

Appendix 1 **INDEPENDENT EVALUATION AT ADB: A BRIEF ACCOUNT**¹

The Beginnings

The Asian Development Bank (ADB) set up an independent system for evaluating the performance of its development assistance in 1972. The 1973 Annual Report states that “a program for the postevaluation of completed loan projects was initiated.” Postevaluation reports were to be submitted to the Board of Directors. The first one was in 1973 on the Modernization of Tea Factories Project in Sri Lanka. The main purpose of such reports was “to assess how far implementation was consistent with the intentions as reflected in the appraisal of the project, and the extent to which projects achieved the expected economic and social benefits.”

The main focus of evaluation was looking at the past, but there was a forward-looking element as well: “From such reviews of past experience, further improvements might be possible in planning and appraisal techniques and in project implementation.” Expansion of the evaluation function was mandated, as the funds for 17 loans had been fully disbursed as of the end of 1973.

The 1974 Annual Report notes the approval in August of that year of the Program for Action for postevaluation, with two objectives: “first, to determine whether projects had achieved their intended objectives; and second, to re-examine, in cooperation with developing member countries and the executing agencies of the various projects, the objectives themselves and the effectiveness of the means of achieving them.” Two types of postevaluation were pursued: internal, by the Economics Office with the assistance of consultants; and external, by academic institutions and nonprofit organizations. The role of staff from ADB’s operations departments was limited to supplying background information.

In 1975, four internal evaluations were completed; and two external ones were substantially finished, with two more under preparation. The 1975 Annual Report discusses results and recommendations for the first time: “Both the external and internal postevaluation studies have shown that the projects concerned have generally achieved their objectives. In some cases, specific recommendations have been made which, after further examination and in consultation with the executing agencies and the borrowers, are being implemented on a regular basis....Recommendations have also been made which will be useful to the Bank in formulating similar future projects.”

The 1976 Annual Report on “The First Ten Years” of ADB’s operations notes two completed external and three internal evaluations aimed at “achieving improvements in the efficiency and effectiveness of future Bank-assisted projects.” Most projects were deemed successful “despite some instances of delay in execution and of cost overruns.”

Articulating the Operations Evaluation System

By the following year a total of 17 evaluation studies—13 internal and 4 external—had identified “conditions for success and causes for failure.” The growing importance of evaluation was seen: “As the number of completed projects increases, postevaluation results, systematically compiled and analyzed, will become an important tool of management for the Bank as well as for the executing agencies concerned.” And the first seeds of the expansion of evaluation activities beyond the cataloguing of projects appeared: “...a review has been initiated of the postevaluation policies and procedures of the Bank with a view *inter alia* to streamlining them and increasing their impact on the Bank’s operational functions.” The Audit Committee of the Board of Directors was established with oversight of postevaluation activities.

The Postevaluation Unit became the separate, independent Postevaluation Office, reporting to the President, in 1978, during which year two internal reports were completed and work on four external evaluations was pursued. Postevaluation of completed projects was becoming an integral part of ADB’s operations, with 50% coverage planned. The Postevaluation Office’s activities were comprehensively reviewed by the Audit Committee, which recommended to the Board several measures to strengthen them, including introduction of the project completion report, to be prepared by ADB’s operations departments and validated in project performance audit reports prepared by the Postevaluation Office; and the establishment of procedures to feed back evaluation findings into ADB’s operations.

The next year saw the formulation of standards and procedures for project performance audit reports, and the publication of the first Annual Review of Postevaluation Reports summarizing findings and recommendations. A quantum leap was made in 1980 with the issuance of 13 reports covering 17 loans and technical assistance activities.

¹ Source: ADB *Annual Reports*.

Appendix 1 **INDEPENDENT EVALUATION AT ADB: A BRIEF ACCOUNT** *(continued)*

The 1981 Annual Report stated that “postevaluation is emerging as an important management tool and as a key input for policy making.” The third Annual Review of Postevaluation Reports again noted the prevalence of delays and cost overruns in ADB projects. The number of evaluations increased significantly: 35 projects covering 13 countries and 10 sectors were reviewed in 30 reports. A new product was introduced, the abbreviated project performance audit report for projects that evidenced few problems. In late 1981, a Board paper was circulated on evaluation activities and procedures. The intention was to audit all projects with completion reports issued in the previous year.

By 1982, which saw 23 project performance audit reports released covering 11 developing member countries (DMCs), a total of 81 reports had been issued for 91 projects. Significantly, four special studies were initiated in the year on the impact of ADB’s operations in the fisheries sector and on the effectiveness of executing agency arrangements, project-related technical assistance, and training in development finance institutions. Thus the role of the Postevaluation Office expanded to the realm of effectiveness and impact studies. Staff began attending meetings on new loan projects “with a view to ensuring that the experience gained from completed projects...was appropriately taken into account.”

In 1983, the guidelines for project completion reports were revised, and guidelines for project performance audit reports were introduced. The two-tiered evaluation became formal. Twenty-four audit reports were issued, plus the first special study (on training in development finance institutions).

Creating New Evaluation Products and Services

In 1984, the first impact evaluation study was completed along with 27 project performance audit reports covering 30 projects in 11 DMCs in 12 sectors.

In 1985, the first audit for a program loan was conducted, in addition to two impact evaluation studies on the fisheries sector. A computerized postevaluation information system was also established. The seventh Annual Review of Postevaluation Reports presented major points for consideration by the Board, which took action to implement them. Henceforth, all appraisal reports would include a summary of lessons learned.

Following a decline over several years in official development assistance and in private assistance to

DMCs, mandating the most effective use of ADB’s resources, the 1986 Annual Report included a theme chapter on performance evaluation. It noted that 40% of staff time was spent on loan supervision activities, with the ex-post evaluation of projects broadening supervision from implementation efficiency to benefit achievement. The evaluation system was being continuously improved and refined: completion and audit reports were now required for all completed projects. To provide a two-way feedback system, the Postevaluation Office reviewed draft completion reports, and ADB’s operations departments commented on draft evaluation reports. By the end of 1986, 200 project performance audit reports had been prepared covering most sectors in most DMCs. Special studies had “become a particularly valuable tool for drawing and disseminating lessons, not only in specific sectors and subsectors, but also with regard to lending programs and the quality of sector work.” For a longer-term perspective, the Postevaluation Office initiated more impact evaluation studies for projects likely to yield valuable insights, usually covering a range of projects in a DMC. Other impact evaluation studies looked at the same sector over several countries. DMCs were encouraged to prepare their own completion reports.

An important postevaluation finding was that more than two thirds of ADB’s projects had “substantially achieved their physical, institutional, and socioeconomic objectives”. But there was a tendency to overestimate projected economic returns at appraisal. Factors affecting success included (i) external factors not under the control of the country or the project, like commodity prices, market access, and exchange rate; climate; and political events; (ii) country-related factors like the institutional and policy environment; and (iii) project-specific factors like project design and implementation. Postevaluation findings showed that project design and external factors were the most crucial.

The theme chapter contained the first inkling of the future role of the design and monitoring framework in project formulation and implementation: “Experience shows that evaluation is facilitated if the project’s objectives, planned achievements and inputs are stated in explicit and measurable terms at the project formulation and appraisal stage.”

By the 1987 Annual Report, postevaluation was a regular chapter. The write-up began giving success rates by country group and by sector, and made attempts to explain the results. A review of the six postevaluated program

Appendix 1 **INDEPENDENT EVALUATION AT ADB: A BRIEF ACCOUNT** *(continued)*

loans stressed “the importance of adequately addressing pertinent sector and operational issues during program formulation and close monitoring of program design, progress and related developments during implementation.”

Increasing Special Studies and Sector Syntheses

The year 1988 saw an increased number of special studies, all country or sector specific. Due to the growing number of loans reaching term, the policy of evaluating all completed projects was changed to a purposeful selection of projects, plus all program and sector loans, and all first loans to a subsector or a country.

The 1989 Annual Report discusses the first reevaluation study, aimed to glean insights into the long-term sustainability of a project.

The 1990 Annual Report presented the first two in-depth evaluations of technical assistance operations, one of project preparatory technical assistance, and one of advisory technical assistance. Steps were taken to assist DMCs in developing and strengthening their own evaluation capabilities, notably through technical assistance to Papua New Guinea for on-the-job training of evaluators and planners, and for establishing a computerized information system.

The write-up for 1991 discusses the reasons for project success or lack thereof. Although poverty reduction had received little attention when the evaluated projects were appraised, the 1991 project performance audit reports recorded the projects’ impacts on the poor. Similarly, despite little discussion of environmental effects in the appraisal reports, attention was given to environmental assessment. And some evaluation studies began to look at the impacts of projects on women. In short, evaluation activities began to examine “issues and subjects of broader relevance to the Bank’s operations, practices, and procedures.”

Developing Evaluation Capacity

The Management Committee on Postevaluation Findings was established under the President to discuss the conclusions and recommendations of studies and to formulate plans. Advisory technical assistance was provided to Sri Lanka to strengthen that country’s postevaluation capabilities. Regional technical assistance was approved to cosponsor, with the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Co-operation and Development (OECD), a regional seminar on Performance

Evaluation in Asia and the Pacific.

The 1992 Annual Report states that project performance audits were still the core activity of the Postevaluation Office. The first postevaluation was done of a private sector project without government guarantee. Lessons identified included the need to improve project quality through more effective use of project preparatory technical assistance, the desirability of an integrated approach to water supply and irrigation projects, and the need to improve the formulation and design of program loans and to ensure that the institutional capabilities in DMCs are adequate. Advisory technical assistance was provided to strengthen postevaluation activities in the Philippines and Thailand, and a technical assistance completion report was prepared on the 1990 advisory technical assistance to Papua New Guinea.

In 1993, a special study presented an analytical review of postevaluation findings in the Philippines covering 41 projects and 1 program. It discussed the factors affecting project implementation and performance, and emphasized the need for better project preparation and appraisal. Other studies pointed to the inadequate operation and maintenance of physical facilities as a major factor affecting the performance and sustainability of projects. Two workshops were held to promote interaction of the Postevaluation Office with ADB’s operations departments. The Management Committee on Postevaluation Findings underscored the need to improve project preparatory technical assistance and to adopt the logical framework approach in project planning and implementation. To facilitate the incorporation of evaluation experience in programming and project appraisal work, country syntheses of postevaluation findings were introduced. The Postevaluation Office also stepped up its efforts to help DMCs develop and strengthen their own evaluation capabilities.

In 1994, the postevaluation information system was made more user friendly, and country and sector syntheses were expanded. Closer coordination with the evaluation units of multilateral and bilateral agencies was promoted through participation in the Expert Group on Aid Evaluation of DAC/OECD.

In line with the recommendations of the Task Force on Improving Project Quality, the 1995 work program of evaluation activities placed special emphasis on broader evaluation studies and on helping DMCs to develop their performance evaluation capabilities. The coverage of project performance audits was consequently reduced to 30% of completed projects. A special study was done on

Appendix 1 **INDEPENDENT EVALUATION AT ADB: A BRIEF ACCOUNT** *(continued)*

the effectiveness of ADB assistance for capacity building in Nepal and Western Samoa. Key findings during the year were to (i) keep project design simple, well focused, and manageable; (ii) examine the socioeconomic aspects of beneficiaries, secure their participation, and ensure that benefits are properly targeted and delivered; and (iii) build benefit monitoring and evaluation into projects.

In 1996, an impact evaluation study of assistance for benefit monitoring and evaluation concluded that its focus on the project level was inadequate. The study stated that benefit monitoring and evaluation needs to be linked with sector- and national-level efforts. Two regional workshops held under a regional technical assistance led to the preparation of a plan to support the implementation of the project performance management system, and several projects were selected as pilots. The Task Force on Improving Project Quality recommendation to prepare an annual performance evaluation program each year “to bring together the activities of various departments and offices as they relate to project performance” concluded that “the institutional mechanism for generating feedback in the Bank is fairly comprehensive and well developed.”

In 1996, the Postevaluation Office was actively involved in formalizing the Evaluation Cooperation Group, composed of the heads of the evaluation units of the multilateral development banks.

Shortening the Feedback Loop

In 1997, the Postevaluation Office undertook a survey to ascertain the relevance, importance, and extent of use of evaluation results by ADB’s operations departments. Recommendations were to shorten the feedback loop, conduct more thematic special studies of operational relevance, prepare expanded country and sector syntheses, and make the postevaluation information system more user friendly. The Postevaluation Office also conducted its first process evaluation—a special study on Issues Pertaining to the Engagement of Consultants in Bank Loan Projects and Their Effect on Project Performance—covering six countries. ADB accepted the 2-year chairing of the Evaluation Cooperation Group.

The Postevaluation Office was increasingly looking at larger units than the traditional single completed project or program, and also at processes. The first country assistance program evaluation was conducted for the People’s Republic of China in 1998, as was a special evaluation study on ADB’s midterm review process. The Postevalua-

tion Office, along with the Central Operations Services Office, became the focal point for monitoring progress and providing assistance in accomplishing project performance reports. The Postevaluation Office launched an Internet web page summarizing evaluation findings and lessons, with links to the websites of other international organizations and with a keyword search capacity.

Promoting Quality at Entry

To recognize the larger role of the Postevaluation Office, its name was changed at the beginning of 1999 to the Operations Evaluation Office. As part of ADB’s central focus on poverty, it began to pay closer attention to the articulation of project objectives and design that could be evaluated in order to facilitate monitoring and verification of ADB’s poverty reduction efforts. The project performance management system was upgraded to emphasize monitorable performance indicators. Two special evaluation studies examined the use of technical assistance to assist public expenditure management, capacity building, and institutional strengthening; and another examined the role of nongovernment organizations and community-based organizations in 54 projects in nine countries. A new product, Evaluation Highlights, was launched, and the Operations Evaluation Office inaugurated a newsletter for the Evaluation Cooperation Group.

The 2000 Annual Report notes, “The Operations Evaluation Office has intensified its work on preparing in-depth studies of particular thematic issues; evaluating the effectiveness of ADB’s operations, practices, and procedures; monitoring and reporting on actions taken by ADB and its executing agencies in response to recommendations; building evaluation capacity within and outside ADB to enhance self-evaluation; and coordinating closely with multilateral and bilateral agencies on evaluation methodology.” The Operations Evaluation Office revised the guidelines for preparing project performance audit reports, introducing a four-tiered rating system. Several significant evaluations were issued: one examined the impacts of ADB’s involuntary resettlement policy; one looked at ADB’s role in and support for agriculture and natural resources research; one scrutinized participatory development processes; and one analyzed the sustainability of policy reforms through advisory technical assistance.

In 2001, the Operations Evaluation Office became the Operations Evaluation Department (OED) with additional personnel, still reporting to the President but under

Appendix 1 **INDEPENDENT EVALUATION AT ADB: A BRIEF ACCOUNT** *(continued)*

the oversight of the Board's Development Effectiveness Committee (DEC). Five audit reports for program loans showed that reforms need a longer time frame, more policy dialogue, and sustained government commitment. Also needed are detailed sector studies, participatory approaches to program design, and realistic assessments of the capacities of executing agencies. Several important evaluations were produced on ADB's crisis support interventions in Indonesia, gender and development, economic and sector work, Asian Development Fund (ADF) resources, and privatizing public sector enterprises. With the Evaluation Cooperation Group, OED pursued the harmonization of evaluation activities and methodologies, and developed good practice standards. OED was involved in a joint evaluation in Viet Nam of the Comprehensive Framework Approach to Partnership.

Significant studies in 2002 examined ADF operations, beneficiary perceptions of the impact of selected agriculture and social infrastructure projects on poverty reduction, project cost estimation, the impact of rural roads on poverty, investment fund operations, and water supply and sanitation activities. OED assessed the new loan classification system and took the lead in reviewing the process for performance-based allocation of ADF resources.

Ensuring Independence of Evaluation

Studies in 2003 investigated financial cost recovery in the power sector, participatory processes, water and forestry sector operations, and project performance management. In December, the Board approved major changes in the operations of OED, which took effect in January 2004. OED now reports to the Board through the DEC. The director general is appointed by the Board upon the joint recommendation of the DEC and the President. OED has more autonomy in staff selection, and develops its work program in consultation with the DEC and ADB's Management, with approval by the Board. There is a separate resource envelope for evaluation operations. Completed

reports are circulated simultaneously to ADB's Management and the Board.

Progressing to Full-Fledged Operations Evaluation

The eight country assistance program evaluations produced as of 2004 revealed problems with the former country operational strategies and country assistance plans, and thus contributed to ADB's switch to country partnership strategies. Under its new mandate, the focus of OED's work shifted to (i) the broader development agenda; and (ii) project and program evaluations that would feed into country assistance program evaluations, requiring closer links between the latter and the country partnership strategy and between sector assistance program evaluations, first introduced in 2003, and other evaluation studies. The country assistance program evaluation for Nepal was prepared in parallel with the country partnership strategy, which was ADB's first results-based country partnership strategy.

OED's other activities in 2004 included preparation of a report for the Evaluation Cooperation Group on good practices for evaluation of policy-based lending; and analyzing the success rate of projects.

In 2005, the Annual Evaluation Review became a more analytical report rather than simply a catalogue of evaluation activities. It was a retrospective look at 968 public sector projects. The results of the 2005 evaluations were used to help ADB improve its country strategies.

By 2006, the influence of country assistance program evaluations on the formulation of new country partnership strategies had been mainstreamed: the Board does not normally discuss a country partnership strategy until after the DEC has considered the corresponding country assistance program evaluation. A 2006 evaluation on poverty targeting in rural areas in three countries challenged some key assumptions. Three studies were begun, which by now have all been completed, to review ADB's safeguard policies, in preparation for the policy update scheduled for 2007.

Appendix 2 **EVALUATION BY TYPE**

Type	Purpose	Challenge	Opportunity
Project	Evaluates a predefined cause-and-effect relationship leading from project inputs to project outputs and fulfillment of project objectives.	Project objectives are often complex, unrealistic, ill defined, and/or may have changed over time. Baseline studies may not have been carried out.	The scope of a single project makes it relatively easy to focus the evaluation if the objective against which success is evaluated was specifically expressed in quantifiable terms.
Program	Evaluates institutional performance, processes, changes, and interrelationships, as well as the development impact of the program.	Involvement and ownership of local partners in an externally funded program are required.	A program loan enables ADB to assist in developing a sector (or subsector, sectors) as a whole and improving its performance through appropriate policy and institutional improvements over the medium to long term. Program loans are relatively quick disbursing to cover the immediate adjustment costs arising from policy reforms.
Sector Assistance	Evaluates ADB's sectoral strategy, policy dialogue, ongoing and completed projects and technical assistance, and ADB's performance within a given sector in one country.	In addition to considering ADB's contributions, evaluations must also consider the contributions of other development stakeholders. There is uncertainty associated with assessing the outcome of ongoing operations.	This is a cost-effective way to evaluate ADB's operations in a sector. Such evaluations can reduce transaction costs, shorten the evaluation feedback loop, and have considerable impact on formulation of ADB's operations in the sector.
Country Assistance	Evaluates the entire ADB support to a country covering ADB's strategy, policy dialogue, both completed and ongoing projects and technical assistance, and ADB's performance. It provides ADB and the country with a basis for deciding on changes in the future country partnership strategy.	These are complex evaluations involving both aid agency and national policies and objectives, and cover all sectors and different modalities of aid. In addition to considering ADB's contributions, evaluations must also consider the contributions of other development stakeholders. There is uncertainty associated with assessing the outcome of ongoing operations.	Important for policy and planning at the highest level to provide a basis for future country strategies and to identify ways for ADB to become a better and more effective development partner.

Appendix 2 **EVALUATION BY TYPE** (continued)

Type	Purpose	Challenge	Opportunity
Modality	Evaluates the efficiency and effectiveness of specific forms of assistance such as policy-based lending, project support, technical assistance, and sources of financing, e.g., Asian Development Fund, ordinary capital resources.	Individual cases to be evaluated often have different objectives, making it difficult to explore the effects and impacts of development assistance systematically.	Drawing experience from a larger sample of development assistance can reveal lessons that could improve development effectiveness by changing development policies and practices.
Thematic	Extracts and aggregates data and information on a specific theme, e.g., non-government and civil society organizations, participation, governance, gender, environment, capacity building. This may involve different modalities, sectors, or countries and make use of data and information from different types of evaluation and sources identified in literature reviews or the experience of other donors.	Methodological constraints exist in comparing different activities in different contexts, and different forms of assistance in the context of different national activities and policies. Difficulties are often experienced in making generalizations based on a limited number of country case studies.	This can be influential in shaping development policies and practices.
Impact	Assesses changes in the well-being of individuals, households, communities, or firms that can be attributed to a particular project, program, or policy. The central impact evaluation question is what would have happened to those receiving the intervention if they had not in fact received the program.	Since it is not possible to observe the beneficiaries both with and without the intervention, the key challenge is to develop a counterfactual—that is, a group which is as similar as possible (in observable and unobservable dimensions) to the beneficiaries. This comparison allows establishment of definitive causality, thereby attributing observed changes in welfare to the intervention while removing confounding factors.	Impact evaluations are a tool for dynamic learning, allowing policymakers to improve ongoing programs and ultimately better allocate funds across programs.

Appendix 3 **KEY OPERATIONS EVALUATION DEPARTMENT REPORTS**

Country assistance program evaluations evaluate the performance of ADB's country strategy and assistance programs, usually over the past 10 years, against the objectives laid out and the country's own development priorities.

Sector assistance program evaluations assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability of ADB's assistance with respect to a particular sector's development and financial performance, as well as its impact on economic development and poverty reduction.

Special evaluation studies focus on selected thematic issues across sectors or countries, or evaluate an ADB policy or process.

Impact evaluation studies evaluate projects and programs using a rigorously defined counterfactual.

Project/program performance evaluation reports evaluate the design, implementation, and performance of loan projects and programs. They are prepared about 3 years after project completion.

Technical assistance performance evaluation reports evaluate technical assistance operations, usually several technical assistance activities in the same report.

Annual evaluation reports provide a summary of evaluation activities and findings in a particular year, and an assessment of portfolio performance.

Learning curves are handy, two-page quick references designed to feed findings and recommendations from evaluation to a broader range of clients.

Appendix 4 **CATALOGUE OF EVALUATION REPORTS**
(as of March 2007)

Number of Evaluated Public Sector Projects/Programs by Country and Sector
(as of 31 December 2006)

Country	Sector										Total
	AG	ED	EN	FI	HL	IN	LW	MS	TC	WS	
Bangladesh	23	6	7	5	2	5		5	6	1	60
Bhutan	1		1			1		1	1		5
Cambodia	1	1	1					1			4
China, People's Rep. of	4		3			3		1	10	2	23
India			5	3				1	5		14
Indonesia	38	10	13	3	3	3		11	16	5	102
Kazakhstan	1			1				1	1		4
Kyrgyz Republic	1						1				2
Lao PDR	4		7	2	1				5	3	22
Malaysia	8	2	5		3			7	11	7	43
Maldives			2					1	3		6
Mongolia	1		1	2		2			3		9
Myanmar	5		1		1	2			1	1	11
Nepal	21	4	7			3		4	4	1	44
Pacific Island DMCs	9	1	7	12	1	1	4	9	8	2	54
Pakistan	15	3	18	9	4	8		5	4	3	69
Papua New Guinea	4	2	1	3	2			2	6	2	22
Philippines	17	4	9	13		2		6	11	7	69
Sri Lanka	17		5	4	2	3		3	2		36
Tajikistan								1			1
Thailand	6	2	18	4	1	2		2	8	3	46
Uzbekistan	1										1
Viet Nam	5		1	2					2	1	11
Graduate Economies	6	5	1	7	2	16		3	7	11	58
Total	188	40	113	70	22	51	5	64	114	49	716

AG = agriculture and natural resources; DMC = developing member country; ED = education; EN = energy; FI = finance; HL = health, nutrition, and social protection; IN = industry and trade; Lao PDR = Lao People's Democratic Republic; LW = law, economic management, and public policy; MS = multisector; TC = transport and communications; WS = water supply, sanitation, and waste management.

Source: OED.

Appendix 4 **CATALOGUE OF EVALUATION REPORTS** *(continued)*
(as of March 2007)

Country Assistance Program Evaluations

Country	Year
China, People's Republic of	1998
Viet Nam, Socialist Republic of	2000
Mongolia	2002
Bangladesh	2003
Papua New Guinea	2003
Philippines	2003
Cambodia	2004
Nepal	2004
Bhutan	2005
Indonesia	2005
Lao People's Democratic Republic	2006
Uzbekistan	2006

Source: OED.

Sector Assistance Program Evaluations

Country	Year
Power Sector in Bangladesh	2003
Agriculture and Natural Resources Sector in the Lao People's Democratic Republic	2005
Social Sectors in Pakistan	2005
Power Sector in the Philippines	2005
Road Sector in Pakistan	2006

Source: OED.

Appendix 4 **CATALOGUE OF EVALUATION REPORTS** (continued)
(as of March 2007)

Special Evaluation Studies

Listed by Year of Approval

Study Title	Study Location	Year
Regional Training Programs for Development Finance Institutions	REG	1983
Executing Agency Arrangements	REG	1984
Effectiveness of Project-Related Technical Assistance	REG	1984
ADB Assistance to the Fisheries Sector in Indonesia	INO	1984
ADB Assistance in the Fisheries Sector in Sri Lanka	SRI	1984
ADB Assistance to the Fisheries Sector in Pakistan	PAK	1985
ADB Assistance to the Fisheries Sector	REG	1985
Water Usage and its Contribution to Agricultural Production in Irrigation	PHI	1986
Study of Compliance with Special Loan Covenants	REG	1987
ADB DFI Lending to Small- and Medium-Scale Industry Development	KOR	1987
A Review of Postevaluation Findings	INO	1988
A Review of Postevaluation Findings	MAL	1988
A Review of Postevaluation Findings	THA	1988
ADB Operations in the Agricultural Credit Subsector	NEP	1988
ADB Operations in the Power Subsector	THA	1988
A Review of Postevaluation Findings	BAN	1989
A Review of Postevaluation Findings	NEP	1989
A Review of Postevaluation Findings	SRI	1989
ADB Lending to Development Finance Institutions	PAK	1989
A Review of Postevaluation Findings	PNG	1990
ADB Lending to Selected Development Finance Institutions in South Asia	REG	1990
A Review of Postevaluation Findings	SAM	1990
A Review of Bank Operations in the Livestock Subsector	REG	1991
A Review of Postevaluation Findings in South Pacific Developing Member Countries	REG	1991
ADB Operations in the Water Supply Subsector in Bangkok	THA	1992
A Review of Postevaluation Findings	PHI	1993
ADB Operations in the Education Sector	INO	1993
ADB Operations in the Water Supply and Sanitation Sector	MAL	1994
ADB Operations in the Irrigation Sector	NEP	1994
Effectiveness of Bank Assistance for Capacity Building	NEP	1995
Assessment of the Effectiveness of Bank Assistance in Capacity Building	SAM	1995
Bank Operations in the Gas Sector	PAK	1995
Bank's Benefit Monitoring and Evaluation Assistance to the Agriculture and Social Sectors	PHI	1995
Bank Assistance in the Health and Population Sector	SRI	1995
Assessment of the Effectiveness of Bank Technical Assistance for Capacity Building	INO	1996
Assessment of the Effectiveness of Bank Technical Assistance for Capacity Building	VAN	1996
Evaluation of Bank Assistance to Developing Member Countries for Benefit Monitoring and Evaluation	REG	1996
Bank Assistance to the Industrial Crops and Agro-Industry Sector	SRI	1996
Effectiveness and Impact of Training in Education Projects	INO	1997
Issues Pertaining to the Engagement of Consultants in Bank Loan Projects and Their Effect on Project Performance	REG	1997

Appendix 4 **CATALOGUE OF EVALUATION REPORTS** (continued)
(as of March 2007)

Special Evaluation Studies

Listed by Year of Approval

Study Title	Study Location	Year
Effectiveness of Multiproject Lending	REG	1997
Macroeconomic Environment and Project Performance	SRI	1997
Bank Operations in the Industrial Crops and Agro-Industry Sector	INO	1997
Bank Operations in the Road Sector	PHI	1997
Bank Assistance to the Urban Development and Housing Sector	REG	1997
Bank Assistance in the Health and Population Sector	REG	1997
Midterm Review Process	ADB	1998
Factors Affecting Project Performance in the Agriculture and Social Sectors: A Review of Postevaluation Reports Between 1991 and 1997	ADB	1998
Port Projects	REG	1998
Operation and Maintenance of Road Facilities and Their Impact on Project Sustainability	REG	1998
Environmental Mitigation Measures in Selected Bank-Financed Projects	REG	1998
Impact of Bank Project Preparatory Technical Assistance on the Agriculture Sector	BAN	1998
Secondary Science Education Projects	REG	1998
Bank Assistance to the Power Sector in the Pacific Developing Member Countries	REG	1998
Role of Nongovernment Organizations and Community-Based Organizations in ADB Projects	REG	1999
Effectiveness of ADB Approaches and Assistance to Poverty Reduction in Bangladesh, Kyrgyz Republic, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Nepal, and Philippines	REG	1999
Advisory and Operational Technical Assistance in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyz Republic	REG	1999
Social and Environmental Impacts of Selected Hydropower Projects	REG	1999
Interim Assessment of ADB's Lending During the Economic Crisis	THA	1999
Bank Assistance in the Water Supply and Sanitation Sector	INO	1999
ADB's Program of Subregional Economic Cooperation in the Greater Mekong Subregion	REG	1999
Technical and Vocational Education Projects	REG	1999
Policy Implementation and Impact of Agriculture and Natural Resources Research	REG	2000
Policy Impact of Involuntary Resettlement	REG	2000
Effectiveness and Impact of ADB Assistance to the Reform of Public Expenditure Management	REG	2000
ADB Assistance to the Roads Sector	NEP	2000
ADB's Crisis Management Interventions	INO	2001
A Review of the Asian Development Fund I-V Operations	REG	2001
Privatization of Public Sector Enterprises: Lessons for Developing Member Countries	REG	2001
Sustainability of Policy Reforms through Advisory Technical Assistance	REG	2001
Program Lending	REG	2001
Gender and Development	REG	2001
Participatory Development Processes in Selected ADB Projects in Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Social Infrastructure Sectors	REG	2001
Selected Economic and Sector Work	REG	2001
ADB's Rural Credit Assistance	REG	2001
Impact on Poverty Reduction of Selected Projects: Perceptions of the Beneficiaries	REG	2002
Water Supply and Sanitation Projects in Selected Developing Member Countries	REG	2002
Impact of Rural Roads on Poverty Reduction: A Case Study-Based Analysis	REG	2002
Special Evaluation Study of Asian Development Fund VI-VII Operations	REG	2003

Appendix 4 **CATALOGUE OF EVALUATION REPORTS** *(continued)*
(as of March 2007)

Special Evaluation Studies

Listed by Year of Approval

Study Title	Study Location	Year
Funds for the Poor: Special Evaluation Study: ADF VI-VII Operations	REG	2003
Cost Recovery in the Power Sector	REG	2003
Government and Nongovernment Provision of Primary Education in Bangladesh, Indonesia, and Nepal	REG	2003
Project Performance Management in ADB and its Projects in Developing Member Countries	REG	2003
Capacity Building Assistance for Managing Water Supply and Sanitation	REG	2003
Participatory Approaches in Forest and Water Resource Operations in Selected Developing Member Countries	REG	2003
ADB Assistance to the Power Sector	INO	2003
Capacity Development Assistance	LAO	2004
Special Evaluation Study on Small-Scale Freshwater Rural Aquaculture Development for Poverty Reduction	REG	2004
Special Evaluation Study of ADB Interventions on Nutrition and Food Fortification	REG	2004
Effectiveness of Participatory Approaches: Do the New Approaches Offer an Effective Solution to the Conventional Problems in Rural Development Projects?	REG	2004
Special Evaluation Study on Project Cost Estimates	REG	2004
Special Evaluation Study on Project Implementation Units	REG	2005
ADB Policy for the Health Sector	REG	2005
Development of Genetically Improved Farmed Tilapia and Their Dissemination in Selected Countries	REG	2005
Involvement of Civil Society Organizations in ADB Operations	REG	2006
The Fisheries Policy	REG	2006
Urban Sector Strategy and Operations	REG	2006
Involuntary Resettlement Safeguards	REG	2006
Environmental Safeguards	REG	2006
Pathways Out of Rural Poverty and the Effectiveness of Poverty Targeting	REG	2006
Lessons in Capacity Development: Sectoral Studies	SRI	2006
Indigenous Peoples Safeguards	REG	2007

Source: OED.

Appendix 5 **HEADS OF EVALUATION**

Ernest Ettliger	1978–1982
Ronald Skeates	1982–1987
S. Mahboob Alam	1987–1992
Aminul Islam	1992–1995
Basudev Dahal	1996–1997
A. Timothy Peterson	1997–2000
J. Antonio M. Quila	2000–2001
Vladimir Bohun	2001–2003
Eisuke Suzuki	2003–2004
Bruce Murray	2004 to date

Source: Budget, Personnel, and Management Systems Department.

Appendix 6 HEADS OF AUDIT AND DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEES

Audit Committee Chairs

M. R. Khan (Pakistan)	1977–1979
Bong H. Kay (Korea)	1979–1981
N. W. Davey (Australia)	1981–1984
G. Ramachandran (India)	1984–1985
N. M. Qureshi (Pakistan)	1985–1989
Jean-Marc Metivier (Canada)	1989–1990
Aitezazuddin Ahmad (Pakistan)	1990–1991
Heinz Buhler (Germany)	1991–1993
Anthony F. Burger (Canada)	1993–1994
Julian Payne (Canada)	1994–1995
Peter McCawley (Australia)	1995–1996
Eric Thorn (Australia)	1996–1997
Julian Payne (Canada)	1997–2001

Development Effectiveness Committee Chairs

Zhao Xiaoyu (People's Republic of China)	2001–2002
Jusuf Anwar (Indonesia)	2002–2004
Ashok Saikia (India)	2004–2005
Agus Haryanto (Indonesia)	2005 to date

Note: The Audit Committee oversaw evaluation activities until the Development Effectiveness Committee was established.

Source: Budget, Personnel, and Management Systems Department.