

EFFECTIVENESS OF ADB ASSISTANCE IN CAPACITY BUILDING

TA Data

TA Title:	Capacity Building of the Inland Fisheries Research and Development Institute
TA Number:	TA 4025–CAM
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries
TA Amount:	\$900,000
Date Approved:	11 December 2002
TA Objective:	The TA's objective was to kick-start IFREDI as an efficient, effective, and relevant research and development institute. The TA's outputs were expected to lie in the realms of (i) institute management; (ii) research and development; (iii) technology transfer; and (iv) policy development and dialogue.

TA Preparation

1. How high was the TA's objective in the Government's overall priorities at the time, as indicated, for instance in the 5-Year Development Plan at the time or later?	High	Medium	Low	Do Not Know
2. Was the TA's objective a high priority of the executing agency at that time?	Yes	No		Do Not Know
3. Who was the principal player in identifying the need for the TA?	ADB	Government	Executing Agency	Do Not Know
4. How satisfactory was the process of developing the terms of reference for the TA in terms of adequate consultation with the staff of the executing agency?	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory	Do Not Know
4a. <i>If not satisfactory</i> : please indicate the major reasons.				
5. Was a satisfactory process for institutional strengthening (i.e., enabling the executing agency itself to build on the outputs of the TA) developed before the TA was accepted by the executing agency (e.g., starting with a diagnostic analysis)?	Yes	No		Do Not Know
6. Before the start of the TA, did the executing agency realistically consider that by the end of the TA, it would gain the technical expertise to do the desired work itself?	Yes	No		Do Not Know
7. Were the major constraints, both inside and outside the executing agency, which could prevent the effective completion of the TA satisfactorily addressed prior to the terms of reference being finalized?	Yes	No		Do Not Know
7a. <i>If yes</i> : please indicate whether the constraints were	Internal		External	
7b. <i>If no</i> : please list the major constraints not addressed. (See Annex for a sample of constraints.)				

TA Design

8. How satisfactory was the design of the TA to achieve its objective?	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory	Do Not Know
--	-------------------	--------------	------------------	-------------

8a. <i>If satisfactory</i> : please list strengths. To meet all the important and urgent demand of IFRReDI at the right time.	<i>If not satisfactory</i> : please list weaknesses.			
9. How important was the TA's objective to the work of the executing agency?	Very Important	Important	Not Very Important	No Opinion
9a. In what way were they important? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From a technical point of view From an institutional strengthening point of view 	The TA was important from both technical and institutional strengthening points of view. It initiated the process of capacity building of IFREDI and put in place the technical and institutional base from which to develop.			
10. Did the design seek to transfer skills to the executing agency by the end of the TA?	Yes	No		Do Not Know
10a. <i>If yes</i> : how satisfactory was the approach to technology and skills transfer? ¹	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory	Do Not Know
10b. <i>If not satisfactory</i> : please state in what way.				
11. Did the senior management of the executing agency play a major role in the design of the TA?	Yes	No		Do Not Know

TA Implementation

12. Were appropriate counterpart staff available to participate in the TA and benefit from it? ²	Yes	No		Do Not Know
12a. <i>If yes</i> : were the counterpart staff and trainees released as required without jeopardizing other high priorities of the executing agency?	Yes	No		Do Not Know
12b. When were counterpart staff made available for the TA?	From The Outset	Shortly After The Beginning	Late In The Project	Not At All
12c. Was the counterpart approach to skills transfer effective?	Yes	No		Do Not Know
12d. <i>If no</i> : please indicate the major reasons.				
13. Were recommendations made under the TA to improve the functioning of the executing agency?	Yes	No		Do Not Know
13a. <i>If yes</i> : were the recommendations appropriate?	Yes	No		Do Not Know
13b. <i>If yes</i> : were the recommendations accepted?	Yes	No		Do Not Know
13c. <i>If yes</i> : how substantially were the recommendations acted upon?	Significantly	Partially		Not At All
14. Did the TA do any staff training?	Yes	No		Do Not Know
14a. <i>If yes</i> : approximately how many staff were planned to be trained and how many were actually trained?	Planned To Be Trained 13 staff		Actually Trained 13 staff	
14b. What level of long-term improvement in staff performance did the training produce?	Marked Improvement	Some Improvement	No Improvement	Do Not Know
15. Were the trainers	Very Competent	Competent	Not Very Competent	Do Not Know
16. Was the training	Just Long Enough	Slightly Too Short	Too Short	Do Not Know

¹ Refers to transfer of technology and skills to counterparts and to the executing agency as distinct from trainees.

² Staff nominated to facilitate the consultants' work and sometimes assist it. Counterparts are not trainees.

17. At the end of the TA, how well could the counterparts and trainees, without further technical assistance, perform the tasks they were supposed to perform?	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory	Do Not Know
17a. <i>If not satisfactory</i> : please indicate the major reasons.				
18. How satisfactorily was the TA's objective achieved?	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory	Do Not Know
18a. Please identify one significant and enduring outcome directly resulting from the implementation of the TA's objective.	Research work related to fish bioecology, socioeconomics, and management skills. The TA also provided English language proficiency training.			
19. Did the senior management of the executing agency play a major role in the implementation and general guidance of the TA?	Yes	No		Do Not Know
19a. <i>If no</i> : did the lack of involvement have an adverse effect on the outcomes of the TA?	Yes	No		Do Not Know
20. Would the TA have been more effective if staff in central agencies, e.g., the Ministry of Economy and Finance, had been more involved?	Yes	No		Do Not Know
20a. <i>If yes</i> : please indicate in what way.				
21. Did women working in the executing agency benefit from the TA?	Yes	No		Do Not Know
21a. <i>If yes</i> : please indicate approximately how many and in what way.	Three female staff members benefited from the project. They developed as many technical skills as men did.			
22. Please list the major problems with TA implementation. (See Annex for a sample.)	There were no major problems.			

Performance of Consultants

23. Please rate the overall performance of the consultants.	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory	Do Not Know
23a. In terms of technical competence.	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory	Do Not Know
23b. In terms of training and skills transfer.	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory	Do Not Know
24. How well did the consultants understand the needs of the executing agency?	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory	Do Not Know
25. Please rate how well the consultants adapted their technical competencies to the needs and competencies of the executing agency.	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory	Do Not Know
26. How culturally sensitive was the work of the consultants?	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory	Do Not Know
27. How well did the consultants understand the professional needs of the people working in the executing agency?	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory	Do Not Know
28. Did the consultants pay any special attention to the needs of the women working in the executing agency?	Yes	No		Do Not Know
29. Did the consultants	Help The Executing Agency To Do	Do Things For The Agency		Do Not Know

	Things		
30. Would you employ the consultants again?	Yes	No	Do Not Know
30a. <i>If no</i> : please indicate why.			

Institutional Development

31. Please rate the contribution of the TA in the improvement of the following:	Major	Minor	None At All	Do Not Know
31a. Management competencies of the executing agency (i.e., is the executing agency better managed as a result of the TA?).	Major	Minor	None At All	Do Not Know
31b. Policy capacity of the executing agency.	Major	Minor	None At All	Do Not Know
31c. Operating systems of the executing agency (i.e., did the TA improve budget, planning, information systems, and procedures on a sustainable basis?).	Major	Minor	None At All	Do Not Know
31d. Organizational efficiency of the executing agency (i.e., has productivity of the executing agency increased as a direct result of the TA?).	Major	Minor	None At All	Do Not Know
31e. Technical competencies of staff working in the executing agency.	Major	Minor	None At All	Do Not Know
31f. Operational effectiveness of the executing agency (i.e., does the executing agency provide a better quality of service for the Government?).	Major	Minor	None At All	Do Not Know
31g. Planning, monitoring and control of the executing agency.	Major	Minor	None At All	Do Not Know
32. Did the TA result in the development of any performance indicators?	Yes	No		Do Not Know
32a. <i>If yes</i> : are those performance indicators still being used?	Yes	No		Do Not Know
32b. <i>If no</i> : can you suggest performance indicators to assess the long-term effectiveness of the TA?				
32c. Over time, has the performance rating on the basis of these indicators	Improved	Remained The Same	Declined	Do Not Know

General

33. To achieve the best sustainable results for the executing agency, was the length of time for the TA	Just Right	Slightly Too Short	Far Too Short	Do Not Know
33a. <i>If too short</i> : please indicate why it was too short.	The original capacities of counterpart staff were such that a longer duration for the TA would have enhanced their effectiveness further.			
34. Do the majority of the counterparts still work in the executing agency?	Yes	No		Do Not Know
34a. <i>If no</i> : do they still work in the public sector?	Yes	No		Do Not Know
34b. <i>If no</i> : broadly, why did they leave the executing agency and the public sector?				
35. Do the majority of trainees still work in the public sector?	Yes	No		Do Not Know
35a. <i>If no</i> : broadly, why did they leave the executing agency and the public				

sector?				
36. Have the facilities created under the TA continued to receive funding even after TA completion?	Yes	No	Do Not Know	
37. Did public service rules and procedures constrain the full effectiveness of the TA?	Yes	No	Do Not Know	
37a. <i>If yes:</i> please indicate in what way.				
38. Were there any incentives to encourage executing agency officers to participate in training provided under the TA?	Yes	No	Do Not Know	
38a. <i>If yes:</i> please describe the incentives.	Allowances for food and accommodation were provided when training was extended in the provinces.			
39. How could TA implementation be improved?	The TA might have extended over a longer period to allow staff members to learn more from the consultants.			
40. Would earlier reform of central agencies, e.g., the Ministry of Economy and Finance, and their rules and procedures have improved the effectiveness of the TA?	Yes	No	Do Not Know	
40a. <i>If yes:</i> please indicate in what way.				
41. Have the benefits of the TA been sustainable?	Yes	No	Do Not Know	
41a. <i>If no:</i> please indicate the major reasons.				
42. Please rate the performance of the ADB in TA preparation, administration, and supervision.	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory	Do Not Know
42a. <i>If not satisfactory:</i> please indicate in what way.				
42b. Please rate the ADB's responsiveness and flexibility.	Very Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory	Do Not Know
42c. <i>If not satisfactory:</i> please indicate in what way.				
43. In retrospect, please rate the long-term effectiveness of the TA on the executing agency.	Successful	Partly Successful	Unsuccessful	Do Not Know

Annex: Sample of Constraints and Problems in TA Implementation

	(Question 7b)	(Question 22)
1. Shortage of counterpart staff and trainees / staff had no time.	No	No
2. Lack of managerial skills / inadequate technical know-how.	Yes	No
3. Management / financial / organizational problems within the executing agency and within the Government itself.	Yes	Yes
4. Sociopolitical / cultural / geographic and demographic factors.	No	No
5. Unclear or absent policy / legislation / guidelines / control mechanisms.	No	No
6. Inadequate database / inaccurate data generated / ineffective or poor management information system.	Yes	No
7. Lack of incentives, support services, infrastructure, and facilities.	Yes	No
8. Lack of coordination / communication / overlapping functions / disputes among concerned implementing agencies / task network.	Yes	No
9. Lack of capital / funds / delay in release of Government counterpart funds.	Yes	No
10. Delay in recruitment of consultants / poor performance of consultants	No	No
11. Training	Yes	No
11a. Was too difficult or too short.	The duration of the TA was slightly short.	The duration of the TA was slightly short.
11b. Was not relevant to work / did not provide skills usable in the prevailing circumstances.	No	No
11c. Did not interest the trainees / did not offer incentives.	No	No