



Technical Assistance Consultant's Report

Project Number: 39107
October 2008

Nepal: Operationalization of Managing for Development Results in Nepal (Financed by the Managing for Development Results Cooperation Fund)

This consultant's report does not necessarily reflect the views of ADB or the Government concerned, and ADB and the Government cannot be held liable for its contents. (For project preparatory technical assistance: All the views expressed herein may not be incorporated into the proposed project's design.)

Asian Development Bank

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms	i
Executive Summary.....	ii
1. Context.....	1
2. ToR of the Assignment:	2
3. Approach followed in the Assignment:	2
4. Review of TA 4765:	2
a. Objectives of the TA:	2
b. Key Activities Undertaken by the TA	3
c. Key Achievements.....	4
d. Factors Contributing to the Success of the TA	5
e. Factors impeding the progress of TA	5
f. Key Learning from Implementation of this TA:.....	6
g. The Way Forward.....	6
5. Review of RETA 6306.....	8
a. Objectives of RETA 6306:	8
b. Key Activities undertaken by the TA:	9
c. Key Achievements:.....	9
d. Suggestions for future intervention by the TA:	10
6. MfDR Government Initiatives and TYIP.....	11
7. Emerging Issues	12
8. Future Intervention Areas	14
9. TA Activities	16
1. Help Consolidate MfDR Operationalization at NPC, MPPW, MLD and MOES	16
2. Extend Operationalization of MfDR approaches in new ministries	17
3. Implement results-based budgeting in selected agencies of the government	17
4. Build capacity of Staff and Institutions on MfDR.....	17
10. Implementation Arrangement.....	17
11. Design and Monitoring Framework	18
References	22
Appendices	24
Appendix -1: LIST OF PERSONS MET	24

List of Acronyms

ADB	:	Asian Development Bank
CA	:	Constituent Assembly
CBS	:	Central Bureau of Statistics
DDC	:	District Development Committee
DIDC	:	District Information and Documentation Centre
DFID	:	Department for International Development, UK
DOLIDAR	:	Department of Local Infrastructure and Agriculture Roads
DOR	:	Department of Roads
DPMAS	:	District Poverty Monitoring and Analysis System
DUDBC	:	Department of Urban Development and Building Construction
DWSS	:	Department of Water Supply and Sewerage
FY	:	Fiscal Year
GoN	:	Government of Nepal
JICA	:	Japan International Cooperation Agency.
LDO	:	Local Development Officer
LDTA	:	Local Development Training Academy
LRN	:	Local Road network
MfDR	:	Managing for Development Results
MLD	:	Ministry of Local development
MoAC	:	Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperative
MoES	:	Ministry of Education and Sports
MoF	:	Ministry of Finance
MPPW	:	Ministry of Physical Planning and Works
MTEF	:	Mid Term Expenditure Framework
NASC	:	Nepal Administrative Staff College
NLSS	:	Nepal Living Standard Survey
PIP	:	Priority Investment Plan
PMAS	:	Poverty Monitoring and Analysis System
PRSP	:	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
RBB	:	Result Based Budgeting
RETA	:	Regional Technical Assistance
SRN	:	Strategic Road Network
TA	:	Technical Assistance
TYIP	:	Three Year Interim Plan
UNDP	:	United Nations Development Programme

Executive Summary

1. Nepal has entered into a new era with Nepal being declared a Federal Democratic Republic by Constituent Assembly. The need for the Government to improve public service delivery and development effectiveness has become even more pertinent.

Government of Nepal (GoN) has indeed taken concrete steps in this direction and had worked and promoted MfDR approach in its development plan formation and implementation since the tenth plan. ADB has fully supported Government's efforts through its TA 4765 and RETA 6306, which were implemented between 2000 and early 2008. The TAs have had a number of impact on promoting and institutionalizing of MfDR in participating government agencies.

However, it is being felt that the Government of Nepal needs further support to strength its MfDR implementation capability to expand horizontally and vertically in operationalizing MfDR at Government agencies

2. This consultancy assignment was, therefore, undertaken to review the achievements of previous two TAs on MfDR in Nepal and suggest future intervention programs to help GoN for further implementation of MfDR in government agencies. The two main tasks of the assignment were:

- a. Review the achievements, experiences, and the 'way forward' proposed by the two MfDR TAs on operationalization of MfDR;
- b. Develop a comprehensive intervention program on implementation of MfDR to be supported by ADB, in close consultation with government stakeholders

The consultant followed an interactive approach while carrying out assignment along with extensive study of relevant materials/reports on ADB TA 4765 and RETA 6306. Intensive discussions were held with Senior Executives from NPC, MoES, MLD, MPPW with a view to identify intervention areas to make the next TA more meaningful and fruitful.

3. Review of TAs indicated that both TAs have had a number of notable outcomes and outputs such as:

- a. NPC, MPPW, MLD, MoES, DWSS and DDC staff at Jumla, Jhapa, Dang and Dhanusa districts became more aware of MfDR concepts and they realized the more extensive operationalization of MfDR approach in their planning and budgeting, and project selection.
- b. Basic tools for MfDR implementation such as result frameworks, performance Indicators, guidelines for MfDR implementation and project prioritization have been developed.
- c. The DIDC Offices have been provided with new software.
- d. Approach to mainstreaming MfDR at the organization level were developed and piloted.
- e. The capacity in MfDR approach and implementation among the staff of participating agencies and local training firms considerably enhanced.
- f. Efforts were made to adopt MfDR approach while formulating TYIP.

4. Based on the way forward proposed by the two TAs and the discussions with the senior executives of GoN, the following seemed to be the major issues that needs to be addressed:
 - a. **Sustained Effort to Institutionalize MfDR Culture required.** By its very nature, MfDR is a long-term process and requires a long time period for thoroughly institutionalizing new processes and approaches. While, a number of MfDR tools and approaches such as Result Framework, Business Plans, and Operational guidelines and so on have been prepared, substantial more time is required to ensure that these tools and techniques are actually put to use.
 - b. **Improvement in Service Delivery.** With the adoption of Democratic Republic Federalism, Nepal has entered into a new phase of development. The aspirations of people have increased manifolds. There is tremendous pressure to improve its service delivery system. This has further made a strong case for building result based planning and budgeting approaches in the government system.
 - c. **Effective use of feed back from M&E system and need of data requirements.** Incorporation of a results-perspective in line-Ministry and Departmental planning activities has revealed a number of weaknesses in the M&E systems of the participating pilot government agencies. Line-agency reporting systems have traditionally focused on information related to sector outputs and sector inputs. As the planning emphasis shifts to results, the line agencies require information that can be used to assess the quality of service delivery and the utilization and adequacy of services to different groups of clients-cum-stakeholders. This implies a need to develop new sources of information on outcomes and impacts and developing mechanism to actually utilizing such information for decision-making purposes.
 - d. **Long term commitment.** As MfDR interventions are most likely to succeed when there is a clear, high-level demand for those interventions, strong ownership and leadership support from the Government are essential.
 - e. **Improved Projects at entry level.** The poverty reduction and other development goals of the country are achievable to the extent that it could ensure quality of projects at the entry level itself and the efficient and effective supervision of the projects executed. And hence, there is a need for strengthening the project screening system at the national as well as organizational level.
 - f. **Capacity building to mainstream MfDR.** It is observed that while awareness of MfDR is increasing in Nepal and its application has started by the participating Ministries and Departments, the use of MfDR is still not extensive. An institutional assessment found that there was need to develop a gamut of new skills from result based planning, monitoring, evaluation to specialized diagnostic skills and foster management's ability to make decisions based on monitoring information.
5. Review of the previous TAs and discussions with Senior Executives of GoN, indicated that the next TA should adopt a three pronged strategy. These are:
 - a. Building on what has been achieved by the previous TAs.

- b. Extending the operationalization of MfDR vertically as well as horizontally in the government agencies taking into account the probability of early success of the intervention and also support whenever possible the efforts of GoN to promote result oriented culture and approaches.
 - c. Focusing extensively on capacity development of staff on MfDR approaches/tools and its implementation processes for sustainability of MfDR operationalization.
6. The following intervention areas are identified for consideration while designing the next TA:

(i) Consolidation of operationalization of MfDR approaches in NPC, MPPW, MLD and MoES:

As a part of the first strategy, the next TA should concentrate on consolidation of operationalization of MfDR processes already initiated by the previous TAs. This basically involves:

- a. helping these ministries review/revise their business plans and results frameworks in line with new TYIP and government's development priorities
- b. helping the ministries/agencies link their business plans to the budgeting and monitoring processes
- c. helping the staff and organizations develop capacity to operationalize MfDR approach through workshops/trainings and sharing of information.

(ii) Extension of Operationalization of MfDR in other Ministries for example MoWR and MoAC.

The experience gained during previous TAs will be utilized in extending the operationalization process of MfDR in other ministries. The ministries or other government agencies to be included for extending Operationalization of MfDR have to be decided by the TA design team in consultation with GoN. The possible candidates for this at present are MoAC and MoWR. The involvement of ADB in their operation is substantial. The TA will initiate operationalization of MfDR in these ministries by developing comprehensive business plans and results framework, which will be mainstreamed into the planning, budgeting and monitoring systems of the participating ministries.

(iii) Development of Results-Based Budgeting system:

As a part of its second strategy of extending support whenever possible to government agencies, promoting result based approach and culture, it is recommended that the next TA should also support MoF to pilot result based budgeting in some government agencies that are directly engaged in public service delivery. Hopefully, this will help, improve service delivery of the participating agencies and also will demonstrate the utility of adopting MfDR (Result based) approach in bringing effectiveness in service delivery.

(iv) Capacity Development on MfDR

The future TA should focus on capacity development of staff and institutions on MfDR with a view to create a pool of specialists equipped with skills and capacity to implement MfDR tools and process in other government agencies.

1. Context

Nepal has ushered into a new era with the successful completion of the Constituent Assembly (CA) elections in April 2008 and the first meeting of the CA declaring Nepal a Federal Democratic Republic on 28 May 2008. People's expectations are really high there is a tremendous pressure on the Government to improve public service delivery and development effectiveness in the changed political context.

In fact, with an avowed aim of reducing poverty through development effectiveness and improved public service delivery, promotion of the concept and practice of "Managing for Development Results" (MfDR) has been encouraged by donors and adopted by many developing countries including Nepal over the years. The Government of Nepal (GoN), in a way, is regarded as a front-runner on the implementation of MfDR in the region as it has taken concrete steps in developing some core elements of results-based management while implementing its Tenth Five Year Plan (FY2003-FY2007), which was also the Government's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP), and more recently the Three Year Interim Plan (TYIP, FY2007/8-FY2009/10), which aims to guide development over the transitional period after the conflict. It lays a strong emphasis on reducing poverty, improving the living conditions of the poor, and establishing lasting peace and stability (NPC, 2007).

The results frameworks of the Tenth Plan (NPC, 2002) and TYIP, Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) and Sectoral Business Plans are important tools the government used to align resources to expected results. Project prioritization criteria introduced since the Tenth Plan has helped focus resource allocations to priority sectors that better contribute to the Government's poverty reduction goals.

The Poverty Monitoring Division of the National Planning Commission (NPC) has been regularly monitoring progress towards achieving the poverty reduction goal. Poverty Monitoring and Analysis System (PMAS) and District Poverty Monitoring and Analysis System (DPMAS) have been developed to facilitate the monitoring of development interventions and their impact at national and local levels. Together with other development partners, ADB has helped the Government implement the Tenth Plan through its country strategy and program (CSP, 2005-2009) which is also ADB's first results-based CSP. The CSP links the strategic priorities of the Tenth Plan, ADB's operations to support the priorities, and the results (outputs or outcomes) expected during CSP implementation.

In 2005, GoN requested ADB to support the capacity development of government institutions to operationalize MfDR and also in recognition of the need for on-going, long-term commitment to enhancing in-country capacity for results management, two TAs (ADB TA 4765 and RETA 6306) were implemented by ADB between 2006 and 2008. These TAs supported operationalization of MfDR in selected government agencies. As a result, planning and implementation of national plans and budgets are becoming increasingly result oriented.

However, this is not enough and in 2007, the Government requested additional technical support to consolidate the achievements of the two TAs and to extend MfDR approaches to other government agencies. ADB confirmed an advisory TA in its 2008 country program (ADB, 2007a), during the 2008 Country Program

Confirmation Mission in January 2008. This consultancy assignment is undertaken to develop a comprehensive intervention program on further institutionalization of MfDR building on the achievements of the two earlier TAs and to support ADB during the development of the TA.

2. ToR of the Assignment:

The main objective of the assignment is to determine the future needs of the government on internalization of managing for development results (MfDR) and suggest intervention programs. The specific tasks as per ToR are as follows:

- Review the achievements, experiences, and the 'way forward' proposed by the two MfDR TAs on operationalization of MfDR;
- Consult government agencies (including NPC and Ministry of Finance) and national consultants responsible for implementing the two TAs, including senior civil servants;
- Assess and develop an approach for building on the achievements of the two TAs;
- Assess GoN's policies, programs and priorities on institutionalization of MfDR in the framework of the Three Year Interim Plan (2007/08-2009/10);
- Develop a comprehensive intervention program on implementation of MfDR to be supported by ADB, in close consultation with government stakeholders; and
- Support ADB during the development/processing of the TA.

3. Approach followed in the Assignment:

An interactive approach was followed in carrying out the assignment along with an extensive study of relevant materials such as TYIP, reports on ADB TA 4765 and RETA 6306 and so on. Intensive discussions were held with the officials from NPC, participating organizations and other concerned officials and experts. Discussions with the Senior Governance and Capacity Building Officer, NRM, ADB helped clarify the tasks. He provided a valuable guidance in identifying the potential intervention areas.

4. Review of TA 4765:

a. Objectives of the TA:

The overall objective of this TA 4765-NEP: Operationalization of Management for Development Results was to help the Government of Nepal operationalize and institutionalize managing for development results (MfDR) (ADB, 2006). Specifically, the TA was designed to help the Government:

- (i) to institutionalize MfDR approaches within National Planning Commission (NPC), selected line ministries (Department of Roads or DoR of Ministry of Physical Planning and Works or MPPW and Ministry of Local Development or MLD, and three District Development Committees (DDCs of Jumla, Dang and Jhapa);
- (ii) to develop sector-wide results frameworks and action plans;

(iii) to strengthen monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems.

The specific TA outputs included

- (i) enhanced MfDR capacity of government agencies, mainly NPC, MPPW, MLD, and three participating DDCs (Jhapa, Dang, and Jumla);
- (ii) development of results frameworks and actions plans for the selected line ministries, and identification of relevant output and outcome indicators at the national and district levels;
- (iii) development of methodologies and operational tools for MfDR;
- (iv) institutionalization of MfDR by building on the existing PMAS and DMPAS in the selected three districts and
- (v) strengthened institutional mechanisms for implementing MfDR in selected national and district government agencies.

The two line ministries (MPPW and MLD) and three DDCs (Jumla, Dang and Jhapa) were selected based on their expected capacity to implement MfDR approaches and relevance of ADB operations.

The TA was designed in September of 2005. The total estimated cost of the TA was \$500,000, with ADB to provide \$400,000 on a grant basis from ADB's Support of Managing for Development Results Cooperation Fund and the Government contributing counterpart support (in kind) of \$100,000. Originally conceived of as an 18 month assistance program, the TA was compressed into a 12 month period, with implementation concentrated from February 2007 to February 2008.

b. Key Activities Undertaken by the TA

- Understanding the context for MfDR
- review of Tenth Plan (PRSP), District Periodic Plans, MTEF, log frames, Draft business plan of MPPW, PMAS, DPMAS
- Operationalizing MfDR at the Central Level
 - MfDR status reports for MPPW (DoR) and MLD
 - workshops/interaction groups/training to help create MfDR culture in central agencies
 - guidance on linking national plans and strategies, resource allocation and implementation
 - senior-level meetings with MPPW and MLD to develop MfDR management chains
 - guidance to MPPW (DoR) and MLD on MfDR-structured inputs to TYIP
 - guidance to MPPW (DoR) and MLD in preparing and "finalizing" results frameworks/matrices and business plans
 - guidance on goal setting, performance indicators (outcomes/outputs/ inputs) and development of baseline data
 - inter-ministerial/inter-agency coordination, including for linking strategic and local road networks

- establishment of MfDR focal points as well as working groups in MLD and MPPW
- tools for assisting in mainstreaming MfDR
 - guidelines/manual for implementation and operationalization of MfDR in central ministries/agencies
 - guidance on simplifying MfDR reporting formats
 - report on project prioritization guidelines, highlighting the importance of diagnostic analysis and strategy formulation
- Operationalizing MfDR at the District Level
 - workshops in the three pilot districts (Jumla, Dang and Jhapa) to help create MfDR culture and strengthen understanding of the core principles
 - MfDR status reports for the three districts
 - soft-ware development and manual for implementation and operationalization of DPMAS in the DDCs
 - technical support for implementation of DPMAS
 - case study/survey in Jhapa district to assess delivery of government services among Rajbanshi, Santhal and Dalit communities, and outline the methodology and steps for similar studies/surveys in other districts
- Capacity Building/Training
 - interaction working groups for MPPW and MLD under the auspices of the TA Project to strengthen understanding of MfDR principles and core components ((e.g., results-based matrices)
 - senior level study tour to PR China (8 senior officials), led by the Honorable Dr. Jagadish Chandra Pokharel
 - external training program at AIT in Bangkok, Thailand for 10 officials
 - training program at the Nepal Administrative Staff College (NASC) for 20 participants from central agencies and district offices
 - training program at the Local Development Training Academy (LDTA) for 17 DDCs representatives in information and documentation management
 - TA completion seminar for government officials and representatives of donor agencies, in collaboration with ADB RETA 6306
 - IT equipment for central agencies and the three districts

c. Key Achievements

The follows are the notable outcomes and outputs achieved by the TA:

- NPC, MPPW and MLD and the DDC staff of Jumla, Jhapa and Dang districts are more knowledgeable about MfDR concepts, and the importance of operationalizing results-based management;
- The series of meetings, workshops, interaction programs and training sessions helped develop a results-based mind set in the three central agencies and pilot districts;

- NPC, MPPW and MLD are better aware of the management chain, organizational structure and incentive system necessary for effective results-based management;
- Practical deliverables relevant to the TYIP, including results-based frameworks/matrices and business plans for MPPW and MLD;
- Basic tools for MfDR implementation, including the scope and depth of the results frameworks and performance indicators; guidelines for MfDR implementation and guidelines for project prioritization have been developed;
- Diagnostic analysis is better recognized as fundamental to designing the most effective and efficient inputs for achieving expected outcomes and outputs; the case study for Jhapa demonstrated practical results;
- MLD and NPC monitoring staff are more knowledgeable about DPMAS; engagement of MLD and NPC staff in the TA activities has generated commitment and interest in DPMAS implementation, and in helping DDCs/LDOs;
- DIDC officers in Dang and Jhapa are familiar with sectoral indicators and have been trained to collect data and information from the line agencies; they are capable of using such information in the planning and reporting process;
- The line agency staff members in the three districts are more familiar with monitoring indicators and data; they better appreciate the importance of the data they generate for DPMAS implementation;
- The DIDC offices have been provided with new software for storing data/information based on DPMAS indicators.

(Uniconsult International Ltd et.al, 2008)

d. Factors Contributing to the Success of the TA

- TA built on a number of the elements of MfDR that were already in place
- Strong leadership and ownership of project-supported initiatives by the Vice-Chairman and members of NPC;
- Active involvement of and strong ownership by senior officials of the participating organizations in all project tasks through high-level steering committee/focal points/working groups and so on.;
- Continuous support by the ADB project manager through all stages of project design and implementation.

e. Factors impeding the progress of TA

The following factors could be taken as the factors that impeded TA progress to a certain extent:

- Political fluid situation during the implementation of the project;
- Changes of staff in focal points;
- Absence of elected political leaders at the district level;
- Insufficient baseline data; and
- Involvement of three different firms to implement the TA.

(Tabor, 2008)

f. Key Learning from Implementation of this TA:

1. The Need for a Long-term, Sustained and Coordinated Effort

The transition from the long-standing input management approach to a results-based management approach is transformational for the Government, requiring sweeping and profound changes in the operations of the civil service. For more robust progress, MfDR management chains are to be more firmly established and decision-making within the ministries and districts more reflective of evolving results. This requires a long-term, sustained coordinated effort.

2. The Need for Diagnostic Analysis

Good diagnostic analysis is fundamental to MfDR. After all, application of MfDR principles would only yield good results if the inputs are sound. Operationalizing of MfDR will be much more successful if accompanied by good diagnostic analysis. This aspect of MfDR seems to be insufficiently addressed at present at least in terms of formulating the national plans.

4. The Need for Leadership

Leadership by the Prime Minister and Cabinet in operationalizing of MfDR is important. At present, NPC plays a leadership role, which would be greatly enhanced if actively supported by the Prime Minister and Cabinet, as is the case in some other developing countries in Asia (e.g., Viet Nam). Operationalizing of MfDR cannot be a bottom-up exercise. Responsibility and accountability for each step from strategic planning to implementation, monitoring and final assessment must be clearly assigned. Further, the necessary human resources and skill levels must be assigned to the tasks

Central ministries should consider establishing a two-tiered “strategic management process”: first tier, involving senior decision makers (Minister, Vice Ministers, and Secretary); and the second tier, an MfDR Secretariat comprised of the Secretary, Joint Secretaries, Program Directors, section heads and selected technical advisers.

g. The Way Forward

NPC should lead a thorough review of how to operationalize and implement results-based management, and to formulate a practical step-by-step for doing so. The next phase of ADB TA support should, ensure, in collaboration with other development partners, that NPC has the capacity to do this. And the core line ministries need to be very much involved in both exercises, based on greater ministerial responsibility and accountability.

Given the low institutional capacity in the district level organizations, operationalization of MfDR and DPMAS implementation should be considered as a long-term reform process. DPMAS implementation requires a ‘learning-by-doing’ approach and ownership by from the DDC and district level line agencies.

Continuous training programs would appear necessary, especially in light of frequent staff rotations. Other elements of capacity building may include

organizational changes, particularly to strengthen the capacity for diagnostic analysis and strategic planning in ministries and district offices.

Listed below are a number of elements that need to be addressed in the next phase of support for operationalizing MfDR:

- Strengthen the context for MfDR, focusing on the following priorities:
 - clarification of the role of government in a market-based economy (e.g., social equity concerns, support role for the business sector);
 - policy adjustments conducive to MfDR (e.g., market-based pricing for key services, together with targeted subsidies for the poor);
 - organizational and institutional adjustments conducive to MfDR (e.g., clarification of the responsibility and accountability of each level of government, including the the role of MLD in a more decentralized system);
 - unify the budget process (e.g., capital and recurrent expenditures consolidated by MoF);
 - establishment of a merit-based professional and stable civil service.
- Build on the base established so far in Nepal for MfDR, focusing on the following priorities:
 - continued leadership by senior management, with establishment of MfDR management chains and clear directives for results-based management;
 - continued work on linking planning and budgeting, with attention to improvements in costing program/project inputs and alternatives;
 - continued mainstreaming and internalization of the key elements of MfDR, including prioritization of MTEF investments consistent with meeting the three-year planning targets;
 - strengthen the building-block approach to development, recognizing the synergies and complementarities among sectors;
 - revise the guidelines for project prioritization, drawing on recommendations of the TA Project Team;
 - operationalization of performance indicators through attention to baseline data, including conducting small scale surveys;
 - improvement of the results-based log frames, drawing on formats developed by Project Team but not adopted because of need for consistency with TYIP;
 - continued improvement of business plans of MLD and MPPW, drawing on international best practices and better integration with the MTEF;
 - extend to other districts the activities under TA 4765 to operationalize DPMAS;
 - extend to other districts the special survey study of targeted Government services;

- extend to other ministries the activities under TA 4765 to operationalize MfDR, with priority attention to strengthening the role of MoF.
- Knowledge dissemination and capacity building, focusing on the following priorities:
 - publish and widely disseminate an operational manual for MfDR, drawing on the outlines developed under TA 4765;
 - continue training programs for all levels of government staff involved in key elements of MfDR; priorities include diagnostic analysis, performance indicators, report preparation, and management chains;
 - facilitate cascading of knowledge to the operational level;
 - undertake further case studies (such as proposed by the Project Team concerning MfDR procedures followed by MPPW in designing and implementing a designated strategic road project in Jumla, compared to those of MLD/DoLIDAR in designing and implementing local roads in the same district);
 - institutional and organizational adjustments to facilitate MfDR (e.g., better integration of road management);
 - strengthen the incentive system for MfDR (e.g., Prime Ministerial awards, elevate status of M&E);
 - strengthen the utility of PMAS through regular performance reports to the Cabinet and Parliament, and greater involvement of M&E staff in the decision-making process so as to incorporate lessons learned;
 - strengthen of internal and external linkages among MfDR experts.

(Uniconsult International Ltd et.al, 2008)

5. Review of RETA 6306

a. Objectives of RETA 6306:

The main purpose of RETA 6306: Mainstreaming MfDR for Poverty Reduction in South Asia is to contribute to poverty reduction as reflected in the attainment of the MDGs in Nepal, Bangladesh and Pakistan.

The specific objectives of the TA are:

- to develop a tool for assessing capacity of a public sector organization to adopt MfDR as a management strategy
- to pilot test the tools
- to identify Technical and managerial capacity gaps
- to design steps to address these gaps
- to build capacity in the RM and in local consultants
- to build and pilot approaches to the implementation of MfDR at the level of the organization
- to share lessons and disseminate information

The basic philosophy of the RETA is that the introduction of MfDR into the government is a long term, two-stage process of managed change.

Stage One of the process of managed change is the introduction of a results focus into country planning and the creation of logframes and indicators at the sectoral level.

Stage Two cascades the philosophy and practices down to the organizations of Government responsible for delivering the planned sectoral results.

It requires change at both the institutional and organizational levels. However, the second area of MfDR (Stage Two) remains less developed. The RETA focuses at this level.

The expected outputs are from RETA 6306 are: (i) MfDR readiness assessment, (ii) MfDR strategy and implementation plans, and (iii) MfDR mainstreamed under ADB-financed pilot initiatives.

This Regional TA was approved in Jan 2006 with \$1.8 million funded by DFID for Pakistan, Nepal and Bangladesh. It was expanded by \$ 0.5 million to include Sri Lanka and this fund was provided by Norway, Netherlands and Canada. The long term goal of the RETA was to assess and strengthen the Resident Missions (RM) and developing member countries' (DMC) capacity to implement a sustainable and results-oriented approach to poverty reduction. (ADB, 2007b, 2007c)

For Nepal, the following institutions were selected for intervention and pilot testing of the capacity testing tools:

1. Ministry of Education and Sports (Ministry Level)
2. Ministry of Physical Planning and Works (Ministry Level)
3. Department of Water Supply and Sewerage (Department Level)
4. District Development Committee Dhanusha

b. Key Activities undertaken by the TA:

1. For all the participating agencies, Readiness assessment was carried out.
2. Organizational results chains for all the agencies have been developed.
3. A core group of trainers from the participating agencies and private were involved in an MfDR training of trainers program based on the training course developed by NASC which is expected to continue training more government officials.
4. For MOES, a guideline for ensuring project quality-at-entry as well as Performance Evaluation Guidelines for Division and Section Heads of MOES were developed.
5. District profile of Dhanusa DDC was prepared.
6. The TA also assisted DWSS to establish a geographical information system (GIS). It also helped develop Web-based Electronic M&E System at DWSS.
7. Some bridging activities particularly concentrating on providing training to create MfDR awareness and culture are still going on.

c. Key Achievements:

1. Approach to mainstreaming MfDR at the organization level were developed and piloted. A change model has been developed and implemented in the pilot organizations.

2. Capacity has strengthened in the RMs and in local consultants. Local consultants were subjected to the intensive training by international consultants and in each RM, liaison persons were identified in order to ensure continuity of knowledge within the RM.
3. Information sharing and dissemination of lessons learned

d. Suggestions for future intervention by the TA:

1. *Developing a mission driven organization to align to national outcomes from higher to lower level*

There is a need to make appropriate connections between the sectoral outcomes and the implementing organizations so that each organization is appropriately mission driven and contributing to national outcomes.

2. *Improving quality at entry and supervision of projects*

At present, projects at the entry stage are analyzed only at a preliminary personal-judgment level and by the application of non-standard filters.

There is, therefore, a need for strengthening the project screening system at the organizational level.

3. *Strengthening M&E Systems for developing MIS in the government*

The M&E set up in Nepal is more than a decade old. In most of the organizations implementation remains at a low level due to the low capacity to move information through organizations and to use that information to make decisions. There is a need to move to the next stage of MIS development by building a web-based system.

4. *Local level capacity building*

The need to strengthen DDCs through (i) Results chain development and DPMAS indicator improvements with emphasis on the MDGs, (ii) Strengthening the DDCs with equipment support, communication system enhancement, and website development and (iii) by strengthening linkages between DDC and grassroots level organizations such as private institutions, community based organizations and local level NGOs to improve service delivery.

5. *Developing performance-based contracts in some government agencies*

Some pilot programs have taken place on performance-based contracting: in MOF (Large tax payer's office and Birganj dry port), at MOES (performance based grant system for the schools in the country and specific incentives to managers in the district education office in the KTM valley), and in the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives. Since these pilots were on a small, isolated scale, there is no linking system to create the pressure required to extend the pilots to other levels and organizations. The pilots have not been picked up by other organizations. For visible progress there is a need to develop a formal performance-based contract with a system.

6. *Establishing and strengthening change management units*

Change management units were established in some ministries as pilots under the Governance Reform Program (2002–2006). There is need for

Technical Assistance to establish /strengthen change management units in pilot organizations and key ministries. Establishment of such units will help improve policy framework development and implementation plans for change.

7. *Fiscal federalism*

The Nepal government has decided to adopt a federal system. But an exercise on the nature of federalism has yet to be undertaken. From the perspective of MfDR, there is a need for a framework for the fiscal federalism by demarcating the roles of the central state and the federal state with respect to the administration of fiscal structures and the sharing of resources and responsibility.

8. *Strengthening business plans*

NPC introduced Business Plan exercise three years ago. However, the efforts do not seem to have been institutionalized, and at the organizational level, it does not exist—only sectoral business plans were developed. It is vitally important to introduce the process at the organizational level for enhancing the implementation of MfDR.

(ADB, 2007d, 2007e, 2007f, 2008b, 2008c)

6. MfDR Government Initiatives and TYIP

Results-based planning, implementation, and monitoring is a long-term reform process, but initial efforts in this area in Nepal have been encouraging. Despite a challenging political and security context in recent years, GoN has taken a number of steps to develop some core elements of MfDR. It has established an MfDR framework and put in place mechanisms that link planning, budgeting, project and/or program implementation, and monitoring to development results (outputs and outcomes). The Nepal PRS, Immediate Action Plan, MTEF, PMAS, DPMAS, and project performance information system are core elements of the Government's MfDR process. At present, ADB has been a major partner of GoN in its efforts to institutionalize MfDR. ADB, as mentioned earlier, has provided two TA support to GoN between 2006 and 2008 with a view to support GoN to operationalize MfDR.

As a result of these TAs, strong awareness as well as commitment to MfDR was created among planners and policy makers as was reflected by reference to MfDR in many places in TYIP (NPC, 2007). In fact, TYIP which was approved by the GoN in December 2007, adopted results-based approaches in formulating the plan and programs. The TYIP consists of an overall result framework and sectoral result frameworks, which still need to be linked to and operationalized at the ministry/institutional level. However, there still needs to establish a strong link among all the result components such as inputs, outputs and impact. The TYIP specifically mentioned that for effective sectoral prioritization and return on investment, result based management system will be adopted (NPC, 2007, p. 46).

It further went as to state that "strong emphasis will be placed as linking annual budget with TYIP and that the sectoral business plans will be made results oriented (NPC, 2007, p47). The Nepal Portfolio Performance Review, conducted jointly by the Government, Japan Bank for International Cooperation, the World Bank, and ADB in September 2007, has agreed to prepare results frameworks in

six major sectors and strengthen monitoring and reporting at the central level and line ministries (ADB, 2007a). While results frameworks have been developed in three line ministries with ADB assistance, the development of other ministry-level results frameworks will require substantive support in view of the limited capacity of the line ministries on MfDR.

As part of its MfDR initiatives, the Ministry of Finance (MoF) has piloted small scale performance-based budgeting in tax and custom offices and is now planning to introduce results-based budgeting in public sector agencies that are directly responsible for delivery of public goods and services. Based on the learning and experiences of the pilots, MoF intends to develop policies and programs to roll out results-based budgeting on a wider scale. Long-term institutional and human capacity building will be essential to institutionalize results based budgeting in public sector management.

However, these elements need to be systematized, integrated, streamlined, and institutionalized within a MfDR framework at all levels of the government for which sustained assistance is critical.

7. Emerging Issues

A number of issues emerged from these TAs. The major issues are mentioned below:

- A. **Sustained Effort to Institutionalize MfDR Culture required.** By its very nature, MfDR is a long-term process and requires a long time period for thoroughly institutionalizing new processes and approaches. While, a number of MfDR tools and approaches such as Result Framework, Business Plans, and Operational guidelines and so on have been prepared, substantial more time is required to ensure that these tools and techniques are actually put to use.

There is a need to sustain the gains made from the previous TAs given the need to further enhance the institutional capacity in the Ministries, Departments and line agencies. In addition, efforts need to be expanded horizontally as well as vertically so as to support improving overall public sector performance seen as critical to attain poverty reduction goal and attainment of the MDGs. With TA support provided by ADB, operationalization of MfDR has been piloted in NPC, MPPW, MoES and MLD, which included readiness/status assessments, development of results frameworks/indicators and business plans, capacity development programs, development of guidelines on project prioritization and a manual for operationalizing MfDR in central ministries, strengthening of monitoring and evaluation systems, and implementation of DPMAS.

The pilot agencies have requested further strengthening of capacity to fully internalize and institutionalize the MfDR approaches into the organizational systems and processes. The business plans and results frameworks have to be linked to the annual budget process, design of projects and programs, and the monitoring and evaluation systems. Further, institutionalization of MfDR approaches will require a number of organizational improvements, including in some cases, changes in mission, organization structure, staffing, funding, performance monitoring, incentive systems, reporting, and organizational

policies. Since MfDR capacity building by its very nature is a long-term challenge and process, further support to pilot agencies will be essential to consolidate the past achievements and to institutionalize an MfDR culture.

- B. Improvement in Service Delivery.** With the adoption of Democratic Republic Federalism, Nepal has entered into a new phase of development. The aspirations of people have increased manifold. There is tremendous pressure to improve its service delivery system. This has further made a strong case for building result based planning and budgeting approaches in the government system.

However, result-based tools, information and process are still at a very early stage of development in Nepal although attempts have been made to improve service delivery by linking results to budgets in some government agencies particularly at the Ministry of Finance. These efforts are needed to be supported and bolstered by building a strong pilot projects at other agencies too by introducing result based budgeting which would eventually help improve service delivery thus meeting expectations or demands of people at large.

- C. Effective use of feed back from M&E system and need of data requirements.** Incorporation of a results-perspective in line-Ministry and Departmental planning activities has revealed a number of weaknesses in the M&E systems of the participating pilot government agencies. Line-agency reporting systems have traditionally focused on information related to sector outputs and sector inputs. As the planning emphasis shifts to results, the line agencies require information that can be used to assess the quality of service delivery and the utilization and adequacy of services to different groups of clients-cum-stakeholders. This implies a need to develop new sources of information on outcomes and impacts and developing mechanism to actually utilizing such information for decision-making purposes.

- D. Long term commitment.** One important lesson from the previous TAs is the importance of the overall context for implementation of MfDR and the strong long term commitment from the leadership. While there continues to be top level support for results-based planning approaches, implementation of the measures identified will require organizational reform, human resources and the ability of planning and monitoring and evaluation staff to adjust and adopt these tools to a rapidly changing country context. As MfDR interventions are most likely to succeed when there is a clear, high-level demand for those interventions, strong ownership and leadership support from the Government are essential.

- E. Improved Projects at entry level.** The poverty reduction and other development goals of the country are achievable to the extent that it could ensure quality of projects at the entry level itself and the efficient and effective supervision of the projects executed. And hence, there is a need for strengthening the project screening system at the national as well as organizational level. At present, projects at the entry stage are analyzed the application of non-standard filters not particularly focusing on development results.

Therefore, the process of improving quality at entry has to be developed in all organizations. While this is a large scale task covering multiple organizations, it could be developed initially in NPC and ministries related to high priority pro-poor national outcomes such as education (MoES), infrastructure (MPPW and MLD), and agriculture (MoAC). Improving the project quality at entry and supervision of this should be a high priority area for MfDR.

- F. **Capacity building to mainstream MfDR.** It is observed that while awareness of MfDR is increasing in Nepal and its application has started by the participating Ministries and Departments, the use of MfDR is still not extensive. An institutional assessment found that there was need to develop a gamut of new skills from result based planning, monitoring, evaluation to specialized diagnostic skills and foster management's ability to make decisions based on monitoring information. Therefore, there is a need to have a concerted sustained effort in building knowledge, skills and attitudes among Strategic managers and operational staff so as to deepen the mainstreaming of MfDR across the government. Hence, MfDR capacity development needs to address the tremendous demand for sensitization, awareness building and human resource development in MfDR across the Government.

8. Future Intervention Areas

While selecting the intervention areas, the following factors were considered:

- a. Build on what have been achievements from the previous TAs (the above identified issues, the learning and the way forward indicated by the previous two TAs)
- b. Intensive discussions with senior executives of GON,
- c. An assessment of the of early success of the intervention areas for gaining credibility to the process of institutionalization of MfDR
- d. Political situation of the country.

Following intervention areas are identified to be considered in the design of the next TA are mentioned below:

1. **Consolidation/Internalization of MfDR Approaches in NPC, MPPW, MLD and MoES.** MfDR's success depends on organization's ability to create a management culture focused on results. Previous TAs tried to build that culture in NPC, MPPW, MLD and MoES and four District Development Committees (Dhanusha, Dang, Jhapa and Jumla) through a series of activities. The readiness assessment (Status assessment on MfDR) was carried out and Result framework, Performance Indicators, business plans were prepared for MLD, MPPW (DOR). NPC, MOES became better aware of the management chain and basic requirements for effective results-based management. Basic tools for MfDR implementation including guidelines for MfDR implementation and project prioritization have been developed.

Building upon these achievements, the TA will, further, help create such a culture by strengthening the internalization of MfDR in NPC, MPPW, MLD and MoES by helping these institutions to implement MfDR tools and processes developed by previous TAs Internalization will include

- (i) assessing the specific needs and priorities of the individual ministries on operationalization of MfDR (for instance, MLD has requested the TA to support: (a) linking of the business plan to the budgeting and monitoring process, and (b) mainstreaming MfDR in its national program on Local Governance and Community Development);
- (ii) helping the pilot ministries review/revise their business plans and results framework in line with the TYIP and the Government's development priorities;
- (iii) developing organization specific MfDR processes and tools;
- (iv) developing an action plan to integrate MfDR processes and tools into the planning, budgeting, project implementation, and monitoring and evaluation systems and supporting its implementation during the full budget cycle;
- (v) assisting NPC to incorporate MfDR approaches in its project entry and supervision system;
- (vi) enhancing the capacity of staff and institutions to mainstream MfDR in planning, implementation and monitoring processes organizing trainings, workshops and seminars and sharing of information.

- 2. Extension of Operationalization of MfDR in other Ministries for example MoWR and MoAC.** The experience gained during previous TAs will be utilized in extending the operationalization process of MfDR in other ministries. The ministries or other government agencies to be included for extending Operationalization of MfDR have to be divided by the TA design team in consultation with GoN. The possible candidates for this at present are MoAC and MoWR. The involvement of ADB in their operation is substantial. The TA will initiate operationalization of MfDR in these ministries by developing comprehensive business plans and results framework, which will be mainstreamed into the planning, budgeting and monitoring systems of the participating ministries.

The business plan as a strategic management tool will clarify thematic priorities and budgetary allocation and provide a basis for developing performance indicators, performance contracts and performance measures. The results framework will present a logical relationship among outputs, outcomes, and strategic development goals. Extensive stakeholder consultation will be undertaken in defining realistic results, assessing risks, identifying monitorable indicators and reviewing reporting mechanisms. The business plans will be linked to sectoral results framework of the TYIP.

- 3. Development of Results-Based Budgeting System.** With an aim to support MoF's effort to introduce results-based budgeting in public sector organizations to improve service delivery, the TA will support development of results based budgeting system by helping MoF to pilot RBB in some government agencies that are directly engaged in public service delivery. Results based budgeting (RBB) aims to shift the focus of budgeting from internal control and inputs to efficiency and outcomes. Potential agencies indicated by MoF include the Transport Management Office and the Traffic Management Office (of Nepal Police).

The TA will assist the Government to develop criteria to assess the readiness of agencies for the implementation of RBB and also facilitate the selection of the pilot

agencies, either the two mentioned above or other viable ones. The TA, in close collaboration with MoF and pilot agencies, will develop implementation modalities, which will include monitorable performance indicators (for example, service timelines, service quality, complaints mechanism, customer satisfaction, etc.) that are organization-specific. The TA will support the implementation of the two pilots, as well as monitor/evaluate/publicize the results of the pilots.

- 4. Capacity Development on MfDR.** Previous TAs addressed Capacity Development issues by undertaking series of workshops, interactions programs, discussions in working groups and providing training both internal as well as external to the officials of the participating agencies. These activities helped develop results-based mind-set and also imparted knowledge and skills on MfDR to the participants. However, for effective institutionalization of MfDR, it is felt that a long term and sustained support is needed to create a pool of specialists among the government staff with enhanced skill and capability to implement MfDR tools and processes in government agencies.

This TA will, therefore, undertake a comprehensive needs assessment of the level of understanding and competency on MfDR in the pilot agencies and NPC and design capacity development programs. Seminar/workshops/training programs will be implemented to enhance knowledge/awareness of MfDR at the strategic management level at NPC and pilot agencies, and to enhance competency and skills on MfDR tools and techniques at the operational levels (planning divisions and staff engaged in monitoring and reporting).

Awareness programs for senior public officials will also contribute to development of commitment and ownership of MfDR which is critical for its institutionalization. The capacity development programs will remove the widely prevalent misunderstanding as well as lack of conceptual clarity of MfDR among senior managers and operational level. In addition, training of trainers programs will be organized to widely disseminate understanding of MfDR among public sector managers.

9. TA Activities

1. Help Consolidate MfDR Operationalization at NPC, MPPW, MLD and MOES

- 1.1 Help establish MfDR steering committee and upgrade focal points if necessary
- 1.2 Review and revise the results frameworks, business plans and other MfDR initiatives, and assess the institutional and human capacity development need for operationalization of MfDR
- 1.3 Support the ministries to integrate their business plans and results frameworks into the planning, budgeting and monitoring systems covering one budget cycle.
- 1.4 Revise guidelines for MfDR operationalization.
- 1.5 Revise and implement NPC's guidelines for project entry and supervision with more results-focused.

2. Extend Operationalization of MfDR approaches in new ministries

- 2.1 Undertake status of MfDR practices in the new ministries selected, including review of their mandates, vision, mission and goals.
- 2.2 Help the ministries to develop result framework, performance indicators, business plans in line with TYIP and development priorities of the Government.
- 2.3 Support the integration of business plans and results frameworks into the planning, budgeting and monitoring systems covering one budget cycle.

3. Implement results-based budgeting in selected agencies of the government

- 3.1 Help develop criteria to assess the readiness of agencies for RBB and propose modules for piloting RBB in two government agencies, including key performance indicators on delivery of effective and efficient services and linkage between budget and performance.
- 3.2 Provide support and guidance to the implementation of RBB.
- 3.3 Help design and conduct survey to assess the impact of pilots on service delivery improvements and disseminate findings.

4. Build capacity of Staff and Institutions on MfDR

- 4.1 Assess MfDR capacity in the participating agencies, establish baseline on capacity specify capacity development needs of staff and institutions, and develop capacity development framework and plan.
- 4.2 Organize capacity development programs for strategic levels managers (to raise awareness and build commitment), operational level (to build skills and competency), and training of trainers program to develop local in-country capacity.

10. Implementation Arrangement

As in the case with TA 4765, NPC should be the Executing Agency (EA) of the TA. The Chief of the Poverty Monitoring Division of NPC will act as the Project Director and will be responsible for directing project implementation, supervising consultants and reviewing their outputs, coordinating with other TA implementing agencies and donor partners extending support on MfDR, and facilitating the reporting by the consultants to the Steering Committee.

NPC will implement the TA through MPPW, MLD, MoES, MoF and two new participating ministries. The joint secretary of the Planning and Foreign Aid Coordination Division of the pilot ministries/agencies will be appointed as the focal point to facilitate and coordinate the implementation of the TA; in addition, the focal points will organize a MfDR group/committee within the ministry to widen engagement of staff in TA activities. The status of the Project Director and the Focal Point member has been raised to the Joint Secretary level for better coordination, guidance and control of the project activities. The Government will

establish a steering committee chaired by the NPC Vice Chairman. The members will comprise secretaries of ministries that are implementing the TA, representative of MoF, and the Project Director who will also function as the member secretary of the steering committee. The steering committee will provide overall guidance on TA implementation.

The TA will be implemented over a 2 years period. Learning from the previous experience, only one Consulting Firm will be engaged in undertaking the TA activities. Consulting services required for the TA include (i) 20 person-months from an MfDR expert as team leader (intermittent service to be spread over 24 months); and (ii) 30 person-months from two MfDR specialists (18 and 12 person-months intermittent inputs spread over 24 and 18 months respectively). All consultants will have extensive experience in implementing MfDR in public sector organizations.

The TA will support short-term training programs within the region for staff directly engaged in its implementation. The institutions and individual participants will be selected based on relevancy, competency and institutional assessments. The TA will also provide limited equipment to the pilot agencies to directly support the operationalization of MfDR.

11. Design and Monitoring Framework

Design and monitoring framework for the TA as per ADB guidelines are suggested to be as follows:

DESIGN AND MONITORING FRAMEWORK

Design Summary	Performance Targets/Indicators	Data Sources/Reporting Mechanisms	Assumptions and Risks
<p>Impact</p> <p>Improved development, effectiveness and service delivery through adoption of MfDR approaches and processes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poverty reduction and growth indicators and relevant MDGs Better public service delivery Management and accountability for results enhanced 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual progress reports on 3YIP Annual reports of line ministries Household income and expenditure survey Joint Review Reports (donors and GON) ADB evaluation mission 	<p>Assumption</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GoN's commitment to adopt MfDR approaches in public sector management Commitment from leadership of NPC and line ministries to enhance capacity on MfDR and improve performance <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government's commitment on MfDR falters

Design Summary	Performance Targets/Indicators	Data Sources/Reporting Mechanisms	Assumptions and Risks
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political instability negates development agenda • Ineffective resource use, or inability to make use of resources, by line ministries
<p>Outcome</p> <p>MfDR approaches and practices consolidated and operationalized in public sector management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government guidelines and directives on adoption of MfDR approaches • Key line ministries adopt MfDR in planning, budgeting and monitoring functions at national and district levels • Project approval and screening more results based • Improved service delivery in selected public service • Better links between NPC, MoF and line ministries on results orientation in planning and budgeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government circulars and notifications • NPC/MoF's directive on results based planning and budgeting • Approved results frameworks, business plans and indicators • TA Review progress • Steering committee meeting minutes • Survey reports on service delivery 	<p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPC and line ministries remain committed on adoption of MfDR • Line ministries try to absorb and apply the capacity building outcomes • Close guidance and supervision provided by the steering committee • Regular ADB review <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak support from leadership of line ministries • Ineffective resource use, or inability to make use of resources, by line ministries • Slow response to issues arising in the process of implementation of MfDR
<p>Outputs</p>			<p>Assumption</p>

Design Summary	Performance Targets/Indicators	Data Sources/Reporting Mechanisms	Assumptions and Risks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consolidation of results frameworks and business plans in MPPW, MLD and MoES • Revised project entry and supervision system in NPC • Operationalization of MfDR in MoAC and MoWR • Development of results-based budgeting • Government staff trained on MfDR concept, approaches and tools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MoAC and MoWR: business plans, results framework and results indicators developed, approved and implemented by December 2009 • Integration of Business Plans and results frameworks for MLD and MPPW (DoL) into Planning, Budgeting and monitoring system by February 2011. • Results based monitoring and evaluation system established by February 2001 • Revised guidelines for MfDR internationalization by September 2009 • NPC's Results-based criteria for project entry and supervision prepared and implemented by F.Y. 2010 • Status Report on MfDR practices in MoAC and MoWR prepared by June 2009 • Readiness assessment criteria on RBB developed by June 2009 • RBB modules (with key performance indicators) developed and implemented in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports of consultants • ADB and steering committee reviews • Reports/proposals of pilot agencies • Result Frameworks and Business Plans • Workshop and seminar proceeding and feedback • Public opinion surveys on service delivery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPC and line ministries' commitment on changes required for operationalizing MfDR • Active mobilization and participation of counterpart government staff • Adequate resources provided towards priority programs <p>Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited capacity staff to contribute effectively • Frequent transfer of staff • Poor working relationship between the consultants, EA and the pilot agencies

Design Summary	Performance Targets/Indicators	Data Sources/Reporting Mechanisms	Assumptions and Risks
	<p>two public agencies by June 2009</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dissemination of results of RBB pilots by September 2010 • Comprehensive training needs assessment report prepared and Capacity Development Framework prepared by June 2009. • Capacity strengthening programs organized: (i) 2 strategic management level; (ii) 5 programs for operational staff (incl. regional); (iii) 2 training of trainers programs by September 2010 		

References

1. Asian Development Bank. March 2006. Technical Assistance to Nepal for Operationalization of Managing for Development Results. TA 4765-NEP.. Manila.
2. ADB. 2007a. Nepal Country Operations Business Plan: 2008-2010., Manila.
3. ADB. 2007b. Overview of the RETA Pilot Organizations: RETA 6306 Regional Forum on Mainstreaming Managing for Development Results (MfDR), 13-14 November 2007. Bangkok.
4. .ADB. 2007c. Implementation Progress under RETA 6306 in Nepal. Kathmandu.
5. ADB. January, 2007d. Mainstreaming Managing for Development Results in Support of
6. Poverty Reduction in South Asia (RETA 6306): READINESS ASESSMENT DEPARTMENT OF WATER SUPPLY AND SEWERAGE GOVERNMENT OF NEPAL. Manila.
7. ADB. January, 2007e. Mainstreaming Managing for Development Results in Support of
8. Poverty Reduction in South Asia (RETA 6306): READINESS ASESSMENT Ministry of Education and Sports, GOVERNMENT OF NEPAL. Manila.
9. ADB. January, 2007f. Mainstreaming Managing for Development Results in Support of
10. Poverty Reduction in South Asia (RETA 6306): READINESS ASESSMENT Ministry of Physical Planning and Works, GOVERNMENT OF NEPAL. Manila.
11. ADB. 2008a. Project Prioritization Guidelines: Issues and Suggested Modifications. TA 4765 Draft Discussion Paper. Kathmandu.
12. ADB. May, 2008b. Mainstreaming Managing for Development Results in Support of Poverty Reduction in South Asia (RETA 6306): Final Report Volume 1. Manila.
13. ADB. May, 2008c. *Mainstreaming Managing for Development Results in Support of Poverty Reduction in South Asia (RETA 6306): Final Report Volume 2.* Manila.
14. Deependra B. Kshetry. February, 2008. *Implementing MfDR in Nepalese Government Organizations: A paper presented in the Interaction Program on "Disseminating Lessons Learnt in Implementing Managing for Development Results (MfDR) at the Organizational Level" of RETA-6306 and TA-4765.* Kathmandu
15. Pradhan and S. Shrestha. 2007. *Operationalization of Managing for Development Results: Enhancing the Implementation of District Poverty Monitoring and Analysis System (DPMAS) in Nepal: RETA 6306 Regional Forum on Mainstreaming Managing for Development Results (MfDR), 13-14 November 2007.* Bangkok.
16. International Development Center of Japan (IDCJ). March, 2008. *Strengthening the Monitoring and Evaluation system Project: Annual project Progress Report (JFY 2007).* Kathmandu.
17. NPC. 2002. *Tenth Five Year Plan (2007/08-2009/10)* Kathmandu.
18. NPC. 2004. *Poverty Monitoring and Analysis System.* Kathmandu.

19. NPC, June 2006. *An Assessment of Tenth Plan/PRSP: PRSP Review 2004/05*. Kathmandu.
20. NPC, 2007. *Three Year Interim Plan (2007/08-2009/10)*. Kathmandu.
21. Rajendra Suwal. February, 2008. *Overview of TA-4765: Major Achievements and Future Needs*: A paper presented in the Interaction Program on “Disseminating Lessons Learnt in Implementing Managing for Development Results (MfDR) at the Organizational Level” of RETA-6306 and TA-4765. Kathmandu.
22. Steven R. Tabor, February 2008. *Preliminary Assessment of TA Project 4765 – NEP: Operationalization of Management for Development Results*. Kathmandu.
23. Uniconsult International Ltd in association with DEVTEC Nepal (P) Ltd. and MULTI Disciplinary Consultants (P) Ltd. October, 2007d. *Operationalization of Managing for Development Results: Progress Report July 2007-September 2007*, Kathmandu.
24. Uniconsult International Ltd in association with DEVTEC Nepal (P) Ltd. and MULTI Disciplinary Consultants (P) Ltd. July. 2007c. *Operationalization of Managing for Development Results: April 2007 – June 2007a*, Kathmandu;
25. Uniconsult International Ltd in association with DEVTEC Nepal (P) Ltd. and MULTI Disciplinary Consultants (P) Ltd. May, 2007b. *Operationalization of Managing for Development Results: Status Report on MfDR at Ministry of Local Development*, Kathmandu.
26. Uniconsult International Ltd in association with DEVTEC Nepal (P) Ltd. and MULTI Disciplinary Consultants (P) Ltd. April, 2007a. *Operationalization of Managing for Development Results: Status Report on MfDR at MPPW/ROAD SECTOR GOVERNMENT OF NEPAL*, Kathmandu.
27. Uniconsult International Ltd in association with DEVTEC Nepal (P) Ltd. and MULTI Disciplinary Consultants (P) Ltd. July, 2008. *Operationalization of Managing for Development Results: Final Report*. Kathmandu.
28. Ziba Farhadian-Lorie. November, 2007. *A brief summary of background to, and progress made by the RETA 6306: A paper presented in RETA 6306 Regional Forum on Mainstreaming Managing for Development Results (MfDR)*. 13-14 November 2007, Bangkok. Bangkok..

Appendices

Appendix -1: LIST OF PERSONS MET

1. Dr. Jagadish C. Pokharel, Vice-Chairman, National Planning Commission
2. Mr. Deependra Chettri, Member, National Planning Commission
3. Dr. Shankar P. Sharma, Ex-Vice- Chairman, National Planning Commission
4. Mr. Rameshore Khanal, Secretary, Ministry of Finance
5. Mr. Dharanidhar Khatiwada, Acting Secretary, National Planning Commission Secretariat
6. Mr. Ganga Dutta Awasthi, Acting Secretary, Ministry of Local Development
7. Mr. Purna Kadariya, Secretary, Ministry of Physical Planning and Works
8. Mr. Subarna Lal Shrestha, Joint Secretary, National Planning Commission Secretariat
9. Mr. Krishna Gyawali, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance
10. Mr. Bimal Wagle, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance
11. Mr. Dhruva Raj Regmi, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Physical Planning and Works
12. Mr. Kamal Pande, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Physical Planning and Works
13. Mr. Mukunda P. Ghimire, Joint Secretary, Ministry of General Administration
14. Mr. Ganga Ram Gailal, Program Director, National Planning Commission Secretariat
15. Mr. Biju Kumar Shrestha, Program Director, National Planning Commission Secretariat
16. Mr. Teertha Dhakal, Program Director, National Planning Commission Secretariat
17. Mr. Lal Shankar Ghimire, Under Secretary, Ministry of Finance
18. Mr. Lava Deo Awasthi, Under Secretary (Foreign Aid), Ministry of Education and Sports
19. Mr. Kedar Neupane, Under Secretary, Ministry of Local Development
20. Mr. Hari Belbase, Planning Officer National, Planning Commission Secretariat
21. Mr. Krishna Raut, Planning Officer, National Planning Commission Secretariat
22. Mr. Dharma Raj Belbase, Section Officer, ministry of local Development
23. Dr. Champak Pokhrel, Consultant, RETA 6306
24. Mr. Arun Rana, Consultant, RETA 6306
25. Dr. Surya P. Shrestha, Senior Governance and Capacity Building Officer, NRM, ADB
26. Shreejana Rajbhandari, Assistant Program and Operations Analyst, NRM, ADB
27. Yoko Ishida, Team Leader/Project Coordinator, Strengthening the Monitoring and Evaluation System in Nepal Project, JICA
28. Mimi Sheikh, Seminar Lecture/Base-line Survey Analysis Specialist, Strengthening the Monitoring and Evaluation System in Nepal Project, JICA
29. Yoko Komatsubara, Training Planning and Management Specialist, Strengthening the Monitoring and Evaluation System in Nepal Project, JICA