



22 November 2007

Managing for Development Results in ADB: Semi-Annual Progress Report to DEC

Asian Development Bank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MFDR ACTION PLAN	1
III. ANALYSIS OF PROGRESS	6
A. MfDR Capacity in DMCs	7
B. Improved Mainstreaming of MfDR in ADB	8
C. ADB's Internal Capacity to Manage for Outcomes	9
IV. CONCLUSION	11
 APPENDIX	
Results Framework for the Revised Action Plan	12

ABBREVIATIONS

ADB	Asian Development Bank
ADF	Asian Development Fund
AfDB	African Development Bank
BPHR	Human Resources Division
CoP	community of practice
COSO	Central Operations Services Office
CPMS	corporate performance management system
CPRM	country portfolio review mission
CPS	country partnership strategy
CWRD	Central and West Asia Regional Department
DMC	developing member country
DMF	design and monitoring framework
EARD	East Asia Regional Department
ERD	Economics and Research Department
IADB	Inter-American Development Bank
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
MDB	multilateral development bank
MFF	multitranches financing facility
MfDR	managing for development results
MIS	management information system
OED	Operations Evaluation Department
P3M	project processing and portfolio management
Partner Country	developing country under OECD nomenclature, including all of ADB's DMCs
PDMC	Pacific developing member country
PDP	performance and development plan
PPMS	project performance management system
RD	regional department
RM	resident mission
RSDD	regional and sustainable development department
SARD	South Asia Regional Department
SPRU	Results Management Unit
TA	technical assistance
WB	World Bank

I. INTRODUCTION

1. ADB has been implementing techniques to manage for development results (MfDR) since 2004. Based on suggestions of the external assessment commissioned in late 2005¹ and lessons from experience, ADB formulated its Revised MfDR Action Plan for 2006-2008 (the MfDR Action Plan) in August 2006 to further mainstream results-based management in ADB.² The MfDR Action Plan focuses on achievable outcomes for the three pillars of MfDR.

2. This is the second semi-annual progress report for 2007 on MfDR in ADB, based on the Results Framework, which is an integral part of the MfDR Action Plan.³ This report has been prepared based on inputs from departments and offices in the ADB on progress made in their respective areas under the Results Framework, and discussions with MfDR Focal Points and staff who have been involved in MfDR activities.

3. Section II summarizes progress achieved in implementing the MfDR Action Plan. Section III provides an analysis of progress around three key areas to be addressed during the remainder of the MfDR Action Plan: namely (i) How does ADB address MfDR capacity issues in Developing Member Countries (DMCs)? (ii) How can ADB mainstream MfDR better in ADB? and (iii) How can ADB improve its internal MfDR capacity? Section IV offers conclusions.

II. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MfDR ACTION PLAN

4. ADB continues to make progress in implementing MfDR in ADB. Departments and offices are assuming greater ownership in mainstreaming MfDR. The full status report – summarizing progress, issues, and proposed corrective actions, under the Results Framework – is found in the **Appendix**. Some highlights under each pillar of the MfDR agenda are set out below.

5. **Pillar 1: Support DMC Capacity to Manage for Development Results.** All regional departments have been conducting country-level dialogue on MfDR capacities and systems through the country partnership strategy (CPS) preparation process, CPS reviews, country programming, and country portfolio reviews, or in conjunction with implementation of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness⁴ in DMCs. As part of the latter, ADB is working with governments and other development partners in developing harmonized approaches to capacity development for improved results.

6. DMC governments have increasingly adopted results frameworks for their national development strategies or national poverty reduction strategies.⁵ To support these efforts, regional departments and the Regional and Sustainable Development Department (RSDD) have provided 19 ongoing MfDR technical assistance (TA) projects⁶ in 15 DMCs, including TA financed from the MfDR Cooperation Fund, established with contributions from Canada, the Netherlands, and Norway. The Economics and Research Department (ERD) is pursuing its new

¹ Independent Assessment of Managing for Development Results at ADB, Universalia, November 25, 2005

² *Managing for Development Results in ADB: Revised Action Plan* (IN.241.06, 6 September 2006), Appendix 1.

³ The first semi-annual report based on the MfDR Action Plan was discussed at the Development Effectiveness Committee meeting on 23 March 2007.

⁴ Includes Afghanistan, Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Pakistan, Philippines, Tonga, and Viet Nam.

⁵ For example, PRC's 11th 5-year plan 2006-2010 adopts qualitative results indicators to gauge progress toward the "Xiao Kang society", where no person is poor and everyone has at least a modest, comfortable life (i.e., raise per capita income to US\$3,000, urbanization to 50%, and cut rural employment to 30% of the workforce, each by 2020, and 22 social and economic indicators of progress by 2010 toward the long term goal such as cutting pollution by 10% and energy intensity by 20%).

⁶ For the list of TAs, refer to <http://www.adb.org/MfDR/tas-table.asp>

approach to statistical capacity development, focusing on very weak DMCs. Central Operations Services Office (COSO) has been implementing a program to train DMC staff in improved results management and techniques at the project level, forming part of ADB's Project Performance Management System.⁷ So far, over 490 executing agency staff from 22 DMCs and almost 140 facilitators have attended COSO's capacity building programs. In addition, COSO is pilot testing a client-led capacity building approach to results-based organizational development in four countries and 14 organizations.⁸ COSO is currently preparing a survey to assess the outcome of its capacity building approach in DMCs. Findings should be available by the end 2007. Peer-to-peer learning⁹ and learning-by-doing processes built around a specific project or programs are increasingly used as effective ways to develop sustainable capacity. Efforts are also being made to align and utilize ongoing loan/TA portfolios in DMCs for better support of MfDR.

7. The Community of Practice on MfDR (CoP-MfDR),¹⁰ established in March 2006 with ADB sponsorship, has emerged as an important initiative in helping build sustainable MfDR capacity in participating DMCs. The CoP-MfDR now comprises more than 80 active members from 18 DMCs, development partners, private sector, civil society organizations, and over 200 peripheral members. Its virtual learning network has conducted a series of expert-led discussions on practical MfDR issues (see Box 1). Following in the footsteps of the ADB-sponsored CoP-MfDR, and with the help of Asian CoP members, developing countries in Africa and Latin American regions, respectively, are working to create their own CoPs. This may lead to a global virtual learning network in MfDR.

8. **Pillar 2: Enhance ADB's Results Orientation.** Operational tools with a results-based approach have been put in place, building on the achievements and lessons from experience over the past couple of years. The revised CPS guidelines, including adoption of MfDR approaches, were issued in February 2007. All CPSs are results-based. So far, 15 results-based CPSs have been prepared: Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Indonesia, Kyrgyz Republic, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Maldives, Mongolia, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Thailand, Tonga, Uzbekistan, and Viet Nam. CSP completion reports have been prepared in Lao PDR, Maldives,¹¹ Kyrgyz Republic, and the People's Republic of China (PRC) to assess the effectiveness of the previous CPSs and to draw lessons for the next CPSs. In Pacific Developing Member Countries (PDMCs), country operations are being updated through results-based Country Operations Business Plans. Typically, these include updated results frameworks. Regional strategies for the Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS) and Pacific Region are also results-based. With adoption of results-based approach, intended CPS outcomes have been specified, monitoring indicators have been developed, and alignment of loan, grant, and TA interventions with CPS outcomes has been improved.

9. Greater selectivity helps to establish better results focus. Sector selection has become more focused¹². New lending and non-lending products, and new business processes have been and are being introduced. While innovative lending products, such as the multitranche financing facility (MFF), and non-sovereign lending, enhance ADB's relevance and reduce client

⁷ This training program has covered the complete project cycle from project design to implementation, and monitoring and evaluation, including preparation of strengthened design and monitoring frameworks.

⁸ These include organizations in Nepal, Lao PDR, Philippines and Kyrgyz Republic

⁹ Key staff from Planning Commission and Economic Affairs, respectively, (Bangladesh, Nepal and Pakistan) went on a study and exposure visit to Malaysia to study results management implementation processes of the Government of Malaysia (Regional Technical Assistance 6306: Mainstreaming MfDR for Poverty Reduction in South Asia).

¹⁰ For details of CoP, see <http://cop-mfdr.adb.org>

¹¹ OED prepared a validation report for the Maldives CSP completion report.

¹² For example, in 2007 three sectors such as energy, transport and communication, and urban and rural infrastructure accounted for 85% of SARD operations, compared with 72% in 2004.

transaction cost, recent experience indicates that they also support effective project implementation when such operations are processed with due regard to readiness.¹³ The proposed TA reforms are expected to enhance responsiveness and quality of TA operations and ultimately to help to achieve better outcomes of TAs.

Box 1: CoP-MfDR Progress in 2007

The focus of the CoP-MfDR 2007 action plan is to help member countries establish results-based monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems at the national, sector and project levels. This is in line with the MfDR target set in Paris Declaration. Through a series of online discussions, training programs, study tours, newsletters, CoP publications and face-to-face events, the CoP-MfDR has played an active role in enhancing the capacity of its members in this area.

The CoP online discussions have focused on the “Ten-Step Approach in Establishing A Results-Based M&E System”. An expert in this area has been leading the series of online discussions, stimulating the online debate and responding to more than 200 practical questions from CoP members. Major issues discussed include MfDR terminologies, climate, ownership, leadership, capacity, results-based M&E system design, use of the M&E system, and finally, MfDR good practices in Asian context.

As a self-help vehicle, the CoP-MfDR website also initiated online peer reviews and discussions on some actual cases, featuring the design of results-based M&E systems in DMCs. The discussions were typically led by the CoP-MfDR members. Examples include Vietnam’s results-based M&E system design at the national level, PRC’s results-based M&E system for 11th Five Year National Plan, Thailand’s results-based balanced scored approach in public sector, Malaysia’s integrated results-based management approach, Pakistan’s results-based M&E indicators in health sector; CIRDAP¹’s regional sustainable rural development index; and sector readiness assessment reports in Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Nepal and Bangladesh.

Regional academic institutions and other development partners have actively contributed to the CoP-MfDR’s activities. Some noteworthy partnerships include the joint sponsorship of the CoP-MfDR 2006 Annual Meeting by Department for International Development, United Kingdom and the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy at the National University of Singapore; a 3-year training program on establishing results-based M&E system jointly sponsored by the PRC Ministry of Finance, Asian Pacific Finance and Development Center (AFDC), ADB and the World Bank; and a proposed 2-year training program on results-based M&E tools and performance budgeting, to be co-sponsored by the Singapore Ministry of Finance and its Civil Service College.

To make the CoP-MfDR more useful and practical, the CoP-MfDR thrust has been extended to the country level. In April, PRC established its results-based M&E network for central and local government officials in budgeting and auditing. In October, the Philippine CoP for Provincial/Local Planning and Expenditure Management (CoP-PLPEM) was launched with an initial membership base of 90 people from 15 regions. This country-based CoP aims to better manage for results by improving capacity in planning and budgeting, through horizontal and vertical linkages among the central and local government agencies.

¹³ As one example, Loan 2248-IND: Rural Roads Project II (MFF – Periodic Financing Request 1) was approved on 31 July 2006, signed on 29 August 2006 and became effective on 18 October 2006. As of 22 October 2007, setting a new record, all contracts had been awarded and \$81.6 million or 45.5% of the total loan amount of \$180 million disbursed following timely execution of advanced project preparatory actions for this MFF.

10. By adhering to shorter response time for queries or requests for assistance by DMCs, result improvements could be observed. Recently introduced new processes for procurement and consultant recruitment have improved internal efficiency and reduced response time. Similarly, the ongoing review of ADB's safeguard policies may lead to improvements in operations and effective application of those policies. The increasing use of participatory approaches for project design is helping to enhance client ownership, which, in turn, will ensure better results on the ground. Ongoing efforts in aligning with DMC country systems for procurement and financial management¹⁴ support MfDR agenda.

11. All regional departments have been implementing their own quality assurance systems for enhancing quality-at-entry of projects and for improving portfolio performance. Country-specific project readiness filters have increasingly been adopted. Project design and monitoring frameworks (DMFs) are now being scrutinized at department level and also regularly reviewed during implementation. A dedicated unit or staff has been assigned in the front office of each department to review quality of DMFs of all projects, and TA projects. This unit is also usually monitoring and reporting on "results" and portfolio performance for the department, providing early alerts on any likely deviations from plan, program or budget.

12. Results-reporting at project and sector level has been strengthened. Sector results profiles introduced by the South Asia Regional Department (SARD) help to assess sector performance, and a computerized tool¹⁵ enables retrieval and more comprehensive analysis of project, sector and country performance data. To strengthen ADB-wide results-reporting, development of a management information system (MIS) for results reporting, replacing outdated monitoring systems including the project performance report and TA performance report, started during 2007. An initial assessment of ADB business requirements has been completed as part of the project processing and portfolio management (P3M) Project, which is planned to become ADB's new system for project processing and implementation, and would also cover results-reporting at project and sector level.

13. Results-based country portfolio review missions (CPRMs) have been increasingly introduced to assess progress towards 'development results' and more effectively link their findings to country programming processes and next generation of CPSs. Building on the experiences of results-based CPRMs which were conducted in 2006 in Bangladesh, Kyrgyz Republic, and Nepal, similar CPRMs were also carried out for India and Sri Lanka in 2007. These CPRMs have been used to monitor and assess not only portfolio performance but also progress on development results in relation to country and sector results frameworks of the CPS.

14. Since 2006, Operations Vice Presidents have convened "Development Effectiveness" meetings with department heads, including two such meetings in 2006 and one in August 2007, to review progress on the MfDR agenda and enhance departmental results orientation efforts. ADB will follow up on the Colloquium on MfDR with Vice Presidents in October 2006, and, in particular, MfDR programs for senior staff are being developed based on learning and development experience.

15. Sustaining ADB's internal capacity, by way of learning and development of results based management, is a key mainstreaming effort. The Human Resources Division (BPHR), together with the Results Management Unit (SPRU), has developed an MfDR curriculum, covering MfDR

¹⁴ Harmonization efforts with procurement and financial management system are taking place in several DMC, such as Bangladesh, Nepal and Sri Lanka.

¹⁵ OIST provides COGNOS.

needs of ADB staff at all levels. So far, 11 MfDR learning programs, including three at director-level and above, have been developed. In 2006 and the first half of 2007, more than 20 separate learning sessions were conducted for over 400 participants. In addition, sessions on MfDR were also included in the induction programs for new staff, orientation programs for new directors and country directors, and in orientation programs for DMC officials. In May 2007, BPHR, in collaboration with SPRU, conducted specific training for the Pacific Department (PARD) staff on results-based CPS approaches. COSO conducted training programs on the preparation of DMFs, problem trees and indicators with a total of more than 600 participants (including staff of the Private Sector Operations Department and sector directors). The MfDR curriculum will be further developed over time, building on experience and feedback from participants. Discussions at MfDR workshops indicate that staff incentives including recognition are still a major issue to be addressed for further mainstreaming MfDR.

16. The results of the Performance and Development Plan (PDP) survey affirmed that staff value the importance of performance management and recognize PDP as a useful tool for distinguishing performance. Staff also identified the practice of giving feedback as an area for improvement. Based on consultations with senior staff and feedback received from staff after the 2006 PDP, implementation related issues were identified and addressed and further refinements were made to improve the 2007 PDP.

17. ADB's results orientation was further enhanced through institutional reporting, including reports related to the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS), the Reform Agenda, and the Work Program and Budget Framework that entail results frameworks and use of indicators. At the organizational level, there is a continuing need to better link results analysis with decision making. Accordingly, preparatory work for developing an improved system at the corporate level to address performance ADB-wide was initiated in 2007.

18. ADB also initiated the preparation of an important new innovation, namely Development Effectiveness Country Briefs (Brief) in August 2007. A sample of these briefs was presented to donors at the first ADF X replenishment meeting in Sydney in September 2007. The purpose of the Brief is to provide an overview of ADB's operational effectiveness in each DMC in terms of key contributions to development outcomes and aid effectiveness. The Brief will continue to be improved and strengthened with better examples of country outcomes and analysis of ADB's contributions.

19. OED is presently conducting an evaluation study of MfDR in ADB and may follow this up with a further review in 2009. It is expected that OED findings for the first phase will be available by end 2007.

20. **Pillar 3: Maintain Effective Results Partnerships.** ADB is an active member of the emerging global partnership for encouraging the adoption of MfDR. The MDBs' Common Performance Assessment System (COMPAS), which was initiated by ADB in 2005, has been acknowledged as an important contribution to the assessment of MDB readiness for MfDR. The Inter-American Bank (IADB) coordinated preparation of the 2006 version (see Box 2). ADB also co-sponsored the Third International Roundtable on MfDR, convened in Hanoi in February 2007. ADB has contributed to knowledge sharing through contributions to the MfDR Sourcebook on Emerging Good Practices and collaborated on MfDR learning programs with other MDBs, including the World Bank. The language barrier is considered as one of the main constraints for DMCs in absorbing knowledge and exchange experience with other countries. Therefore, ADB is helping to translate the MfDR Sourcebook into local languages for wider dissemination.

Box 2: Summary of Main Findings in 2006 COMPAS

DMC's demand for strengthening country capacity to MfDR is increasing. MDBs are keen to respond to this growing demand and support the strengthening of capacity through a variety of means. MDBs have taken various approaches and steps to assess existing country capacity to identify capacity gaps to be addressed. The assessments are conducted as an integral part of the process of country strategy formulation (ADB, African Development Bank [AfDB]), or during the design of public sector management projects (WB), or under specific initiatives (IADB).

Results orientation is adopted in the country strategy process, but quality should be improved. MDBs monitor compliance with results features, either through country strategy quality-at-entry reviews carried out by Management (ADB), or via country strategy evaluations carried out by independent evaluation office (ADB, AfDB, IADB, WB). MDBs also take steps to ensure that results are achieved from the implementation of country strategies through country strategy completion reports (ADB, AfDB, WB) or independent evaluation (ADB, AfDB, IADB, WB). However, greater improvement in the quality of country strategies is needed.

Project performance and monitoring could be improved. All MDBs conduct periodic reviews of project quality-at-entry. Independent evaluation offices periodically review the quality of project design and monitoring framework (ADB and AfDB), and project evaluability (IADB). All MDBs have procedures for reporting on the results of their operations after completion and also for conducting independent ex-post evaluation. Significant room for improvement exists in project implementation, monitoring, and supervision.

Institutional Learning from Operational Experience is not systematic. Various formal devices are in place to identify lessons and disseminate MfDR lessons to Partner Countries. Recommendations arising from independent evaluations do seem to influence the way MDBs conduct their business. Some MDBs have a formal mechanism to keep track of, and measure Management's actual adoption of independent evaluation recommendation (ADB, and WB). However, the actual degree of lesson utilization remains unclear and needs to be improved.

Source: Common Performance Assessment System (COMPAS)

21. ADB has also developed results-based partnerships with the international donor community at regional and country level. In some DMCs, such as Bangladesh and Kyrgyz Republic, ADB has prepared joint results-based CPSs together with major development partners. In several DMCs, joint annual portfolio reviews are conducted. Analytical work and studies on results-based management are also frequently conducted jointly or in collaboration with other development partners. ADB has also been prominent in working with some DMCs, and the local donor community, to adopt a "localized" version of, or an action plan for, the Paris Declaration.¹⁶

III. ANALYSIS OF PROGRESS

22. The implementation of the MfDR Action Plan has been generally sound to date¹⁷, as summarized in the Appendix. Many operational tools and procedures for MfDR are now in place, streamlined business process and new products have been introduced, dialogue on results management with DMCs is being strengthened, staff knowledge on MfDR continues to be

¹⁶ Bangladesh, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Philippines, and Viet Nam

¹⁷ This preliminary self-assessment could be further examined through ongoing OED evaluation on MfDR, which will be available by late 2007.

enhanced, regional departments are embracing MfDR and pursuing related initiatives in a more systematic manner, and all ADB operations including CPSs, loans, grants, and TAs have specified their intended outcomes and provided monitoring frameworks. However, ADB still faces a number of challenges in mainstreaming MfDR. This section addresses seven emerging issues, organized around three key areas under the MfDR Action Plan, and which will be addressed over the balance of current three-year time frame (namely, through to the end of 2008).

A. MfDR Capacity in DMCs

23. MfDR requires that ADB's operational strategies and business plans are aligned with DMCs' strategies and those indicators, and, to the extent possible, data sources are drawn from governments' monitoring systems. Thus, DMC capacity to plan, manage, implement, monitor, and evaluate strategies, policies, and programs for outcomes is critical in helping achieve intended development objectives. While DMCs are responsible in developing capacities needed to implement MfDR, ADB has been actively supporting the capacity development process. Two issues have emerged from this experience: (i) importance of capacity development at the sector level, and (ii) the urgent need to strengthen statistical capacity.

24. *Importance of Capacity Development at the Sector Level.* While there has been progress toward developing results-based national development plans or national poverty reduction strategies, implementation is constrained by significant capacity gaps at the line ministry and agency level. Sector strategies are often not clear enough to effectively contribute to achievement of national development goals. Goals and targets are usually too broad and the information flow system is weak. Sector agencies are responsible for outputs of discrete projects or programs, but often do not have clear organizational results and do not sufficiently pay attention to outcomes at and beyond the sector level. Systematic collection of sector performance data is generally weak and often lacking. COSO's pilot tests of a capacity development approach to results-based organizational development have identified the lack of incentives for staff and management of the line agencies as a major constraint to mainstreaming of MfDR.

25. Regional departments have started to support results-based management at the sector level to address the results management gap between the national level and project level. A sector readiness assessment tool has been piloted in DMCs under the SARD as well as in Philippines. ADB's experience suggests that it is important to conduct a readiness assessment for sector agencies and assess the existing MfDR capacity of sector and oversight agencies, as this will allow for the development of customized capacity development measures and well-targeted technical assistance. MfDR capacity development must be mainstreamed into key activities and responsibilities of sector agencies, and integrated into lending and non-lending operations. Sustainable capacity development also requires significant financial resources. Regional departments should accord high priority to MfDR capacity development at the sector level.¹⁸ Necessary measures, including replenishment of the MfDR Cooperation Fund, will be needed to address this concern.

26. *Urgency of Statistical Capacity Development.* MfDR is not solely related to measuring and monitoring. However, an effective results management system needs strong statistical capacity. ADB and other developing partners have been facing difficulties in accessing necessary information and data for planning, design, monitoring, and evaluation in many DMCs. During the

¹⁸ ADB. 2007. *Integrating Capacity Development into Country Programs and Operations. Medium-Term Framework and Action Plan.* 19 January.

Third MfDR Roundtable in Hanoi in February 2007, development partners discussed the urgent need for coordinated investment in statistics at the DMC level and agreed to significantly scale up resources to support statistical capacity development.¹⁹

27. ERD has been implementing a strategic approach to statistical capacity building focusing on statistically very weak DMCs, which was approved by the President in 2006. ERD's has identified 11 DMCs as statistically very weak. Presently, it has selected four of these DMCs for statistical capacity building assistance and more DMCs may be considered for such assistance at a later stage. For other DMCs, regional departments have been selectively supporting statistical capacity development (see Box 3). However, due to resource constraints and competing demands, regional departments have not been able to adequately address the needs of statistical capacity development. ADB, together with other development partners, will find constructive ways to deal with this emerging issue and actively participate in joint efforts in developing statistical capacity in DMCs.

Box 3: Statistical Capacity Development in the Pacific

Support for the improved collection of statistics and their use in national planning processes has been a focus of ADB operations in the Pacific. Since 2001, ADB has supported capacity building and regional cooperation in the area of economic statistics in selected PDMCs. This has also included support for the statistics unit of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, which has been primarily directed towards strengthening national statistics offices within PDMCs.

Collection of statistics in the Pacific however remains supply rather than demand driven; and use of statistics in national planning processes remains limited. Significant gaps in the information available remain. A new regional technical assistance commencing in 2007 will support PDMCs in better utilizing economic statistical information to inform economic and social planning. This includes the development of national statistics plans and improving linkages with policy processes. In September 2007, ADB supported a workshop for the national heads of planning and statistics in PDMCs, which discussed future directions for evidence based decision making in the Pacific. With ADB support, a Pacific benchmarking study will be undertaken which aims to assess current country capabilities and needs for assistance.

These efforts will be supplemented at the country level by ongoing assistance in a number of countries for national planning processes (Palau, Samoa, Federated States of Micronesia, Palau and Samoa).

B. Improved Mainstreaming of MfDR in ADB

28. ADB has started to mainstream MfDR in its operations by building on experience. Regional departments and private sector operations department are increasingly taking a leading role in the mainstreaming process. They have introduced various initiatives to apply MfDR in their business practices depending on specific circumstances (see Box 4). However, prioritization and progress on implementation of MfDR is uneven across regional departments. This raises two important issues: (i) Do we need standardized approach across regional departments to manage better for outcomes? and (ii) How should we improve ADB-wide results reporting and management?

¹⁹ Ed. Ashbourne, Cooper. 2007. *Summary of Proceedings for the Third International Roundtable on Managing for Development Results*. Vietnam. February.

29. **The Need for a Standardized Approach:** In line with the original action plan, ADB adopted a “learning-by-doing” approach in implementing MfDR. This flexible approach has encouraged staff to innovate, has promoted different ways of thinking and nurtured creativity in MfDR approaches. This has fostered ownership, an important ingredient of MfDR mainstreaming. However, it has also created the perception that ADB’s approach to MfDR is ad hoc and that Management guidance is not clear enough to translate MfDR into all operations, notwithstanding ADB-wide adoption of results-based CPS and Design and Monitoring Frameworks. There is also an increasing demand that the approach to MfDR should be consolidated and integrated in order to strengthen ADB-wide consistency and facilitate ADB-wide reporting and management. While there is always a need to examine the progress and lessons from various initiatives introduced by individual regional departments, ADB is now at the point where a further standardized approach across departments must be considered²⁰. As one step in this process, a stocktaking of the results-based country portfolio reviews will be conducted by SPRU in consultation with regional departments and COSO to draw lessons from experience and develop practical recommendations on how, ADB-wide, results should be measured, interpreted, and adopted in country portfolio reviews for effective monitoring and reporting on the progress towards CPS, sector and project outcomes.

30. **Corporate-level Systems.** The MfDR Action Plan includes development of a Corporate Performance Management Systems (CPMS). SPRU has carried out initial preparatory work and conducted consultation with departments and offices concerned. SPRU is closely coordinating with OIST in relation to the latter’s work in improving MIS under the P3M project.

C. ADB’s Internal Capacity to Manage for Outcomes

31. Mainstreaming MfDR involves change management, including changes in approaches, attitudes, practices, institutional culture, management, use of knowledge, and incentive systems. Since change management requires continuous learning, the MfDR Action Plan emphasized ADB’s internal capacity for MfDR as a core activity. An MfDR learning and development curriculum has been developed. Three issues have emerged from progress to date, namely: (i) limited application of acquired learning, (ii) importance of engagement with senior staff, and (iii) need for systematic quality assessment of CPS.

²⁰ To facilitate this process, SPRU’s role may need to be further clarified.

The Pacific Department (PARD) has established a four-member MfDR task team as a departmental focus group for MfDR initiatives, used conceptual design meetings at the Director General level to help promote results focus and improve quality at entry, and revised its internal business processes memo on CPS development, including compact design peer review in compliance with results-based CPS requirements. PARD has developed performance management tools in support of a MIS to track ongoing operations and budget. PARD is also piloting an MfDR activity monitoring and reporting system for the Private Sector Operations Development Initiative and for Papua New Guinea.

The South East Asia Department (SERD) has employed results-based techniques in regional cooperation strategies and programs for GMS, archipelagic Southeast Asia (aSEA), Brunei Darussalam-Indonesia-Malaysia-Philippines East Asian Growth Area (BIMP-EAGA), and Indonesia-Malaysia-Thailand Growth Triangle (IMT-GT) programs. It has institutionalized a system for reviewing the quality of projects (including DMFs) at the front office, has issued a department administrative order to provide guidelines for review and monitoring of project documents; has paid greater focus on projects at risks and problem project, and has used department-wide readiness criteria for resource allocation and TA prioritization. RMs and sector divisions have adopted their own peer review mechanisms to ensure quality-at-entry at the project level throughout programming, project processing and implementation.

The East Asia Department (EARD) has updated its Project Performance Management System (PPMS) Action Plan as PPMS and Portfolio Management Action Plan in March 2007 to include portfolio management and results-based CPRMs; adopted a quality-at-entry mechanism for development of its knowledge management work; conducted systemic DMF review for all loans and TA projects by the PPMS Focal Point; and completed training on DMF of most EARD professional staff and DMF facilitators for the PRC and Mongolia resident missions.

The Central and West Asia Department (CWRD) has introduced CPS quality assurance mechanisms. MfDR has become a main focus of CWRD operations in 2007, giving a strong commitment to the Results Framework and orienting its planning, implementation, and reporting processes around results. CWRD designated PPMS and DMF focal points; established internal review process in preparing DMFs for loan and TA projects based on an internal survey on DMF conducted in June 2007; conducted implementation and supervision focusing on early warning and spring cleaning; and developed division/resident mission (RM) action plans to address projects at risks. CWRD also pursued headquarters-RM joint venture that builds on the synergy of sector expertise and local knowledge for effective loan supervision.

The South Asia Department (SARD) has strengthened project and sector level results monitoring and reporting, utilizing sector results profiles for priority sectors in its operations in DMCs. This is complemented by monthly and quarterly results reporting on key portfolio management indicators with support of an automated MIS and computerized tool. A form of "early warning system" provides alerts for projects deviating from plan, schedule or budget. Project design and results focus are strengthened by (i) doing more upfront design and project preparatory work, (ii) improving quality of DMFs, (iii) using project readiness filters, and (iv) using a quality assurance review mechanism. Results-based CPRMs have been conducted in Bangladesh and Nepal since 2006, and were also carried out in India and Sri Lanka during 2007. These efforts helped to assess the progress on development results based on country and sector results frameworks.

The Private Sector Operations Department (PSOD) has adopted the Design and Monitoring Framework for all operations to facilitate evaluation in accordance with the Good Practice Standards developed by the Evaluation Cooperation Group. In addition to usual indicators for measuring development effectiveness, it emphasizes social development and minimizing environmental impacts through its projects. PSOD's performance information on nonsovereign operations will be included in the 2007 COMPAS. PSOD, together with EARD, will implement an advisory TA for Mongolia: Mainstreaming MfDR in Investment Planning and Public Funds Management.

32. Limited Application of Acquired Learning. According to initial assessments, training has helped to enhance staff knowledge on the concepts and basic techniques of MfDR. Training activities have also helped improve DMF quality to some extent. However, much more emphasis is required in relation to applied learning and the use of good quality results frameworks as a management tool. For example, this requires a shift away from seeing the DMF as simply a new mandatory requirement, to appreciating it a results-focused design and management tool. Training should be tailored to staff experience levels and specific needs. In parallel with training, regional departments established focal points at the front office to review all DMFs for all loans. This approach has proven to be effective to enhance awareness of MfDR and ensure the quality of DMF. Adequate learning programs for, or appropriate knowledge sharing among MfDR Focal Points should be arranged to support the quality assurance mechanisms at the department level.

33. Engagement with Senior Staff. Commitment and leadership by regional/department management are key variables in mainstreaming MfDR at the department level. Their clear guidance, backed by resources, recognition, and incentives, will stimulate staff to practice MfDR techniques in actual work and accelerate changes of results culture. An MfDR colloquium with Vice Presidents in 2006 provided a good opportunity to interact with external experts in results management. Building on this experience, a follow-up colloquium with senior staff should be continued to further enhance senior staff's capacity to manage for outcomes. All senior staff should be familiar with and regularly updated on, MfDR. SPRU and BPHR are now addressing this as part of the MfDR Learning and Development Curriculum.

34. Systematic Quality Assessment of CPS. ADB needs to improve the quality of sector roadmaps and CPS results frameworks. Annual assessment of the quality of DMFs by OED was introduced with the new PPMS and has become a reliable system to draw conclusions on whether the quality of DMFs has been improving. Unlike the DMFs, there is no annual assessment of the quality of CPS results features²¹ (e.g., no random sampling to enable an independent assessment of the quality of the results features, including the quality of the CPS results frameworks). Although the first biennial quality-at-entry assessment for all CPSs approved during 2004-2005 was conducted in 2005, and SPRU's own stock-taking assessment was undertaken, these have not been able to provide real time feedback on the quality of CPS results frameworks. Building on experiences, appropriate ways to establish ADB-wide annual assessment of the quality of CPS results features could be considered. One option would be a similar approach to DMFs (i.e, annual OED evaluation).

IV. CONCLUSION

35. Progress on the MfDR Action Plan is encouraging. However, in order to sustain momentum, ADB will need to specifically address the seven issues discussed above for the remaining period of the MfDR Action Plan. Management is committed to maintain this momentum, and to achieve the objectives of the MfDR Action Plan.

²¹ OED's Country Assistance Program Evaluations are usually conducted in conjunction with the initiating process of the next CPS.

Results Framework for the Revised Action Plan (2006-2008)

PILLAR 1: SUPPORT DMC CAPACITY TO MANAGE FOR DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

Intended Outcome: 1.1 Increased Understanding and use of results management in DMCs

Performance Indicators	Responsibility	Progress	Constraints and Issues	Proposed Initiatives to Address Constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of DMCs receiving ADB technical assistance to strengthen MfDR capacities and systems <p><u>Baseline 2005</u>: 6 DMCs (PRC, MLD, VIE, LAO, PHI, PAK)</p> <p><u>2008 target</u>: 15 DMCs</p>	RDs, ERD, RSDD, COSO with support of SPRU	<p>Country-level dialogue on MfDR is being conducted as part of country strategy and programming.</p> <p>MfDR related TA projects are being implemented in <u>15 DMCs</u> (Afghanistan, Bangladesh, People's Republic of China, Kyrgyz Republic, Lao PDR, Marshall Island, Mongolia, Nepal, Pakistan, Palau, Philippines, Samoa, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, and Viet Nam), Pacific region and Greater Mekong Subregion.</p> <p>Statistical TAs are being implemented in <u>11 DMCs</u>, including Pacific DMCs</p>	<p>Lack of attention to Capacity Development concepts and issues by DMC</p> <p>Limited resources for MfDR TA in RDs</p> <p>Lack of DMC demand for and weak commitment to MfDR</p> <p>Lack of clarity of results</p>	<p>More systematic attention given to capacity development concepts and issues, including increased dialogue on capacity, performance and change at country and sector level.</p> <p>Additional resources and staff as required.</p> <p>Replenishment of MfDR Cooperation Fund</p> <p>Focus on raising demand for MfDR, including engaging with groups beyond governments</p> <p>Prepare a series of "what works" messages in economic governance for public circulation (ongoing).</p> <p>Explore possible incentive structures for MfDR, including collaborative efforts with other donors</p> <p>Disseminate experience gained under TA projects</p> <p>Support results-based national planning processes</p>

		<p>PPMS capacity building program is being implemented in <u>22 DMCs</u>, concentrating on results-focused project design and management.</p>	<p>Weak sub-national level capacity</p> <p>Frequent changes in roles of agencies</p> <p>Statistical/data/analysis capabilities and information flow need to be strengthened.</p> <p>Overall government statistical / data / analysis capabilities need to be further strengthened.</p> <p>The trained local capacity remains untapped by RDs.</p>	<p>Conduct results workshops with selected agencies, high-level meetings with senior officials, and support from local consultants</p> <p>Conduct readiness assessments for sector agencies and customized training programs</p> <p>Systematically integrate MfDR capacity development into ADB's lending and non-lending activities in addition to MfDR TAs.</p> <p>Improve government systems for monitoring and evaluation (M&E), and include civil society participation in MfDR</p> <p>Provide information of qualified facilitators. (Database is in progress and will be launched in November). Encourage RDs to engage facilitators during project planning and provide guidance on the engagement of local facilitators.</p> <p>Build a core trainer team across RDs and RMs who can conduct DMF and PPMS workshops</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of results management practitioners actively participating in the Community of Practice on MfDR <p><i>Baseline 2006: 25</i></p>	SPRU	CoP-MfDR now comprises more than <u>80 active members</u> from 18 DMCs, development partners, private sector, and civil society organizations.	<p>Staff constraints limit outreach and timely response to training requests.</p> <p>Low access to information;</p>	<p>Build a core trainer team across RDs who can conduct DMF and PPMS workshops competently</p> <p>Provide IT/MIS support</p>

2008 target: 50 (double)			<p>weak information technology (IT) capacity</p> <p>Language barrier is one of major constraints for peer to peer learning.</p>	<p>Translate good practices into local language for wide dissemination</p>
--------------------------	--	--	---	--

CoP = community of practice, COSO = central operations services office, DMC = developing member country, DMF = design and monitoring framework, ERD = economics and research department, IT = information technology, M&E = monitoring and evaluation, MfDR = managing for development results, MIS = management information system, PPMS = project performance management system, RD = regional department, RSDD = regional and sustainable development department, SPRU = results management unit, TA = technical assistance

PILLAR 2: ENHANCE ADB'S RESULTS ORIENTATION

Intended Outcome: 2.1. Improved quality of RB-CPSs

Performance Indicators	Responsibility	Progress	Constraints and Issues	Proposed Initiatives to Address Contraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of DMCs with RB-CPS <p>Baseline 2005: 5 DMCs (Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Philippines and Uzbekistan)</p> <p>2008 Target: All DMCs for which CPSs are programmed</p>	RDs with support of SPD and RSDD	<p>CPS enhanced business process and CPS guidelines approved in August 2006, and February 2007, respectively.</p> <p>All CPSs are now results-based.</p> <p>So far, <u>15 RB-CPSs</u> have been prepared (Bagladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Indonesia, Kyrgyz Republic, Lao PDR, Nepal, Maldives, Mongolia, Philippines, Paoua New Guinea, Thailand, Tonga, Uzbekistan, and Viet Nam)</p> <p>In Pacific DMCs, country operation are being updated through results-based COBPs.</p> <p>Subregional strategy and programs are also anchored on results orientation.</p> <p><u>CPS completion reports</u> were prepared in connection with the next CPS preparation for 4 DMCs (PRC, Kyrgyz Republic, Lao PDR, and Maldives) in 2007.</p> <p><u>Results-oriented CPRMs,</u></p>	<p>Lack of clarity of results in national/sector strategies of governments</p> <p>CPS process is resource intensive.</p> <p>Joint preparation with other development partners is a challenge.</p> <p>Significant time needed for coordination with JCSS partners.</p> <p>Clear guidance on CPS completion reports is required</p> <p>Lack of experience and expertise of executing</p>	<p>Continue to arrange workshops on results-focused sector planning for key DMC officials and RM staff</p> <p>Further review and streamline CPS processes</p> <p>Hold discussions with development partners and Government to ensure that overlaps are avoided and synergy developed in the CPS process for maximizing aid effectiveness and focus on results (ongoing).</p> <p>Coordinate closely on division of labor among development partners on key issues</p> <p>Disseminate CPS guidelines and good practices</p>

Performance Indicators	Responsibility	Progress	Constraints and Issues	Proposed Initiatives to Address Constraints
		<p>linking to progress on sector and country level results, were conducted in 5 DMCs (Bangladesh, India, Kyrgyz Republic, and Nepal and Sri Lanka) in 2007.</p> <p>Sector Results Profiles have been developed and are being utilized in SARD operations.</p> <p>RDs have strengthened quality review mechanism at the front offices or through peer review process.</p>	<p>agencies and country offices of partner international financial institutions in RB methodologies</p> <p>Lack of consistent MfDR approach across RDs. Clear guidance on monitoring CPS results are necessary</p> <p>Lack of ADB-wide systematic quality assessment of CPS results feature</p>	<p>Disseminate CPS guidelines and provide incentive and guidance by Regional Management</p>

CPRM = country programming review mission, DMC = developing member country , JCSS = joint country support strategy, RB-CPS = results-based country partnership strategy, RD = regional department, RM = resident mission, RSDD = regional and sustainable development department, SARD = South Asia regional department, SPD = strategy and policy department

PILLAR 2: ENHANCE ADB'S RESULTS ORIENTATION

Intended Outcome: 2.2 Improved results-focus of ADB projects

Performance Indicators	Responsibility	Progress	Constraints and Issues	Proposed Initiatives to Address Constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of project Design and Monitoring Frameworks (DMFs) summary outcome statement rated satisfactory or better by OED <p>Baseline 2005 (for 2004 projects and TA projects): 71% for projects, 35% for advisory TA (ADTA) projects.</p> <p>2008 Targets (for 2007 projects and TAs): 85% for projects, 75% for ADTAs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of public sector loan projects "at risk" <p><i>Baseline 2005:</i> 18% for program loans, 14% for project loans <i>2008 target:</i> 11% for program loans, 8% for project loans</p>	<p>RDs, PSOD, and COSO, with guidance from Management</p>	<p>2006 (for 2005 project and TA DMF): 83% for projects, 64% for TAs are satisfactory or better.</p> <p>As of July 2007, project "at risk": 10.4% for program loans, 13% for project loans</p> <p>RDs have institutionalized their own internal project (DMF) quality assurance mechanisms.</p> <p>Greater focus is given to projects at risks and problem projects.</p>	<p>Selecting and quantifying indicators and targets, especially for policy loans; difficult to carry out the analyses (problem tree analysis); collecting data since field data can be unreliable and conducting extensive survey is costly; working with DMCs with very little capacity in DMF preparation.</p> <p>Incentives may favor generating new loans over preparing new knowledge products</p> <p>Difficulty in obtaining consistent data for monitoring progress and achievements against sector indicators.</p> <p>Existing MIS does not adequately facilitate MfDR approaches, particularly activity management and monitoring. Systems primarily inputs oriented</p>	<p>Conduct customized learning programs for PPMS focal points and OED staff addressing quality aspects of the DMF and the process tools</p> <p>Set up a database EA staff who participated in PPMS training (490) to facilitate linkage with ADB staff (launch scheduled for December 2007)</p> <p>Continue close collaboration among members of the RD PAU Network.</p> <p>Assist in establishing regular reporting mechanisms for monitoring against key indicators from national poverty reduction strategy targets, on which CSP results-framework and sector results profiles are based.</p> <p>Carry out the project processing and portfolio management (P3M) process (ongoing)</p>

		<p>Greater delegation to RMs and redeployment of staff to RMs.</p>	<p>Staff skills constraint, particularly experienced staff for reviewing DMF and coaching staff.</p> <p>Knowledge, skills, interest and availability of PPMS focal points, who are responsible for the final quality control of DMFs particularly prior to interdepartmental circulation, varies greatly.</p> <p>OED provides comments on the DMF with the intention to improve quality. However, the quality and consistency of comments provided by OED on the DMF needs to be improved.</p> <p>Skills mismatch and flexibility in deploying staff.</p>	<p>Provide PPMS focal points with skills to facilitate DMF planning session with stakeholders. For this purpose, a training of facilitators needs to be conducted.</p> <p>Repeat and intensify capacity upgrade of OED to assess and provide consistent comments on DMFs.</p> <p>Continue review of skills mix, redeployment, and portfolio delegation and flexibility in resource use.</p> <p>Enhance project supervision and permit greater responsiveness to problems encountered on the ground by proximity to the client</p>
--	--	--	---	---

ADTA = advisory technical assistance, COSO = central operations services office, DMC = developing member country, DMF = design and monitoring framework, MfDR = managing for development results, OED = operations evaluation department, P3M = project processing and portfolio management, PAU = project administration unit, PPMS = project performance management system, PSOD = private sector operations department, RD = regional department

PILLAR 2: ENHANCE ADB'S RESULTS ORIENTATION

Intended Outcome: 2.3 Institutionalized results reporting in ADB corporate management systems

Performance Indicators	Responsibility	Progress	Constraints and Issues	Proposed Initiatives to Address Constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of progress reports on MfDR submitted to and accepted by the Management Committee <p><i>Baseline 2005: 1</i> <i>2006-2008 target: regular semi-annual reports</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of meetings on development effectiveness chaired by vice presidents to discuss ADB's results agenda and development effectiveness issues <p><i>2006-2008 target: semiannual meetings</i></p>	<p>SPD, BPMSD, MD, RSDD, RDs</p> <p>SPD with selected departments</p>	<p>2 Semi-annual reports on MfDR prepared (in March and November 2007 [current report], respectively).</p> <p>Since 2006, Operations Vice Presidents have convened "Development Effectiveness" meetings with department heads, including two such meetings in 2006 and one in August 2007, to review progress on the MfDR agenda and enhance departmental results orientation efforts</p> <p>A report on Effectiveness of ADF operations were prepared and discussed at the first ADF X negotiation meeting in September in Sydney. This report has evolved from the Annual Poverty Reduction Reports. As a new feature, it also includes country results briefs.</p> <p>Feasibility assessments, initial consultations and</p>	<p>Development Effectiveness Report will be further developed based on feedback from donors. There is also a need to strengthen some indicators and monitoring of findings/recommendation</p> <p>Building on Development Effectiveness Country Briefs, internal development effectiveness reporting system should be further developed, utilizing IT more effectively including web-based reporting system.</p> <p>No follow up on Development Effectiveness Meetings (reinforces the lack of value of these meetings)</p> <p>ADB requires a strategy or timeframe for addressing how/when ADB corporate</p>	<p>Further improve and expand the country development effectiveness briefs. Provide better illustrations of country outcomes on thematic areas, to be highlighted in the theme sections of future reports.</p> <p>Continue efforts to further improve the quality and data of the indicators used in the report (i.e., better indicators on capacity development and knowledge management are necessary, some HR and financial indicators may also need to be reviewed) and also adjust the targets to keep them in line with institutional goals.</p> <p>Ensure that RSDD and SPD conclusions are reviewed at Management level and followed up regularly with concerned departments.</p> <p>Development Effectiveness Meetings need to be reviewed by VP (O1) VP (O2)</p> <p>CPMS needs to be advanced</p>

		<p>preparations for development a corporate-wide management information system were conducted in 2007.</p> <p>Based on consultations with senior staff and feedback received from staff after the 2006 PDP, implementation related issues were identified and addressed and further refinements were made to improve the 2007 PDP.</p> <p>OED is currently conducting the first phase of evaluation studies on MfDR in ADB in 2007.</p>	<p>management systems will be improved to support MfDR.</p> <p>The results of the PDP survey affirmed that staff value the importance of performance management and recognize PDP as a useful tool for distinguishing performance. Staff also identified the practice of giving feedback as an area for improvement</p>	<p>Take into account OED's recommendations</p>
--	--	---	---	--

ADB = Asian Development Bank, ADF = Asian Development Fund, BPMSD = budget, personnel and management systems department, IT = information technology, MD = managing director, MfDR = managing for development results, OED = operations evaluation department, PDP = performance and development plan, RD = regional department, RSDD = regional and sustainable development department, SPD = strategy and policy department

PILLAR 2: ENHANCE ADB'S RESULTS ORIENTATION

Intended Outcome: 2.4. Increased staff knowledge in MfDR

Performance Indicators	Responsibility	Progress	Constraints and Issues	Proposed Initiatives to Address Constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved quality of results-orientation of CPSs (according to OED MfDR evaluation) • Improved results orientation of DMF (according to OED evaluation) 	<p>RDs, with assistance of BPHR, SPRU, and COSO</p>	<p>BPHR has developed comprehensive MfDR learning and development program, in coordination with SPRU.</p> <p>11 learning programs have been developed. In 2006, 12 sessions were conducted for 245 participants. In January-June 2007, 10 sessions were conducted for 169 participants. 3 of these 11 programs are for director-level and above. A CPS workshop tailored for PARD staff was held in May 2007.</p> <p>COSO conducted training programs on the preparation of DMFs, DMFs for policy-based lending, indicators and performance targets with a total of 601 participants.</p> <p>RD in-house briefing or seminars on results management were arranged.</p>	<p>The DMF training was mandatory for some staff in which resulted in a higher attendance rates. While staff appreciates the DMF as a design tool, they do not use it much for project implementation. The opposite is the case for EAs, who appreciate learning about the design process and also use the DMF for annual implementation planning.</p> <p>Due to staff's time constraints the DMF training has been limited to 1.5 days. Based on adult learning principals this</p>	<p>Continue colloquium with senior staff (being discussed)</p> <p>Integrate DMF training as part of the induction training for new staff members</p> <p>Offer training commensurate with different skills levels.</p> <p>Offer customized training for mission leaders and mission members—at least 5 days—in</p>

		<p>A session on MfDR has also been included in the induction programs for new staff, new Directors/Country Directors, and orientation program for DMC officials.</p> <p>Consultation missions for RM Policy review which will address the role of RM staff in adoption of MfDR techniques are being conducted since last quarter of 2006.</p>	<p>is insufficient to effect behavioral change. It is a mere introduction.</p> <p>Translating and mainstreaming MfDR into core operations is challenging. There is a need to further explain, communicate, and translate MfDR into what it means for staff's work. This process may be helped by developing some materials, such as, a more detailed strategy and/or action plan, a primer for MfDR and/or checklist, etc</p>	<p>effectively applying the DMF process tools</p> <p>Include RD staff in training of facilitators' workshops that have so far focused on DMCs and RM staff</p>
--	--	---	---	--

BPHR = human resources division, COSO = central operations services office, CPS = country partnership strategy, DMC = developing member country, DMF = design and monitoring framework, MfDR = managing for development results, OED = operations evaluation department, PARD = Pacific department, RD = regional department, RM = resident mission, SPRU = results management unit

