, budget, or policy/strategy processes in the countries concerned (paras. 41-46). This reduces the value added from carrying out performance evaluation. A lack of demand for the results of performance evaluation is likely to have an impact on sustainability (paras. 23 and 51).

16. From ADB's perspective, the TAs were relevant in a strategic sense, both at the time of approval and at the time of the OEM, although it should be acknowledged that the TAs did not form part of a long-term strategy for building DMC evaluation capability. For ADB, strategic relevance has two dimensions: relevance to overall development and the country strategy, and relevance for internal assessment of ADB's development effectiveness. From the DMC perspective, there was very limited awareness of the importance of evaluation, either postevaluation or performance evaluation, at the time of approval. In most cases, the perceived relevance and importance were fairly narrowly based in the DMCs concerned. Had the primary objective of the TAs been creating awareness, this would not have been a problem. However, given that the objectives were to introduce and sustain systems, the lack of perceived relevance and priority by countries contributed to problems with sustainability in some cases (para. 51). At the time of the OEM, the DMCs perceived the TAs as more relevant, and this perception was much more broadly based, at least in terms of stated commitment. However, a number of stakeholders noted limitations in budgetary support, staff numbers assigned to the task, and status accorded the evaluation function.

17. In addition to strategic fit with stated priorities, relevance also needs to be assessed on the basis of the appropriateness of the approach promoted in light of the political, administrative, and social context of the country concerned. In this regard, the TAs were insufficiently customized for specific country contexts. In fact, in some DMCs it seems the necessary preconditions for building public sector capacity in performance evaluation do not exist (para. 59). In situations where such preconditions are not met, relevance may be high in terms of need but low in terms of being an appropriate response to underlying or systemic problems. In other words, building capacity—in terms of staff skills, systems, and procedures—may not be the priority for action.

18. A further issue of relevance relates to the nature of the results-based M&E systems being promoted. Whether intended or not, systems tend to be information-supply-driven, comprehensive, often complex, and resource-intensive to sustain. One possible cause is that the starting point for RME is the logical framework. While this is appropriate, there is a need for a frequent check against the demand and need for information and resource requirements for data collection to ensure that indicators and means of verifying them are realistic and do no more than meet clearly identified needs. This has not always been so and means (the process) have become more important than ends (better decisions) in a number of cases. An example of this is the excessive amount of time spent retrofitting logical frameworks in the Philippines.

B. Engagement of Consultants

19. In all cases, ADB recruited individual consultants. The consultants were fielded on time and their formal performance rating ranged from satisfactory to excellent. In one instance, however, the EA and other involved agencies indicated that the performance and knowledge of a consultant were unsatisfactory. The recruitment of individuals was appropriate for the phase 1 small-scale TAs, but problematic for the larger phase 2 TAs as recruiting individuals was burdensome for ADB staff who had to handle a series of contracts and deal with a large amount of minor administrative matters. Perhaps the more important issue is the divided accountability that can exist when more than one individual consultant is recruited. When there is no common line of contractual accountability through the team leader, poor performance or dysfunctional behavior by other members of the team cannot easily be managed. It is important that the consultants present a unified view and that the team leader has contractual responsibility to exercise control and discipline. For this reason, a firm or institution should have been recruited to manage the consulting team for the larger TAs as normally done. Two added benefits might accrue from this. In one case where the performance of the team leader was widely judged to be inadequate, replacement would have been easier if a firm or institution had been contracted. The second potential advantage is the possibility of establishing an ongoing relationship with the recruited firm or institution. Opportunities for establishing twinning relationships need be explored to provide some ongoing support in evaluation beyond the period of the TA.

C. Organization and Management

20. In Nepal, the National Planning Commission (NPC) was the EA for TA 1967-NEP and TA 2954-NEP. NPC is supported by NPCSC. CMED, which is the part of NPCSC responsible for planning and coordinating performance evaluation activities at the central level, was the focal point for the two TAs. TA 2954-NEP also involved the Ministry of Physical Works/Department of Roads, Ministry of Agriculture, and Ministry of Water Resources in the pilot introduction of PPMS. In the Philippines, NEDA was the EA for TA 1650-PHI and TA 2782-PHI. Within NEDA, the Project Monitoring Staff was responsible for M&E, and the Project Monitoring Staff was the focal point for both TAs. TA 2782-PHI also worked with the Department of Agriculture and

Department of Health to introduce PPMS on a pilot basis. In Sri Lanka, MPI was the EA for TA 1579-SRI and TA 2810-SRI. Within MPI, the Performance Evaluation Unit (PEU) in the Monitoring and Progress Review Division is operationally responsible for planning and coordinating postevaluation of development projects and programs. The PEU and the Monitoring and Progress Review Division were the focal point of TA activities. The two TAs in Sri Lanka also worked with the National Planning Department and Department of External Resources, both of the Ministry of Finance.

21. In each case, the EA was a central agency responsible for monitoring public investment programs, among other functions. The selected EAs were appropriate in terms of a match with their mandated function. However, their selection carried with it some structural problems affecting organization and management of the evaluation function and, consequently, of the TAs. First, as oversight agencies, they rely on others to carry out data collection and field-level monitoring. The role of the central agency is to aggregate and analyze this information and to package it for a variety of end users. While a requirement to provide monitoring/evaluation data may be mandated, the incentives for compliance, particularly at the field level, may not be high. In fact, all phase 2 TAs suffered problems in getting performance evaluation data as input for the new systems. Those expected to provide the information saw few benefits—in terms of extra resources or even utility of the information—from cooperating. Even in the Philippines where project level staff were involved in the training, initial enthusiasm was soon replaced by lack of interest as the implications of the extra work without extra resources became apparent. The TAs should have adopted a more holistic approach that incorporated the field/project/regional/department levels rather than just the aggregation level (the central agency).

22. A second problem affecting the effective organization and management of performance evaluation, and hence the TAs, is the location of the evaluation function within the concerned central agency. In each case, it is at the third level or below in the agency's hierarchy. This relatively low level is often seen as a reflection of the status accorded to performance evaluation and affects the ability of the concerned unit to effectively organize and manage performance evaluation, and consequently the TAs, particularly where there is a need to cross organizational boundaries.

23. Further, most of the EAs have no direct role either in planning and approving new projects, or in the budget process. Often they are not linked to the high-level policy and strategy formulation process. This means that potential users of performance evaluation information are often in other agencies. Thus, the demand for the results of performance evaluation requires effective interagency links, which often do not exist. The TAs should have incorporated ways of creating demand and formalizing the means by which performance evaluation results could be used in decision making.

24. The situation highlights the fact that various structural and institutional realities impact negatively on the organization and management of the performance evaluation function in general and the ADB-funded TAs in particular. These issues should have been considered during TA formulation. Essentially, a more holistic view needs to be taken to understand how performance evaluation can be introduced. Given the contextual reality described above, EA organization and management performance were variable. The best results were evident where a strong champion for evaluation existed within the EA.

D. Implementation Schedule and Financing Arrangements

25. All six TAs had time overruns averaging one year between TA effectiveness and completion. The predominant reason was that the TAs were completed significantly under

budget and, in response to requests from governments, ADB approved additional activities (such as extension of domestic consultant input, purchase of additional equipment, conduct of additional training, and conduct of a regional seminar). The time overrun was due to the time required to discuss, agree on, and carry out the additional activities. The additional areas of expenditure had some merit in themselves but, except for Sri Lanka, performance ratings of the TAs are still partly successful or unsuccessful (para. 56).

26. The costs and key TA implementation dates are in the basic data sheets. The phase 1 TAs were small-scale TAs for \$100,000. The phase 2 TAs were approved for \$500,000 (TA 2954-NEP), \$250,000 (TA 2782-PHI), and \$350,000 (TA 2810-SRI). The average cost underrun for phase 1 TAs was 7.5 percent (8.1 percent for TA 1967-NEP, 5.0 percent for TA 1650-PHI, and 9.5 percent for TA 1579-SRI). For phase 2 TAs, the average cost underrun was 15.2 percent (19.0 percent for TA 2954-NEP, 13.2 percent for TA 2782-PHI, and 13.5 percent for TA 2810-SRI). Cost savings occurred in all categories of expenditure, with consulting services accounting for the major share.

E. Supervision

27. The supervision of the phase 1 small-scale TAs by OED staff was adequate but, in the view of the OEM, was less so for the longer phase 2 TAs. OED staff in charge changed several times, causing problems with continuity, and only one review mission was undertaken for the TAs in Nepal and Sri Lanka. Notwithstanding this, the EAs and consultants generally assessed the support and supervision provided by OED staff as effective during TA implementation. However, the EAs in Nepal and Sri Lanka noted that OED did not provide follow-on support. In the Philippines, there was effective ongoing support because of the proximity of NEDA to ADB headquarters and the follow-on TA.⁸ In the future, OED and operational departments should provide some level of ongoing support to evaluation units after completion of the TAs. One possibility is to enable local evaluation staff to participate in OEMs and project completion report missions. While OED reports and guidelines can be downloaded from the Internet, it is still appropriate to provide hard copies of them to DMC evaluation units because Internet access is limited in many cases.

28. Generally, OED failed to integrate and work effectively with the resident missions to provide a more constant level of support and supervision to the EAs and consultants. In the future, OED needs to more fully involve resident missions from the design stage on and to establish a clear agreement as to the roles of each in supporting and managing the TA.

29. The evaluation revealed another important issue in ADB management of efforts to develop DMC evaluation capability. All ADB staff need to communicate the same message to DMCs to create an effective lobby for them to operate performance evaluation systems, and a single message on how to achieve this. As it was, the PPMS had not been fully implemented in ADB at the time of the phase 2 TAs and the pilot projects (ADB loans) with which the TAs were working were still using BME. Project staff were reluctant to change from BME to PPMS or RME without formal endorsement from ADB operational staff.

⁸ TA 3308-PHI: *Strengthening Results Monitoring and Evaluation*, for \$400,000, approved on 24 November 1999.

III. EVALUATION OF OUTPUTS AND IMPACT

A. Outputs

30. The OEM found that phase 1 TAs produced most planned outputs to a generally high standard. Planned outputs were (i) revised institutional framework and procedures adopted for postevaluation, (ii) an institutional capability to conduct postevaluation, (iii) staff with the skills and experience to conduct postevaluation, and (iv) a functioning computer-based PEIS. In each country, units with responsibility for postevaluation were established. However, not all have been sustained (paras. 47-49).

31. The in-country training provided under phase 1 TAs stands out as being particularly effective. All participants gave it a uniformly high rating. The training took place over 4-6 weeks and it adopted a case study approach that mixed classroom learning with fieldwork. Two groups of participants, each supported by a consultant, carried out a postevaluation exercise. At the end of the training, the participants had the knowledge, skills, and confidence to carry out postevaluation.

32. A computerized PEIS was established in each country by using OED's own DOS-based system. EA staff were trained in the use of the system. The output was effectively and efficiently produced in each case but sustainability has been a problem (para. 39).

33. The reasons for the high level of production of phase 1 TA outputs follow: (i) each EA has an influential "champion" for postevaluation; (ii) postevaluation is an activity that can be successfully carried out by a small unit mandated with this task, therefore, a small TA could successfully establish a postevaluation capability; and (iii) the training used a very effective case study approach under the guidance of competent consultants.

34. Phase 2 TAs were partly successful at producing planned outputs. The consultants for TA 2954-NEP reviewed existing systems and processes and made detailed recommendations for improved arrangements. However, the consultants were not successful in getting the full and active participation of NPC or the line ministries in the process, despite strenuous efforts. This was not helped by the fact that the line ministries were not aware of the TA until implementation started. The consultants were also not able to engage the attention of senior decision makers in NPC and NPC itself to obtain high-level support and commitment (the steering committee met infrequently). Therefore, subsequent implementation of the introduced PPMS was seen largely as an activity of the consultants.

35. The computer programming work for the PPMS in Nepal was carried out very effectively by a domestic consultant and the system is still operational although it is not used (the system is known as project performance information system). Computer facilities were provided. The planned network was installed in CMED but was not extended more widely. Rather, e-mail links were established among the concerned agencies but these are not used for the transfer of data (as the reasons for this situation also applied to other TAs, these are outlined in para. 39). Despite the largely successful system development and installation, there was limited time to train staff in the new system. Selected staff of NPC and the line ministries highly valued the study tour to the PRC and they wrote a report on their findings. However, they acknowledged that the exercise produced little if any impact on institutional performance. Three manuals were prepared and translated under the TA. The manuals are an available resource of a reasonable quality, but are unlikely to substitute for lack of hands-on experience as new staff come to the evaluation function with no prior experience in this field. Around 150 representatives of ministries received training in the use of logical frameworks and the development of indicators,

and it is generally acknowledged that awareness of PPMS in general and the use of the logical framework in particular have increased as a result of the TA. The consultants developed indicators for sectors and specific projects. However, the indicators were not used for monitoring by project staff (who were not involved in their development). Consequently, the PPMS system had difficulty in obtaining data that would demonstrate its usefulness.

36. TA 2782-PHI did not produce the planned institutional assessment because of ongoing support in this area by a bilateral source (Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit, or German Agency for Technical Cooperation). However, a considerable amount of consultant effort went into the review of process and systems and the design of the component parts of a PPMS. Documents prepared by the international consultant included *A Comprehensive Guide for Implementing a Project Performance Management System* and an *Overview of Key Concepts*. The TA spent a lot of time developing and handling training in the tools and techniques of PPMS for concerned staff, but it was unable to bring all into a coherent and usable system that could be adopted, even on a pilot basis. Therefore, this TA did not achieve the planned output of pilot adoption of PPMS. The output of trained and skilled staff was achieved to a certain extent. Training was generally of short duration and covered a wide range of topics. Therefore, the result was generally increased awareness and knowledge, rather than enhanced skills. The numerous problems encountered are accurately summarized in the TCR and the international consultant's final report: (i) lack of coordination with line ministries (which were not involved in TA preparation); (ii) noncompliance with project reporting requests (compounded by the lack of effective authority vested in NEDA); (iii) conflict with existing reporting systems of regional NEDA offices that were unable to cope with the requirements of PPMS; (iv) problems and time consumed in redesigning (retrofitting) inadequate logical frameworks; (v) lack of official approval for the redesigned logical frameworks, which meant project staff did not comply with the revised reporting requirements; (vi) a perception of evaluation as faultfinding; (vii) too many tools and techniques that created confusion and did not clearly fit into a coherent PPMS system; and (viii) most staff's perception that evaluation was a part-time activity.

37. TA 2810-SRI produced an action plan for institutionalizing a more effective PPMS, designing system procedures to enhance the dissemination of evaluation findings, preparing guidelines for PPMS, and reviewing/developing indicators. The result was contained in three reports prepared by the consultant team leader. While the plan covered the issues, it lacked substance and was a general outline of an ideal situation rather than a set of practical steps firmly linked to the Sri Lanka situation. Little attention was given on how to input information into the PPMS. The report did propose a set of standard indicators for different sectors but it acknowledged that these were prepared by the consultants with no input from the ministries. Nevertheless, a documents center was established and it continues to function although it would benefit from more up-to-date material (including ADB evaluation reports and guidelines). The PEIS developed under TA 1570-SRI was moved to a Windows-based system and made available on a local area network and via an Internet site established under the TA. Training under the TA was carried out as planned and the participants gave it a high rating. The regional study tour included the MPI Minister and this proved to be extremely beneficial in raising the profile and importance of evaluation at the Cabinet level. SLIDA participated in the TA and its capability to give training in performance evaluation was enhanced.

38. None of the phase 2 TAs succeeded in establishing PPMS. At the time of the TAs' approval, ADB had not fully implemented PPMS internally. Perhaps as a consequence, the time and resources required for implementation in DMCs were underestimated (or the objectives were too ambitious for the resources provided). There was also lack of clarity or, at least, a uniform view, on what PPMS really comprised. Although OED now views PPMS and RME as different terms for the same process, the TA reports conveyed the impression that PPMS was a distinct approach to performance evaluation. Certainly, most people in EAs believed this to be

the case. OED has worked hard over recent years to overcome this perception, but the idea persists in some quarters. Consequently, PPMS was not implemented in any of the three countries. While the phase 2 TAs did not result in the adoption of PPMS, the work done provided skills and created awareness that became available to subsequent efforts to introduce RME. Notwithstanding this, ownership of the process by the EAs was low and the process was primarily perceived as an activity of the consultants and largely for the benefit of ADB. Overall, the training in phase 2 TAs was less effective than that provided in phase 1 as it was of shorter duration despite the greater breadth and complexity of PPMS.

39. All of the TAs involved the introduction of computerized postevaluation or performance evaluation information systems. The intent was to establish more efficient ways of transmitting evaluation data within and between agencies and to facilitate the wider dissemination of evaluation findings. The results have been mixed. While systems were generally established as envisaged, they have proved difficult to sustain. A number of factors appear to be involved. First and foremost, computerization of poorly performing manual systems is not a solution to the problem. Other factors are a lack of budget support (even to cover the cost of minor consumables in some cases), lack of management commitment to the systems, movement of trained staff to other functions, problems of data availability and/or validity, lack of effective demand for the information, and lack of motivation at various levels of government agencies. A number of sociocultural factors are influential in some countries: for example, the sole responsibility of computer operators for data entry and lack of familiarity of senior staff with computers. On a more practical note, in some countries only signed and stamped reports are official documents, and electronically transmitted data has no official validity. The mix and relative importance of contributing factors differ in each country.

40. Institutionalizing a capacity to provide ongoing training in the tools and techniques of postevaluation and performance evaluation was an explicit part of only one TA (TA 2810-SRI). As sustainability is important, the OEM looked at the current situation in Nepal and the Philippines as well as Sri Lanka. SLIDA and the Nepal Administrative Staff College (NASC) give a short course training in M&E, including the use of logical frameworks. NASC reported that the public sector demand for such training is low. In Sri Lanka, SLIDA indicated that demand is high because the modules are included in courses that give points for promotion. Staff members of MPI are called upon to present the modules on M&E. TA 2810-SRI supported SLIDA in developing curricula and train faculty members in evaluation techniques. Although the key faculty member has now moved to another institution, SLIDA retains a capability to deliver training in evaluation. TA 2954-NEP contracted NASC to prepare one of the manuals, but the faculty received no training. However, NASC is able to deliver training in evaluation. Current faculty in SLIDA and NASC will benefit from practical experience in evaluation techniques. In the Philippines, the follow-on TA (TA 3308-PHI) is developing curricula for training in RME. All countries have an available resource of trainers in the private sector. The OEM concluded that there is a sustainable supply of trainers with knowledge of performance evaluation in each country. A lack of demand for and unwillingness to pay for training in this area are the main constraints.

B. Impact of the TAs and Achievement of Purpose

41. The purpose of TA 1967-NEP was to strengthen postevaluation capability, increase awareness of key officials of the importance of performance evaluation, and ensure timely feedback of postevaluation findings to project planners and policy makers. The TA was successful in developing a capability in CMED for postevaluation. However, this capability was rapidly lost as trained staff were moved to other agencies and other roles (para. 48). The TA did result in greater awareness of the importance of evaluation but this has also dissipated with time

as staff have moved to other functions. The TA also trained consultants, mostly staff of government-owned consulting companies. A number of these people continue to be involved in evaluation activities. For the last two years, CMED has had the budget to contract two evaluation studies a year (known as effectiveness of investment studies). The two studies are circulated to concerned agencies; however, there is no formal process by which the evaluation findings enter the decision-making processes of government.

42. TA 1650-PHI aimed to improve the capability of NEDA staff and that of selected implementing agencies in evaluating the performance of projects through design of a postevaluation system and procedures and to ensure effective feedback of evaluation results into decision making. The TA successfully established a capability within NEDA for postevaluation. However, the Postevaluation Division has been disbanded and postevaluation is not carried out (para. 49).

43. TA 1579-SRI had the objective of improving the aid management system by strengthening the capacity for performance evaluation within MPI, through the introduction of postevaluation and the effective feedback of evaluation results into decision making. The TA very successfully established a postevaluation capability in MPI. The unit established as a result of the TA remains in place, as do most of the staff trained under the TA. Regular postevaluation studies are carried out and local government agencies are supported in their evaluation work. The evaluation reports produced are of a high standard. The unanimous view is that awareness of the importance of evaluation among politicians and at many levels of government is now much greater than it was at the time of TA approval. Less successful is ensuring the timely feedback of postevaluation findings to project planners and policy makers. The form required for approval of all new projects has a section on lessons learned, but the input or endorsement of MPI is not mandated. Similarly, there is no formal link between MPI and policy-making parts of government.

44. The objective of TA 2954-NEP was to establish an accountable and result-oriented institutional framework in Nepal at the national and selected line ministry levels for programming, budgeting, and management of development projects. This objective was not achieved. The TA report established certain success criteria, but none of them were met. A first step was taken with the decision to require a logical framework for all new project proposals. The TA certainly contributed to achieving this first step. However, it will take time before it can be said that the Government is able to meet the success criteria in the TA report.

45. The goal of TA 2782-PHI was to improve the effectiveness of development expenditures in the Philippines by enhancing the Government's capabilities in M&E through achieving its purpose of implementation of the PPMS on a pilot basis in three agencies. The purpose was not achieved although the groundwork was laid for a follow-on TA (footnote 6) with ADB support. That TA 3308-PHI was necessary confirms the lack of success of TA 2782-PHI. Again, a first step was taken with the use of RME now incorporated in the Investment Coordination Committee guidelines.

46. The objective of TA 2810-SRI was to enhance the project performance evaluation and quality assurance capability of three central agencies so as to support the Government's efforts to foster a results-oriented PPMS as part of administrative reform. Owing to the solid base provided by the preceding phase 1 TA, TA 2810-SRI made more progress in achieving its purpose than did the other phase 2 TAs. Specifically, the project performance evaluation activity of MPI was enhanced: the change of name from Postevaluation Unit to Performance Evaluation Unit reflected a real change in emphasis and capability. Also, progress was made in enhancing quality assurance with the incorporation of most of the elements of the logical framework in the approval process for new projects. The TA did not result in the adoption of the PPMS although it

created the conditions for further work on the PPMS that is being supported by the United Nations Development Programme.

C. Sustainability

47. For phase 1 TAs, Sri Lanka stands out in terms of sustainability of the TA intervention. The unit established to conduct postevaluation activities still functions. It has been renamed as the PEU and a Cabinet decree has formalized its status. This formal and high-level recognition of the evaluation function is an important reason for the success of the TAs in Sri Lanka. PEU carries out an annual program of evaluation studies and supports subnational evaluation studies. Of the 10 MPI staff trained under the TA, 8 are still in the ministry almost 10 years later. The PEIS has been moved to an Internet-based system. While this currently does not facilitate wide dissemination of evaluation findings because of limited access by potential users, it is a useful development that could produce real benefits in the future.

48. Conversely in Nepal, NPCS staff are members of the general administrative cadre (compared with Sri Lanka where there is a specialized technical cadre). There is considerable political involvement in staff transfers, even of relatively low-level professional staff. Staff transfers are frequent, consequently, few if any staff trained under the first TA remain. CMED no longer undertakes postevaluation work for a number of reasons: (i) transfer of trained staff; (ii) inadequate incentives (for example, very low daily allowance for fieldwork); (iii) lack of supporting facilities (for example, transport); and (iv) a lack of importance attached to the activity. In recent years, however, two “effectiveness of investment” studies were contracted out by CMED to government-owned consulting companies, some of whom received training under the TAs. The PEIS is no longer operational in Nepal.

49. In the Philippines, about a third of the trained staff remain in NEDA, but no postevaluation studies are carried out currently. NEDA made a conscious decision to move away from postevaluation as a discrete activity in favor of continuous evaluation within an RME framework. However, it remains to be seen whether this will occur as RME moves from the pilot phase to wider adoption. Because postevaluation is not carried out, the issue of use of the results does not arise although it is clear that the means by which the results of RME will be formally fed back into the decision-making process have yet to be established, notwithstanding the incorporation of RME in the Investment Coordinating Committee guidelines as part of the new project approval process. The PEIS is no longer operational in the Philippines.

50. The phase 2 TAs did not result in general adoption of performance evaluation either in the pilot ministries/departments or more widely. Further, a follow-on TA with essentially the same purpose (introduction of RME) is being provided in the Philippines by ADB and in Sri Lanka by the United Nations Development Programme. However, the phase 2 TAs provided useful training to increase knowledge and create awareness, both of which have been sustained. In Sri Lanka, 100 percent of the staff trained in MPI remain in their posts. In Nepal, retention of trained staff is around 50 percent in CMED of NPCS, 66 percent in the Ministry of Agriculture, 50 percent in the Ministry/Department of Roads, and 100 percent in the Ministry of Water Resources. The better figures for staff retention under the phase 2 TA in Nepal (compared with the first phase) may reflect a recent government mandate that staff remain at least two years in a post before transfer (being implemented partially), but it may also be because less time has passed. In the Philippines, close to 100 percent of trained staff have been retained in NEDA, Department of Agriculture, and Department of Health.

51. For sustainability of performance evaluation, the benefits must exceed the costs from the perspective of both political and administration decision makers. In other words, ministers and

heads of departments must derive benefits from performance evaluation and the increased transparency that this implies if they are to genuinely commit themselves to its adoption and use. If they do not benefit, it should come as no surprise that the activity will not be sustained or accorded high priority. Such considerations need to be taken into account when building DMC performance evaluation capability. Performance evaluation can be more politically acceptable if the results of evaluation focus on successes as well as poor performance. If the evaluation entity features successes as well as problems, the climate for evaluation may well become more favorable as politicians need “political wins.” The experience of including a minister in the awareness-creating study tour under TA 2810-SRI had a very positive impact on engendering high-level commitment as the minister was able to see first-hand the benefits of RME. Engendering political support for RME is one way of stimulating demand. Another way is to formalize requirements for the use of RME information at key points in the new project approval and budget decision-making processes. An ongoing demand for RME information will help ensure sustainability.

D. Other Development Impacts

52. Had the purposes been fully achieved and the results sustained, the potential for achieving wider development impacts would have been high. In the case of phase 1 TAs, the main factor limiting the achievement of other development impacts is that where postevaluation is undertaken, the results are not yet fully incorporated in decision making. Wider impacts were not achieved by phase 2 TAs because performance evaluation was not adopted or was only partially adopted.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

A. Key Issues

53. As DMCs move from pilot introduction of RME (involving perhaps 5-10 projects) to more widespread adoption (potentially covering more than 100 major projects in some DMCs), two interrelated questions need to be addressed. First, will the staff and budget be available to carry out the necessary aggregation, analysis, interpretation, and reporting? Second, should all projects be subjected to the same intensity of performance evaluation all the time, or would a more selective approach suffice? Under a more selective or sample approach, each project would have the framework for evaluation (logical framework and indicators), but only selected projects may be subjected to detailed performance evaluation.

54. Efforts to introduce performance evaluation in DMCs should not assume an alignment of interests among key stakeholders. In DMCs, RME must provide benefits to political and administration decision makers if genuine and sustained support is to be forthcoming. Performance evaluation is about increased transparency and this can be seen as threatening. Ensuring that the report on results of performance evaluation focuses on both successes and failures can encourage high-level political support. Within ADB, a common understanding of the purpose and nature of performance evaluation and its application to projects is required so that DMCs receive a clear and unequivocal message about what needs to be done.

55. In the Philippines, NEDA has moved away from postevaluation as a separate and distinct activity in favor of incorporating it within an overall RME framework. Currently, no postevaluation work is carried out. Whether this will be redressed when RME is fully adopted remains to be seen. While ADB has adopted PPMS internally, it still maintains a distinct and separate postevaluation function. Postevaluation uses the indicators and data developed by RME and also requires additional and independent data collection and analysis. Also, postevaluation is an activity that should be independent of self-evaluation carried out during implementation and at completion. Further, postevaluation information has different although related uses. RME during implementation contributes to improved operational management. Postevaluation does that and, in addition, provides input for developing macropolicies and strategies as well as answers to questions of whether broad development goals are being achieved. For these reasons, DMCs need to consider the benefits of independent postevaluation information and to allocate financial and human resources to carry out the task.

B. Overall Assessment

56. The performance rating given to the six TAs is given in Table 2. All TAs are assessed as relevant although an important caveat is that they tended to be ad hoc activities rather than part of a longer term strategy for building evaluation capability. In other words, it was assumed that the desired capacity could be developed and sustained as a result of a single TA. Phase 1 TAs produced outputs as planned to a generally high standard. Phase 2 TAs performed less well in producing planned outputs. Except for Sri Lanka, the impact of the TAs was not sustained. Most TAs score poorly on other impacts. The lack of other impacts is attributable to the lost opportunity to incorporate effectively evaluation findings into the budget, new project approval, and policy/strategy-setting processes.

Table 2: Performance Ratings

Phase	TA No.	Rating
1	1967-NEP	Partly successful
	1650-PHI	Partly successful
	1579-SRI	Highly successful
2	2954-NEP	Unsuccessful
	2782-PHI	Partly successful
	2810-SRI	Successful

C. Lessons Learned

57. Building performance evaluation capacity in DMCs is more complex, difficult, and time-consuming than first envisaged. The phase 2 TAs were overambitious relative to the resources provided. A more thorough preparation process should be adopted in future TAs to ensure

- (i) high-level ownership of and commitment to performance evaluation, clearly demonstrated by budget and staff allocation, status within the institutional hierarchy, and existence of an influential “champion for evaluation;”
- (ii) participation by all key stakeholders in the TA preparation process; and
- (iii) creation of awareness among senior decision makers during the preparation process.

58. A number of conditions should exist if public sector capacity building is to be successful. These include (i) a commitment to accountability, with limits placed on self-interested behavior by public servants; (ii) a separation between the role of ministers and heads of departments so that staffing and other management decisions are not made on political grounds; (iii) adherence to the principle of merit selection; (iv) an incentive structure that encourages public servants to operate in the public interest; and (v) stability in staffing so that trained staff remain in their positions for a reasonable period. If these conditions are not met, capacity building is likely to be less effective in improving organizational performance. An assessment needs to be made to determine whether the systemic or underlying problems should be addressed before capacity building is attempted.

59. Building DMC capacity in performance evaluation requires a holistic approach that covers data collection at the field and project levels, through various levels of aggregation and analysis for the end users. TA design should consider needs at all levels. A primary focus on building capability in the central oversight agency may carry a risk that other entities may have weak incentives for providing information for evaluating performance. The location of responsibility for evaluation within organizational hierarchies is also important. To ensure the required status, importance, budget and staff support, and an ability to operate across organizational boundaries, the responsibility should be located as close as possible to the head of the organization.

60. During TA design and implementation, care needs to be taken that performance evaluation systems do not become “supply-driven,” too complex, and too resource intensive to

sustain. When preparing the logical framework, the aim should be to select indicators that provide the type of information decision makers require, and to ensure that these indicators and their means of verification can be measured within the limits of expected resource availability. Establishing performance evaluation systems is a means to an end; benefits are obtained when the results are used in key operational, budget, investment, and policy/strategy decision-making processes. TA design should not assume that evaluation results will be used—rather, specific features should be incorporated to encourage, facilitate, and formalize their incorporation in decision making.

61. To develop staff competency and confidence to carry out evaluation, as opposed to creating awareness of its importance and the related tools and techniques, training requires a case study approach where the participants actually produce the final product—for example, a postevaluation study or an operational performance evaluation system.

62. If OED is to manage future TAs to build DMC evaluation capability, it should pay more attention to the professional and support staff resources and skills required. Among other skills, it is important that staff understand the political dimension of policy making. A staff member skilled in evaluation does not automatically have the right skills to manage the development of evaluation capacity in DMCs. OED should work more closely with resident missions with a clear agreement on roles and responsibilities in providing TA support and supervision. For larger TAs, OED should follow the practice of recruiting a firm or institution, rather than individuals, to ensure high efficiency and effectiveness of the consulting services. Any extension of TAs to utilize savings should be subject to rigorous assessment of the likelihood that extension will contribute to improved TA performance.

63. The pace of TAs to build performance evaluation capacity should be driven by DMC ownership and commitment, and not by deadlines imposed by the TA implementation schedule. Finally, the introduction of computerized information systems is not a solution to poorly performing manual systems. Various institutional, management, and social factors must be taken into account during computerization.

D. Follow-Up Actions and Recommendations

64. The following proposals are recommended for action by the Government of Nepal:

Recommendation	Responsibility for		Timing
	Action	Monitoring	
1. An instruction should be issued to the ministries that participated in TA 2954-NEP to use the project performance information system established under the TA.	Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson, National Planning Commission Secretariat (NPCS)	Central Monitoring and Evaluation Division	As soon as possible
2. NPCS and the Ministry of Finance should mandate the incorporation of performance evaluation and monitoring information in the approval process for new projects and at key points in the budget process.	Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson, NPCS; Secretary, Ministry of Finance	Secretary, NPCS	As soon as possible
3. The Government should create a technical cadre for monitoring and evaluation staff, thereby moving away from the current practice of assigning members of the general administrative cadre to these functions.	Vice-Chairperson, NPCS	Secretary, NPCS	1-2 years
4. The Government should more rigorously enforce the instruction that staff should remain at least two years in a position before being considered for transfer.	Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson, NPCS	Secretary, NPCS	As soon as possible

65. TA 2782-PHI was followed by TA 3308-PHI. The successor TA was adjusted to take into account the findings of the TCR for TA 2782-PHI. Consequently, the recommended actions for the Government of the Philippines focus on broader issues rather than direct follow-up for TA 2782-PHI. The following areas merit further consideration:

Recommendation	Responsibility for		TIMING
	Action	Monitoring	
1. National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) should consider moving the responsibility for results monitoring and evaluation (RME) closer to the top of the institutional hierarchy to enhance the status of the activity and to provide a better link to users of the information.	Director-General, NEDA	Director, Project Monitoring Staff (PMS)	6 months to 1 year
2. NEDA should reassess the need for independent postevaluation as a complement to self-evaluation, and to provide input for macropolicy and strategy development and to answer questions about development effectiveness. If the need for independent evaluation is confirmed, decisions should be made on institutional responsibility, staffing, and budget.	Directors, PMS and Public Investment Staff	PMS	6 months to 1 year

Recommendation	Responsibility for		TIMING
	Action	Monitoring	
3. NEDA will need to provide additional budget and staff for evaluation as RME moves from pilot introduction to wider adoption. Alternatively, the coverage of RME may need to be adjusted in light of available resources.	Director, PMS	PMS	6 months to 1 year

66. The following recommendations are made for the consideration of the Government of Sri Lanka. The impact and sustainability of TA 1579-SRI and TA 2810-SRI can be enhanced by the following actions:

Recommendation	Responsibility for		TIMING
	Action	Monitoring	
1. Ministry of Plan Implementation (MPI)/ Performance Evaluation Unit (PEU) should be formally mandated to scrutinize, comment, and endorse project formulation formats (PFF) before their approval. This sign-off would be required to confirm that (i) the proposed purpose and outcomes, and their verifiable indicators are specific, monitorable, actionable, relevant, and timebound (sections 7 and 8 of the PFF); (ii) lessons learned from the implementation of similar types of projects are correctly stated and have been incorporated in the project concept/design (section 10 of the PFF); and (iii) the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms proposed will provide the required information for effective performance evaluation (section 14 of the PFF).	Secretaries of Finance and MPI	PEU	6 months to 1 year
2. MPI should seek a Presidential decree or Cabinet instruction that projects for evaluation in each year be selected by a high-level committee and that MPI be given the appropriate mandate to conduct or contract out these evaluations.	Secretary, MPI	PEU	As soon as possible
3. MPI should push for results monitoring and evaluation based on output indicators to be formalized by Presidential decree or Cabinet instruction while a favorable climate exists.	Secretary, MPI	PEU	3-6 months

67. The follow-up actions proposed for ADB include the following:⁹

Recommendation	Responsibility for		Timing
	Action	Monitoring	
1. Where ADB has provided TA support for strengthening such activities, OEMs of OED and PCR missions of operational departments should invite the participation of DMC staff and units involved in postevaluation and performance evaluation.	OED and operational departments	OED	Immediately
2. Any future ADB support to strengthen DMC evaluation capacity should start at the project level and focus on supporting the adoption for use in ADB projects of a mandated project performance evaluation system that provides required input for the project performance report.	Operational departments	OED	3-6 months
3. A small working group should be convened comprising Nepal Resident Mission (NRM) and Headquarters staff to develop a strategy for public sector capacity building in Nepal and guidelines for related advisory TA grants, taking into account the findings of this TPAR and the Special Evaluation Study on Effectiveness of Bank Assistance in Capacity Building in Nepal.	NRM (to initiate)	NRM	6-9 months

⁹ The findings of this TPAR suggest a number of more general recommendations for follow-up actions by ADB and governments. They will be included in a special evaluation study on performance management in ADB, EAs, and planning agencies, which is scheduled for later in 2001. This TPAR is an input to the special evaluation study.

APPENDIXES

Number	Title	Page	Cited on (page, para.)
1	Summary of Responses to Questionnaire	21	2, 5
2	Technical Assistance Objectives and Scope	29	2, 6
3	Technical Assistance Results and Findings of the Technical Assistance Completion Report	31	4, 11

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Survey Questionnaire and Results for Executing Agencies (EA) in the Philippines

1. Were the EAs and other stakeholders adequately involved in the technical assistance (TA) design?

	TA 1650	TA 2782 (Respondent 1)	TA 2782 (Respondent 2)
Senior Management in the EA	Adequately involved	Adequately involved	Adequately involved
Operational Staff in the EA	Adequately involved	Adequately involved	Adequately involved
External Stakeholders	Adequately involved	Adequately involved	Less than adequately involved

2. Did the TA achieve what it set out to do? Did it achieve its objectives?

The TA rating is	Successful	Successful	Partly successful
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> My knowledge of postevaluation was enhanced. Confidence in the conduct of postevaluation was strengthened. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Able to build the capacity of the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) in coming up with tools and techniques toward developing a project framework as the analytical tool in project monitoring and evaluation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objectives were too ambitious.

3. Did the training provided under the TA increase the skills of those receiving training?

In improving individual skills	Successful	Highly successful	Successful
In improving organizational performance	Successful	Successful	Successful
Comments			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training is very general and so many tools and techniques provided for monitoring and evaluation (M&E). Project staff (Department of Agriculture [DA]) and NEDA Regional Office staff did not realize and understand the training objectives, which resulted in resistance to training. The new project monitoring staff (PMS) staff improved their skills and knowledge of M&E tools and techniques.

4. How effective is the current performance in project monitoring and evaluation?

Central agency responsible for M&E	Less than effective	Effective	Less than effective
Other government agencies	Less than effective	Less than effective	Less than effective
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff involved in M&E lack basic training. • Resources for conducting site visits were lacking. • M&E reports are not religiously used for decision making. • There was lack of direction from the management. • Management information system was inefficient and ineffective. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate skills in monitoring of management resulted in inadequate long-term direction. • Resources for M&E (site visits) were inadequate. • Training in basic M&E for new staff was inadequate.

5. Please rate the performance of the consultants.

Consultant 1	Effective	Very effective	Effective
Consultant 2	Effective	Very effective	Effective

6. Please rate the performance of the Asian Development Bank (ADB).

During the TA	Effective	Effective	Effective
In providing follow-up after TA completion	Effective	Effective	Effective

Comments

- ADB was not firm whether it was results monitoring and evaluation (RME) or benefit monitoring and evaluation (BME) – this affected Philippine implementation of the project performance management system (PPMS). Project staff were confused and became reluctant to follow and believe PMS staff regarding PPMS/RME.

B. Survey Questionnaire and Results for Executing Agencies in Sri Lanka

1. Were the executing agencies and other stakeholders adequately involved in TA design?

	TA 1579	TA 2810 (Respondent 1)
Senior Management in the EA	Fully involved	Adequately involved
Operational Staff in the EA	Adequately involved	Fully involved
External Stakeholders	Fully involved	Fully involved
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was basically a training program to establish the importance of postevaluation of projects and programs at national level. ADB support was the maximum possible. Relationship between senior management of the EA and the External Resources Department was good. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding of the situation made the task easy. Lessons from previous TA implementation were taken into consideration.

2. Did the TA achieve what it set out to do? Did it achieve its objectives?

The TA rating is	Highly successful	Successful
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no proper system to postevaluate projects methodically. TA not only provided the methodology but created awareness among operational staff of the EA. Provision of computers and introduction of the postevaluation information system (PEIS) were commendable. On-the-job training for 2 senior officers enlightened the regional as well as global picture of impact assessment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to a number of avoidable reasons, planned activities did not take place simultaneously.

3. Did the training provided under the TA increase the skills of those receiving training?

In improving individual skills	Highly successful	Successful
In improving organizational performance	Successful	Highly successful
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority of the participants were from the EA; proper leadership and vision. Subsequent changes in senior management hampered the progress and operations of the Performance Evaluation Unit (PEU). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a general consensus on PPMS, which has an impact on improving organizational performance.

4. How effective is the current performance in project monitoring and evaluation?

Central agency responsible for M&E	Very effective	Very effective
------------------------------------	----------------	----------------

Other government agencies	Effective	Effective
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central agency is making a progressive headway toward RBME through performance indicators developed for several line ministries, at the national level and a step forward in the subnational level with provincial planning units. There is much to do with other government agencies in organizing M&E units. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All the line ministries have developed their development indicators with the initiative of MPI/MPRD and are ready to do pilot testing. This exercise has been done on the provincial level and is planned to be carried out on the next level during the year.

5. Please rate the performance of the consultants.

Consultant 1	Very effective	Less than effective
Consultant 2	Very effective	Very effective
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultant had vast experience not only in the Asian region but also outside the region. Good relationship with consultant and his keen interest in M&E contributed to a successful training program and sustainability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultant 1 was a manager more than an academician. His contribution was much less than expected. Consultant 2 had solid academic background.

6. Please rate the performance of the Asian Development Bank.

During the TA	Very effective	Very effective
In providing follow-up after TA completion	Very effective	Effective
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personal interest and assistance were highly appreciated. ADB fully understood the difficult situation with the changed management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ADB was closely associated with ongoing activities and provided prompt support when needed. Organizing a regional workshop was a tremendous achievement.

C. Survey Questionnaire and Results for Executing Agencies in Nepal

1. Were the executing agencies and other stakeholders adequately involved in TA design?

	TA 1967	TA 2954 (Respondent 1)	TA 2954 (Respondent 2)
Senior Management in the EA	Adequately involved	Not involved	Less than adequately involved
Operational Staff in the EA	Less than adequately involved	Less than adequately involved	Less than adequately involved
External Stakeholders	Less than adequately involved	Adequately involved	Less than adequately involved
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TAs are normally designed by involving only senior management in the EA. Operational staff get information only after the TA is approved by ADB. External stakeholders come into the picture during implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senior management in the EA does not perform in the TA to the required scale. The performance of the external stakeholders is adequate. 	

2. Did the TA achieve what it set out to do? Did it achieve its objectives?

The TA rating is	Successful	Partly successful	Successful
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scope of the TA was limited to 3 ministries and NPC. The software and manuals developed under the TA were useful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The concerned ministry got the computer, e-mail facility, and fax machine. The computer is used only in typing reports and letters, and not for monitoring and evaluation. 	

3. Did the training provided under the TA increase the skills of those receiving training?

In improving individual skills	Successful	Successful	Successful
In improving organizational performance	Partly successful	Unsuccessful	Successful
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual skills were improved in the areas of identifying problems, assessing performance, collecting information, preparing the project logical framework, etc. which were essential for management. To improve organization, a longer term effort is necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TA provided training to concerned staff. The know-how is neither transferred to the lower level nor to any organization following the monitoring part. 	

4. How effective is the current performance in project monitoring and evaluation?

Central agency responsible for M&E	Effective	Less than effective	Effective
Other government agencies	Less than effective	Ineffective	Less than effective

Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Efforts are being made by the central agency to get the system operated as planned. Due to frequent changes in the top level authorities, M&E performance is low. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no improvement in the project monitoring part. Not a single person from the staff of the monitoring section in the Ministry has monitored any project. 	
----------	---	---	--

5. Please rate the performance of the consultants.

Consultant 1	Effective	Effective	
Consultant 2	Less than effective	Effective	
Consultant 3	Effective	Effective	
Consultant 4	Effective	Effective	
Consultant 5	-	Effective	
Consultant 6	-	Effective	
Consultant 7	-	Effective	

6. Please rate the performance of the Asian Development Bank.

During the TA	Effective	Effective	
In providing follow-up after TA completion	Ineffective	Ineffective	

D. Survey Questionnaire and Results for Executing Agencies in Nepal

1. Were the executing agencies and other stakeholders adequately involved in TA design?

	TA 2954 (Respondent 3)	TA 2954 (Respondent 4)	TA 2954 (Respondent 5)	TA 2954 (Respondent 6)
Senior Management in the EA	Adequately involved	Less than adequately involved	No comment	Less than adequately involved
Operational Staff in the EA	Adequately Involved	Less than adequately involved	No comment	Less than adequately involved
External Stakeholders	Not involved	Less than adequately involved		Not involved
Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The consultant designed the TA. Stakeholder groups gave some comments and reactions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MA was only involved in the workshop. 	

2. Did the TA achieve what it set out to do? Did it achieve its objectives?

The TA rating is	Successful	Successful	Partly successful	Successful
Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff of EA could increase their knowledge of project management, selection guidelines, computer database applications, and efficient project monitoring and evaluation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TA was successful in developing indicators, giving training in the logical framework, and developing manuals, but partly successful in continuing the database network, project screening criteria, project manager selection criteria. 	

3. Did the training provided under the TA increase the skills of those receiving training?

	Successful	Partly successful	Successful	Successful
In improving individual skills	Successful	Partly successful	Successful	Successful
In improving organizational performance	Partly successful	Successful	Partly successful	Partly successful
Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The materials and programs available are useful for individual skill development as well as for improving organizational performance. 		

4. How effective is the current performance in project monitoring and evaluation?

Central agency responsible for M&E	Less than effective	Less than effective	Less than effective	Ineffective
------------------------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	-------------

Other government agencies		Effective	No comment	Ineffective
Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central agency and other agencies responsible for M&E are well equipped through tools and training provided by the TA. 		

5. Please rate the performance of the consultants.

Consultant 1	Effective		Effective	Effective
Consultant 2	Effective		Effective	Effective
Consultant 3	Effective	Effective	Effective	Effective
Consultant 4	Effective	Effective	Effective	Very effective
Consultant 5			Effective	Effective
Consultant 6			Not seen	Effective
Consultant 7			Not seen	Effective

6. Please rate the performance of the Asian Development Bank.

During the TA	Effective	Effective	Effective	Effective
In providing follow-up after TA completion	Less than effective	Less than effective		Less than effective
Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A short overseas observation tour should have been arranged. 		

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

TA No.	Country	TA Title	Objectives	Scope
1579	SRI	Strengthening Post-evaluation Capability	Improve the aid management system by strengthening the capacity for performance evaluation within the Ministry of Policy Planning and Implementation (MPPI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of appropriate methodology, techniques, and procedures for postevaluation and dissemination of evaluation results • Provision of on-the-job training to MPPI and line ministries • Provision of a two-week training program for two MPPI staff • Development of a computerized information system for storing and retrieving postevaluation findings • Provision of minicomputers, ancillary equipment, and software
1650	PHI	Strengthening Post-Evaluation Capability of the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA)	Improve the capability of NEDA staff and that of selected implementing agencies in carrying out performance evaluation of projects, and create a computerized management information system to provide access within NEDA to the lessons derived from evaluation of Philippine public sector projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of existing institutional setup for postevaluation as well as design of postevaluation system and procedures • Training of staff from NEDA and other implementing agencies through lectures, site visits, and case studies • Provision of on-the-job training in ADB OED • Provision of personal computers, ancillary equipment, and software
1967	NEP	Strengthening Post-Evaluation Capability of National Planning Commission Secretariat (NPCS)	Strengthen the postevaluation capability of the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) Division of NPCS and increase the awareness of officials in the Ministry of Finance (MOF) and key line agencies of the importance of performance evaluation as a management and planning tool	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A study of the existing sectoral performance indicators developed by NPCS, and of the institutional arrangements within NPCS and other government agencies • A review of NPCS's internal system, procedures, and institutional arrangements for conducting postevaluation and impact assessment; introduction of appropriate methodology, techniques and procedures to improve the system; and recommendation of a suitable mechanism for coordinating with other agencies in postevaluation • Assistance to NPCS in designing a computerized postevaluation information system • A six-week training program for 24 staff from NPCS, MOF, selected line ministries, and experts from the private sector • Training of two NPCS staff in ADB OEO • Provision of microcomputer, ancillary equipment, and software, and training of NPCS staff by the equipment supplier

TA No.	Country	TA Title	Objectives	Scope
2782	PHI	Pilot Implementation of the Project Performance Management System (PPMS)	Improve the effectiveness of national development expenditures by enhancing Government M&E capabilities through pilot implementation of PPMS in the Department of Agriculture (DA) and Department of Health (DOH), with the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) as coordinating body	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capability assessment of M&E units in NEDA, DA, and DOH • PPMS pilot program • Institutional strengthening of NEDA, DA, and DOH to operationalize PPMS • Preparation of a program/strategy for broad-based implementation of PPMS
2810	SRI	Strengthening Project Performance Evaluation Capability of the Ministry of Plan Implementation (MPI), Ethnic Affairs and National Integration	Enhance the project performance evaluation and quality assurance capability of MPI, National Planning Department (NPD), and External Resources Department (ERD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation of an action plan for institutionalizing a more effective PPMS • Designing system procedures to ensure that results of evaluation work are effectively made available • Preparation of guidelines for each of the operational units involved in PPMS • Setting up a documents center in MPRD • Strengthening the postevaluation information system (PEIS)
2954	NEP	Strengthening the Project Performance Management System	Establish an accountable and result-oriented institutional framework in Nepal at the national and selected line ministry levels for the programming, budgeting, and management of development projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of a PPMS • Integration of the management information system (MIS) at central and line ministries' level with PPMS • Human resource development: training programs and workshops on implementing PPMS • Provision of computer facilities

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

TA No.	Country	TA Title	Objectives	Scope
1579	SRI	Strengthening Postevaluation Capability of the Ministry of Policy Planning and Implementation (MPPI)	Improve the aid management system by strengthening the capacity for performance evaluation within MPPI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of appropriate methodology, techniques, and procedures for postevaluation and dissemination of evaluation results • Provision of on-the-job training to MPPI and line ministries • Provision of a two-week training program for two MPPI staff • Development of a computerized information system for storing and retrieving postevaluation findings • Provision of minicomputers, ancillary equipment, and software
1650	PHI	Strengthening Postevaluation Capacity of the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA)	Improve the capability of NEDA staff and that of selected implementing agencies in carrying out performance evaluation of projects, and create a computerized management information system to provide access within NEDA to the lessons derived from evaluation of Philippine public sector projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of existing institutional setup for postevaluation as well as design of postevaluation system and procedures • Training of staff from NEDA and other implementing agencies through lectures, site visits, and case studies • Provision of on-the-job training in the Asian Development Bank (ADB) Operations Evaluation Department (OED) • Provision of personal computers, ancillary equipment, and software
1967	NEP	Strengthening Postevaluation Capability of the National Planning Commission Secretariat (NPCS)	Strengthen the postevaluation capability of the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) Division of NPCS and increase the awareness of officials in the Ministry of Finance (MOF) and key line agencies of the importance of performance evaluation as a management and planning tool	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A study of the existing sectoral performance indicators developed by NPCS, and of the institutional arrangements within NPCS and other government agencies • A review of NPCS's internal system, procedures, and institutional arrangements for conducting postevaluation and impact assessment; introduction of appropriate methodology, techniques and procedures to improve the system; and recommendation of a suitable mechanism for coordinating with other agencies in postevaluation • Assistance to NPCS in designing a computerized postevaluation information system (PEIS) • A six-week training program for 24 staff from NPCS, MOF, selected line ministries, and experts from the private sector • Training of two NPCS staff in ADB OED • Provision of microcomputer, ancillary equipment, and software; and training of NPCS staff by the equipment supplier

TA No.	Country	TA Title	Objectives	Scope
2782	PHI	Pilot Implementation of the Project Performance Management System (PPMS)	Improve the effectiveness of national development expenditures by enhancing Government M&E capabilities through pilot implementation of PPMS in the Department of Agriculture (DA) and Department of Health (DOH), with NEDA as coordinating body	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capability assessment of M&E units in NEDA, DA, and DOH • PPMS pilot program • Institutional strengthening of NEDA, DA, and DOH to operationalize PPMS • Preparation of a program/strategy for broad-based implementation of PPMS
2810	SRI	Strengthening Project Performance Evaluation Capability of the Ministry of Plan Implementation (MPI), Ethnic Affairs and National Integration	Enhance the project performance evaluation and quality assurance capability of MPI, National Planning Department (NPD), and External Resources Department (ERD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation of an action plan for institutionalizing a more effective PPMS • Designing system procedures to ensure that results of evaluation work are effectively made available • Preparation of guidelines for each of the operational units involved in PPMS • Setting up a documents center in MPRD • Strengthening the PEIS
2954	NEP	Strengthening the Project Performance Management System	Establish an accountable and result-oriented institutional framework in Nepal at the national and selected line ministry levels for the programming, budgeting, and management of development projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of a PPMS • Integration of the management information system at central and line ministries' level with PPMS • Human resource development: training programs and workshops on implementing PPMS • Provision of computer facilities

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE RESULTS AND FINDINGS OF THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPLETION REPORT (TCR)

TA Number and Title	Results	TCR's Overall Assessment and Rating	Lessons Identified by TCR	TCR Recommendations and Follow-Up Action
<p>TA 1650-PHI: Strengthening Postevaluation Capability of the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA)</p>	<p>The Asian Development Bank (ADB) conducted an intensive training course in postevaluation. Participating agencies and assigned staff valued highly all ADB training. An institutional review report submitted to the Government found that NEDA had the technical capability to postevaluate government projects on a regular basis if existing levels of staffing and budget support were maintained. The postevaluation information system (PEIS) established at NEDA is capable of collecting and retrieving data on postevaluated projects. The equipment provided NEDA with adequate capacity for processing and storing postevaluation data and has enhanced the use and dissemination of information.</p>	<p>ADB has initiated an activity that could expedite the pace of project implementation and reduce redundancy in slow-moving or badly conceived projects in the public sector. Longer term, more intensive assistance would have been preferable. The TA made a small beginning that was of a reasonable good quality, but needs to be sustained.</p>	<p>Careful study of the postevaluation environment during TA implementation can help identify factors that will affect sustainability. A phased, medium-term system building program and a work plan that take these factors into account and commits the counterpart agency in charge of postevaluation to sustaining the effort would be a useful TA output to monitor progress.</p> <p>When counterpart staff participate in ADB missions, assignments should be planned and the mission leader should prepare a performance assessment to guide the participant's professional growth.</p>	<p>ADB should keep close contact with NEDA/PED on its ongoing work during 1994 and beyond. If NEDA demonstrates a commitment to postevaluation, ADB should consider further assistance when NEDA is ready to enter the next stage of this long-term effort.</p>

TA Number and Title	Results	TCR's Overall Assessment and Rating	Lessons Identified by TCR	TCR Recommendations and Follow-Up Action
TA 1967-NEP: Strengthening the Postevaluation Capability of the National Planning Commission Secretariat (NPCS)	The major TA outputs included (i) a manual for postevaluation system and methodology, (ii) postevaluation reports of four projects, (iii) a computerized PEIS, and (iv) 39 trained Government staff and 8 officers from four nongovernment consulting firms.	<p>The TA contributed to creating positive awareness of the importance of institutionalizing postevaluation systems in various line ministries and in the Central Monitoring and Evaluation Division (CMED) of NPCS. The well-laid evaluation units that have been established and increased awareness shown by the decision makers reflect the TA's success.</p> <p>The only shortcoming is that some of the staff of CMED and line agencies who benefited have been transferred. The TA has achieved its intended objectives and is rated as generally successful.</p>	<p>The focus of the TA on training staff from CMED and line agencies, and also from consulting firms was appropriate. This experience highlights the importance of needs assessment as a basis for formulating programs to build institutional capacity.</p> <p>Strengthening postevaluation capability at the national level will be effective only to the extent that a similar capability is created at the important line agencies as well.</p>	<p>Introducing some incentives and measures to motivate staff could be one possible way to retain staff for a longer period after their training.</p> <p>The manuals prepared and equipment should be used regularly in training new staff.</p> <p>In carrying out postevaluation-related activities, CMED could consider seeking assistance from nongovernment consulting firms that have benefited from training under the TA.</p> <p>The Government should consider establishing a project performance management system, and seek further support from external aid agencies when needed.</p>

TA Number and Title	Results	TCR's Overall Assessment and Rating	Lessons Identified by TCR	TCR Recommendations and Follow-Up Action
TA 2782-PHI: Pilot Implementation of the Project Performance Management System (PPMS)	The TA accomplished the following: (i) trained staff at NEDA, Department of Agriculture (DA) DA, and Department of Health (DOH) in PPMS concepts and created an understanding of PPMS methodology and tools; (ii) assessed the capability of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) units of these agencies; (iii) prepared a comprehensive guideline on PPMS that will serve as reference for its implementation; and (iv) devised several quick and easy tools and techniques to supplement standard evaluation methodologies and simplify data collection, processing, and analysis in applying ADB's PPMS concepts.	The TA rationale and mix of components were sound. While the immediate objective of pilot testing the PPMS was met, the expectation of an operational system was not realized. The TA design underestimated the time frame and administrative requirements for introducing such system, which included field tests on ADB projects where ADB staff themselves were not yet familiar with the concepts and procedures. The TA is rated partly successful.	The TA-specific lessons to be learned follow: (i) a partial/ piecemeal aid agency approach to implementing changes in national M&E processes will not be effective unless it is done in a broad M&E agenda/framework and sustained by institutional and leadership support at all levels; (ii) the exercise should have been less aid agency-driven and with stronger local initiative; (iii) manpower training must be institutionalized so as to develop and maintain the necessary depth of understanding and competence in M&E concepts; (iv) a project should be designed using the logical framework; (v) a project should not be approved for funding until the objectives, indicators, and targets have been clearly defined and a M&E system established; (vi) funding for M&E should be anticipated and included in the project budget; and (vii) it is difficult to undertake retrofitting of logical framework for existing projects.	The Government further requested ADB assistance to refocus monitoring toward assessing outcomes, and reorienting evaluation from postevaluation to concurrent evaluation during project implementation. Further ADB support in operationalizing a practical, national RME system is needed.
TA 2810-SRI: Strengthening Project Performance Evaluation Capability of the Ministry of Plan Implementation, Ethnic Affairs and National Integration	The PEIS was expanded to provide a feedback mechanism to the line ministries and other key agencies through the installation of Internet and e-mail facilities. A web site was established at Ministry of Plan Implementation (MPI). A documentation center was also established. Training programs, workshops, and study tours were conducted.	The TA is rated as generally successful as it achieved the envisaged objectives set out in the TA paper. TA components were well balanced in providing consultancy, training, and institutional development, and in creating awareness. The PEIS was successfully strengthened and made a significant impact in the public sector where PPMS is being institutionalized within the project cycle. The modern technological facilities provided by the TA are being used effectively for development management.	The successful implementation of the TA depends largely on (i) conscious effort by ADB staff in maintaining close contacts and relationship with the implementing agencies and the periodic informal monitoring and facilitation role, (ii) the political commitment accorded to it, (iii) availability of strategic information, and (iv) skilled manpower to carry out the tasks. Advanced training of officers creates a multiplier effect, especially when trained officers act as resource speakers in M&E training programs.	It is recommended that ADB maintain close contact with MPI to monitor and exchange information on lessons from project management. To ensure long-term sustainability of training in PPMS, other agencies should be made aware of the importance of PPMS during processing of future ADB loans. Coordination among the External Resources Department, MPI, and National Planning Department should be strengthened by more systematic exchange of information among these institutions.

