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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AER</td>
<td>annual evaluation review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>administrative staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPE</td>
<td>country assistance program evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES</td>
<td>corporate evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>country partnership strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSFR</td>
<td>country partnership strategy final review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSFRV</td>
<td>country partnership strategy final review validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSPE</td>
<td>country strategy and program evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>Development Effectiveness Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.E.E.P.</td>
<td>delivery, effectiveness, efficiency, people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMC</td>
<td>developing member country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>evaluation approach paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECG</td>
<td>Evaluation Cooperation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>focus group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IED</td>
<td>Independent Evaluation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG</td>
<td>Independent Evaluation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>international staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARS</td>
<td>management action record system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDB</td>
<td>Multilateral Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>national staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OED</td>
<td>Operations Evaluation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR</td>
<td>project completion report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPER</td>
<td>project/program performance evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVR</td>
<td>validation of project completion report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAPE</td>
<td>sector assistance program evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>sectorwide evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>technical assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TES</td>
<td>thematic evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPER</td>
<td>technical assistance performance evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XARR</td>
<td>extended annual review report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVR</td>
<td>validation of extended annual review report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note

In this report, “$” refers to US dollars
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Executive Summary

The Independent Evaluation Department (IED), through its accountability and learning mandates, conducts evaluation activities to help the Board of Directors, ADB Management, and decision makers in Asian Development Bank’s developing member countries to understand whether resources have been well spent, and whether the planned outcomes have been achieved. Its strategic goal is to accelerate ADB’s development effectiveness through independent evaluation. The Self-Evaluation has been undertaken to take stock of the relevance and effectiveness of IED’s evaluation products and processes, and to identify opportunities to enhance the quality and influence of the evaluations and strengthen IED’s effectiveness and impact.

The Independent Evaluation Department (IED) has relied on a range of evaluation products to evaluate and validate the strategic and operational assistance programs supported by the Asian Development Bank (ADB) in developing member countries (DMCs). In 2008, an independent evaluation of the Operations Evaluation Department (OED) was undertaken which led to the formulation of ADB’s Independent Evaluation Policy in 2008 and restructuring of OED as the IED. The purpose was to strengthen the independence and improve the quality of evaluation products generated by the evaluation department. In 2012, a self-evaluation was undertaken by IED to provide further guidance on IED’s work program.

This review takes stock of IED’s experience with implementing the recommendations of the 2008 and 2012 report and focuses, in particular, on remaining challenges to strengthen the quality and influence of IED evaluations. IED’s evaluation products have evolved over the past five years with greater emphasis on high-level evaluation products that have reinforced ADB’s focus on the three strategic priorities—inclusive growth, environmentally sustainable growth, and regional cooperation and integration laid out in ADB’s corporate strategy. There is recognition by some stakeholders that IED’s contribution in these areas has been significant, and that the quality of IED’s evaluations has improved over the past five years. At the same time, there is demand, particularly from operational departments, for a rebalancing of the product mix to balance strategic and operational priorities. While there is widespread recognition of the value added by evaluation products aimed at the country level, which are essential to inform the next country partnership strategy (CPS), there is also some concern about variability in quality particularly for validation products at the project and country levels. There is also unrealized potential to mine the lessons in evaluations and disseminate them more effective to operational staff and DMC clients. These are among the challenges that IED will need to address more effectively in the coming years.

Key Findings

The review finds that IED’s product mix has been fairly stable over the past five years. In 2012-2016, IED completed a total of 506 evaluation and validation products. These included an annual average of 7-8 high-level evaluations, which comprise 5-7 corporate and thematic evaluations (including the Annual Evaluation Review and large topical papers) and 1 country assistance program evaluation (CAPE). Other IED products include 1 impact evaluation, 8 project performance evaluation reports (PPERs) and one TA performance evaluation report (TPER), as well as 78 project-level and 3 country-level validation reports.

In keeping with the smaller number of ADB operations, IED produces about one-fifth as many PPERs/TPERs and validations of project completion reports (PVRs) and validations of extended annual review reports (XVRs) as the World Bank Group’s Independent Evaluation Group does but the number of high-level evaluations in both independent evaluation units is identical.

The majority of IED staff and most ADB interlocutors seem to agree that the most important objective of IED is ensuring accountability. At the same time, they all
recognize the potential for extracting more learning value from the wealth of knowledge generated by IED. The Self-Evaluation found that the purpose and scope of the corporate evaluation (CES), thematic evaluation (TES), and CAPE is appropriate and similar to those undertaken by evaluation departments in other multilateral development banks and their methodology is broadly consistent with the guidelines established by the Evaluation Cooperation Group formed by the heads of evaluation organizations of the multilateral development banks. The main issues identified on CES and TES were the number of evaluations and the bunching at the end of the financial year.

The review found contrasting views between Board and Management on IED’s strategic evaluations. The DEC Chair and members, as well as the few Board members interviewed placed a high value on the CES and TES produced by IED in the last few years. They found the evaluations to be very informative and of high quality, and felt that the evaluations enhanced ADB’s focus on the key strategic themes—inclusive growth, environmentally sustainable growth, regional cooperation and integration as well as disaster risk management—which are strongly embedded in ADB’s corporate strategy. While ADB Management recognized IED’s contribution to these strategic themes, most ADB management interlocutors felt these were responding more to the concern of shareholders than to operational needs, and expressed a desire to see a rebalancing of priorities towards evaluation products targeted at operations.

However, the nature and scope of validation work is not entirely clear to IED and ADB staff. IED’s role should be to use a standardized template and guidelines to validate the self-evaluations prepared by operational units in project-level completion reports and country-level CPS Final Reviews, based on the evidence provided by operational teams. Instead, IED often finds itself in the position of having to defend the quality of evidence that underpins its judgment in the validation reports. Distinguishing the responsibilities of IED from those of ADB operational units should be a high priority to clarify the basis for validation ratings.

There is room to raise IED’s efficiency in managing financial and staff resources. While the overall volume of its budget allocation from ADB and its staff strength has been fairly stable, two issues affect efficient resource management.

First, evaluation teams lack complete budget awareness as they are allocated consultant budgets only. Staff costs are paid off-the-top and are not tracked, which makes it very difficult for IED management and IED evaluation staff to plan and manage full evaluation budgets effectively. The consequence of this budget management gap is most severe in the resources expended on Country Partnership Strategy Final Review Validations (CPSFRVs) where staff costs constitute a larger share of the real cost. These country validations cost much more than what they do at the comparator evaluation unit of the World Bank, because unlike in the latter, at ADB they include extensive field confirmation as well. Indeed, it is critical to note though that the CPSFRVs entail missions and in-country evidence gathering in contrast to the comparator evaluation unit’s approach of confining their country validations to desk reviews. The introduction of a time-management system at ADB in January 2017 will make it feasible to track full costs going forward but this will need a determined management effort. A rethinking of the methodology of country validations may also be needed.

Second, staff deployment for evaluations can be more strategic. Staff are considered fungible and work across the full range of evaluation products. The lack of specialization according to skills, experience, and comparative advantage leads to suboptimal staff use both for international staff (IS), national staff (NS) and administrative staff (AS).

Main Issues and Proposed Actions

The Self-Evaluation identified four issues—(i) Product Mix, (ii) Quality Assurance, (iii) Knowledge and Learning, and (iv) Management Action Record System (MARS)—on which actions could be taken in the near term to strengthen the effectiveness and impact of IED. The evaluation undertakes a problem diagnosis for these four sets of issues and lays out a set of proposed actions to strengthen delivery, effectiveness, efficiency, and use of people for each of these four sets.
The product mix could be rebalanced from corporate and thematic evaluations towards more operational products, with an increase in the number of sectorwide evaluations, simplification (reduced intensity) of CPSFRVs, and of reinstating Sector Assistance Program Evaluations (SAPEs) for field-based sector reviews at the country level.

Staff resources could be deployed more effectively through more transparent budget management and revisiting the design of validations of CPS Final Reviews, and reorganization of IED staff into specialized divisions for corporate/thematic and country evaluations, and another for sector (including private sector) and project evaluations.

Quality assurance could be enhanced by revising the guidelines particularly for country evaluation products, providing more support up-front to evaluation teams on methodology, and increasing the guidance and rigor of quality assurance reviews especially for validation products.

The potential for gaining knowledge from IED evaluations can be enhanced by introducing a more deliberate strategy to produce and disseminate synthesis products and synopsis of evaluation findings, and by modifying the MARS and by investing more directly in disseminating lessons learned from evaluations to operational staff and DMC clients.

**Recommendations**

For IED to achieve its intended purpose, the Self-Evaluation puts forward a set of recommendations responding to issues identified on the product mix, quality assurance, knowledge and learning, and the MARS process, as well as on related organizational adjustments that would be needed to ensure delivery of actions on the identified issues. A critical starting point for these recommendations is the organizational adjustments needed to encourage staff specialization and more efficient deployment of IS, NS and AS.

**Recommendation 1: Product Mix**

(i) Rebalance the product mix by reducing the number of corporate and thematic evaluations;

(ii) Refine the focus of the CAPE to evaluate the country strategy and assistance program, simplify the design of the CPSFRV, and rebalance the number of CAPEs and CPSFRVs; and

(iii) Redeploy the savings to increase the number of direct operational evaluation products by increasing project evaluations and reintroducing the sectorwide evaluations (SES) and the SAPEs as stand-alone evaluations of sector programs at the country level.

**Recommendation 2: Organizational Adjustments**

(i) Reorganize IED into (a) one division for corporate, thematic and country evaluations (CES, TES, CAPE, CPSFRV); (b) one division for sector and project evaluations (SES, SAPE, PPER/PVR/XVR), including private sector/nonsovereign operations; (c) support groups under the Deputy Director General to assist the evaluation teams on communication and outreach and raise IED work on knowledge and evaluation capacity development for staff both in ADB (including IED) and client countries; and

(ii) Organize better evaluation teams by delinking IS, NS, and AS and establishing pools of NS and AS from which team members are assigned and staff time programmed to each evaluation product.

**Recommendation 3: Quality Assurance**

(i) Strengthen systems for annual work programming and deployment of mapping all staff (IS, NS, and AS) to evaluation products to ensure realistic time planning and balanced workflow for all staff; and

(ii) Institutionalize a quality assurance system that provides (a) early and continuing support to evaluation teams on methodology, with high-level technical advice by the Front Office on corporate, thematic and sector evaluations, and (b) reviews of project-level validations by designated quality assurers in the division focusing on sectors and projects.

**Recommendation 4: Knowledge and Learning**

(i) Adopt a more deliberate approach to knowledge and learning by ensuring that
two support groups are institutionalized—one for communication and outreach support to evaluation teams in capturing and disseminating lessons from evaluation products, and another to raise the evaluation capacity development work, both internal and external to ADB, of IED;

(ii) Invest more deliberately in producing synthesis and synopsis of evaluation findings; and make greater use of new technologies and collaborative events to disseminate lessons learned to operational staff and DMC clients; and

(iii) Promote knowledge exchange across evaluation agencies by encouraging staff participation in communities of practice under the ECG.

Recommendation 5: Redesign MARS
(i) Modify the MARS format to focus on evaluations as a whole rather than individual recommendations and include key evaluation findings and the context of recommendations in the MARS; and

(ii) Modify the MARS process to increase periodicity of updates to annual or biannual reports on each evaluation, and use the engagement process at the end of the MARS monitoring period to prepare a closing statement on lessons learned that can be shared with DEC.
CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1. The Independent Evaluation Department (IED) is charged with evaluating the strategy and operational effectiveness of the Asian Development Bank (ADB). IED’s strategic goal is to accelerate ADB’s development effectiveness through independent evaluation. IED is undertaking a self-evaluation of its work program, and the effectiveness, efficiency, and impact of its evaluation products and services.

2. Originally known as the Post-Evaluation Office, the Operations Evaluation Department (OED) was established in 1978. Over the years, the department has undergone several organizational changes, leading to the establishment of an independent department on 1 January 2004, reporting to the Board of Directors through the Development Effectiveness Committee (DEC). OED’s functions, priorities, and procedures were embodied in the 2003 Board paper on enhancing OED’s independence and effectiveness, as amended in 2008, and the associated Operations Manual section on operations evaluation. Following the external review of OED in 2008, a new policy was adopted strengthening the independence of its evaluation function and the department was renamed as IED.

3. Under its 2008 Policy, IED is responsible for undertaking evaluation activities to help the Board of Directors, ADB Management, and decision-makers in developing member countries (DMCs) who are responsible for planning, designing, and implementing ADB-supported projects and programs to understand whether resources have been well spent, and whether the planned outcomes have been achieved. Evaluation covers all aspects of ADB operations, including the policies, strategies, selections, practices, and procedures that govern them.

4. In 2012, IED commissioned a self-evaluation to assess key aspects of the effectiveness and identify ways in which this effectiveness could be improved. It also reviewed IED’s independence in light of the changes that were implemented with the 2008 Evaluation Policy and identified issues (including smaller operational and practical issues) that may still be affecting aspects of this independence, and developed a set of recommended actions for IED management.

A. Methodology of the Self-Evaluation

1. Purpose and Scope

5. This Self-Evaluation has been undertaken to take stock of the relevance and effectiveness of IED’s evaluation products and processes, and to identify opportunities to enhance the quality and influence of IED’s evaluations. The Self-Evaluation will also inform the upcoming external evaluation of IED being commissioned by DEC in 2017. It

---

builds on the work and recommendations of the 2008 external review and the 2012 Self-Evaluation of IED and complements the findings from the 2016 Report of focus group discussions (FGDs) following the 2015 Staff Engagement Survey. It aims to identify outstanding or new issues that could be addressed to strengthen IED’s effectiveness and impact.

6. The team has used quick feedback loops to review the product mix of the evaluations and validations undertaken by IED in the last five years and sought candid feedback on the value and impact of IED’s work from key stakeholders in ADB and IED to identify the issues or nodes that need attention. The Self-Evaluation applied the D.E.E.P. framework (Delivery, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and People) to identify action points for each of the critical issues/nodes identified.

2. Conceptual Framework

7. The literature on evaluation use and influence reveals that the uptake of the knowledge generated by evaluative inquiry depends on evaluation products, e.g., credibility, relevance, findings, timeliness, and quality, and the decision setting that the evaluation process seeks to influence, e.g., information needs, characteristics of decision makers, receptiveness to the findings, and timeliness (Cousins and Leithwood 1986; Alkin and Taut 2003; Leviton 2003; Weiss 1998; Patton 2008; Johnson et al. 2009). To be effective, evaluators who aim to promote the use of the knowledge they generate and influence change need to be concerned both about supply-side and demand-side factors.

8. The conceptual framework for the Self-Evaluation recognizes the significance of supply-side factors (evaluation inputs) and demand-side factors (evaluation process) as determinants of the quality and influence of evaluation products. Figure 1 spells out the factors under each of these characteristics that are inherent in the underlying assumptions on which IED’s evaluation work is based. The degree to which individual evaluations achieve the desired outcomes—high quality and influence—can be affected by the attention paid to the underlying evaluation inputs and processes.

---

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework


---

9. The Self-Evaluation used multiple methods of data collection and analysis, including desk analysis of IED outputs and budget data, semi-structured interviews with members of DEC and other Board chairs, ADB Management and senior staff who have been more engaged with IED evaluations; an IED staff survey; FGDs with IED staff; and a review of the content, production process, outputs and costs of IED’s evaluation products. The IED staff survey was undertaken from 22 December 2016 to 13 January 2017. The interviews and FGDs were conducted between 17-27 January 2017. Appendix 1 provides a detailed discussion of the methodology.

B. Findings from Previous Reviews of IED

10. Findings from previous reviews remain relevant to IED today, even though many of their recommendations have been implemented.

1. 2008 External Review

11. The 2008 review concluded that ADB has a clearly articulated model of independent evaluation that emphasized organizational and behavioral independence, protection from external influence, and avoidance of conflict of interest. It said that OED's credibility as an independent evaluation unit could be further enhanced by the following measures: (i) the non-renewable term of Director General, OED to be expanded from 3 to 5 years; (ii) Director General, OED to be appointed by the Board, upon recommendation of the DEC in consultation with the President; (iii) the selection process for Director General, OED to be led by the DEC and strengthened through the use of an executive search firm and extensive media advertising; (iv) Director General, OED to be exempted from the formal performance review process with his/her salary determined by a formula; (v) OED's budget to be approved by the Board separately from ADB's overall administrative budget; and (vi) OED to be renamed the IED to reflect its enhanced independent status. As a result of the 2008 review, ADB revised its policy adopting most of the measures recommended to strengthen the independence of evaluation effective 1 January 2009 and renamed OED as IED.

2. 2012 Self-Evaluation

12. The 2012 Self-Evaluation commissioned by IED found that its current mandate laid out in the Policy was largely appropriate. But for greater focus and impact, it recommended (i) strengthening the independence of the Director General to review and comment on all crucial aspects of ADB’s strategy, directions as well as its self-evaluation systems and practices; (ii) broadening the expected scope and impact of the Annual Evaluation Review (AER); and (iii) giving more attention to high-level (sectoral, thematic, and corporate) evaluations. One important recommendation was to improve the quality and relevance of its evaluations, especially in high-level evaluations, by enhancing the focus on ADB’s strategic positioning, i.e., whether ADB has been doing the right things, in addition to focusing on whether ADB has been doing things right; thus, strengthening the attention to strategic options and policy selections.

3. 2016 Focus Group Discussions

13. Following the 2015 Staff Engagement Survey, IED commissioned a consultancy study to obtain additional feedback from IED staff on the underlying reasons driving staff discontent. The report focused mainly on internal processes within IED (footnote 3). Of those, the issue most relevant to this Self-Evaluation was the discussion of workload distribution and allocation with staff concerns about the lack of systematic approach and
transparency in the allocation of studies, resulting in uneven and ad hoc distribution of workload. Better sequencing and timing, and early involvement of staff with more two-way communication in work programming, identified as key actions remain relevant.

4. Structure of the Report

14. The Self-Evaluation is structured as follows: Chapter 2 discusses the finding of the report. Based on the findings, Chapter 3 organizes the issues into four categories and lists possible actions that can be taken following the D.E.E.P framework. The final chapter presents conclusions and offers recommendations to IED.
15. IED’s product mix has been fairly stable over the past 5 years. The majority of IED staff and most ADB interlocutors seem to agree that the most important objective of IED is ensuring accountability. In the IED survey, the objectives most frequently rated high priority by IED staff were Ensuring Accountability (68%); Strengthening IED’s role to advise ADB policies and strategies (54%); and Evaluating impacts of development interventions (51%). Promoting learning by sharing evaluation knowledge and outreach was scored high by 49%, while other objectives were viewed as less of a priority. In terms of objectives, ADB Management concurred with the perception of IED staff that IED’s primary focus has been on accountability.

16. The Self-Evaluation found that the purpose and scope of the corporate evaluation (CES), thematic evaluation (TES) and Country Assistance Program Evaluation (CAPE) are appropriate and similar to those undertaken by evaluation departments in other multilateral development banks (MDBs) and their methodology is broadly consistent with the guidelines established by the Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG) formed by the heads of evaluation organizations of the MDBs. Positive feedback was received from DEC members on the scope and quality of the CES and TES. ADB Management identified timeliness and quality as issues in few instances but most of all pointed to the sheer volume of CESs and TESs as being greater than their absorptive capacity. IED staff too identified the relatively high volume of CESs and TESs and bunching with overlapping demands on senior staff as being a significant constraint to producing high quality, influential evaluations.

17. However, the nature and scope of validation work is not entirely clear to IED and ADB staff. The primary responsibility for preparing project completion reports (PCRs) and extended annual review reports (XARRs) lies with operational staff. Similarly, the primary responsibility for preparing country partnership strategy final reviews (CPSFRs) lies with the operational staff in ADB Headquarters or Resident Missions. IED’s role should be to use a standardized template and guidelines to validate the assessment in the PCRs, XARRs, and CPSFRs, based on the evidence provided to support the self-evaluations undertaken by operational units. IED often finds itself in the position of having to defend the quality of the evidence that underpins its judgment in the validations of PCRs (PVRs), XARRs (XVRs), and CPSFRs (CPSFRVs). This is an inversion of the standard practice adopted by independent evaluation departments in other MDBs where the responsibility for producing evidence rests entirely with operational units. Distinguishing the responsibilities of IED from those of ADB operational units should be a high priority to clarify the basis for validation ratings.
A. Findings from the Desk Review

1. IED Outputs

18. In 2012–2016, IED completed a total of 506 evaluation and validation products (Appendix 2, Table A2.1). These included an annual average of 7-8 high-level evaluations, which comprise 5-7 CESs and TESs (including the Annual Evaluation Review and large topical papers) and 1 CAPE. Other IED products include 1 impact evaluation, 8 project performance evaluation reports (PPERs) and one TA performance evaluation report (TPER), as well as 78 project-level and 3 country-level validation reports (CPSFRVs). In addition, IED produced an average of 2 topical papers and 1–2 publications on lessons learned.

19. Comparing IED’s outputs with the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) at the World Bank Group can give a better perspective of IED work. IED produces about one-fifth as many PPERs/TPERs and PVRs and XVRs as IEG does but the number of high-level evaluations in both independent evaluation units is identical. Consequently, IED spends a larger share of its budget on high-level evaluations that inform corporate or country strategies than IEG does, while IEG produces more operational evaluations. This is consistent with a perception among ADB Management, supported somewhat by DEC members and IED staff that IED could be more selective in programming corporate and thematic evaluations to rebalance its work program.

2. Budget Analysis

20. A key limitation of IED, which is common to the rest of ADB, is that the absence of dollar budgeting makes it very difficult for IED management and IED evaluation staff to plan and manage full evaluation budgets effectively. Budgeting of individual evaluation products is done in terms of consultant costs, while staff time is paid for off-the-top. Team leaders are expected to manage evaluation budgets but since IED lacked a time recording system for staff until 2017, it was impossible to track full costs in real time.4

21. This Self-Evaluation made a special effort to compile consultant and staff costs using a sample consisting of 2016 evaluation products to enable a more informed discussion on value-for-money and efficiency.5 The main findings are:

(i) The number of evaluation staff has increased marginally from 26 international staff (IS) and 10 national staff (NS) to 27 IS and 12 NS.6

(ii) Aggregate staff costs have steadily increased from $4.4 million in 2012 to $5.4 million in 2016.

(iii) IED has been using technical assistance (TA) more to engage consultants with TA consultant costs increasing from $1.9 million in 2012 to $3.0 million in 2016.

(iv) With the engagement of more experts to improve the depth and widen the coverage of CES and TES, based on partial data from consultant costs, the average costs on CES and TES have been increasing from $124,889 in 2010–2012 to $210,100 in 2013-2014 to $315,780 in 2015. The 2016 costs are higher but this is attributable to the 2016 safeguard evaluation, which was an outlier.

---

4 A time management system has been introduced to IED as of January 2017.
5 Budget data are available in Appendix 2 (Tables A2.2–A2.5).
6 Total IED staff strength at the end of 2016 was 53, including 14 administrative staff.
Consultant costs for CAPEs increased slightly from $291,000 in 2010-2012 to $340,000 in 2015, and $393,000 for the 2016 Sri Lanka CAPE. For CAPEs in countries with large portfolios, where IED needs to employ more instruments (e.g., surveys) and cover more ground, the consultant costs can be higher, e.g., the ongoing India CAPE exceeds $700,000.

Estimated staff cost averaged at around $280 thousand for more recent Sri Lanka CAPE and India CAPE (still ongoing when the Self-Evaluation was being prepared). The staff and consultant cost on the Sri Lanka CAPE was $647,833, which is comparable to the average costs of CAPEs at the World Bank.

The consultant costs of CPSFRV for recent CPSFRVs is about $62,443. In the Bangladesh and Vietnam CPSFRVs (for which staff costs are available), staff costs averaged an additional $120,872 and total CPSFRVs costs averaged $215,062, eight times the cost of similar validations at the World Bank. However, it is critical to note that the IEG validations are purely desk reviews as opposed to IED’s CPSFRVs which include missions and in-country evidence gathering.

While consultant costs on CAPEs are more than six times that of CPSFRVs, when staff costs are added, CPSFRVs cost about one third as much as a CAPE.

In 2016, the average PVR cost $9,817, while the average XVR cost $9,118.

In summary, there has been an increase in IED investment in CES and TES but the unit cost of these evaluations is in line with that at other independent evaluation organizations. The project-level validations are slightly more expensive than those at IEG and the validations of CPSFRs are several orders of magnitude more expensive than those at IEG because of country verifications. Indeed, it is worth noting though that ADB’s validations of CPSFRs entail field missions and evidence gathering, and has a much broader and deeper coverage than the standardized template-based desk reviews done by IEG. This broader and deeper coverage is a reason why regional departments in ADB highly value CPSFRVs as inputs to the next country strategies, almost similar to a CAPE.

B. Findings from IED Staff Survey and Focus Group Discussions

1. IED Staff Survey

The self-evaluation solicited feedback from IED staff and consultants who have had multiple years of experience in IED evaluations through a perception survey. This received a very high response rate (88%) from the universe of 90 people. The main messages from the survey are:

(i) The most useful evaluation products are the CAPEs (75%); and TES (68%).

(ii) The least useful products are the AER (56%); and PVRs (44%). PVRs were also identified most frequently (45%) as the evaluation product with weak quality.

---

7 This estimate is based on the average of the CPSFRVs for Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Kazakhstan, Mongolia, Myanmar, Philippines, Solomon Islands, and Vietnam.

8 The average cost of validations of completion and learning reviews of country partnership strategies at the World Bank was $25,000 for the 20 completed in FY2015 and 21 in FY2016.

9 The percentages reflect the share of respondents who identified the corresponding product or response from a multiple choice questionnaire administered to the universe of 90 IED staff and consultants, almost equally divided among the two categories of respondents.
The most frequent causes of complaints about quality are perceived to be because of (a) disagreement on findings (57%); or (b) insufficient evidence to support the conclusions (40%).

Among the activities that IED staff would like to see more of, the highest ranked were: (a) collaboration with operations on monitoring and evaluation (67%); (b) synthesis of evaluation findings (56%); and (c) more forward-looking evaluations (54%).

According to staff, steps that IED management could take to enhance quality are to provide: (a) early feedback on evaluation findings (49%); and (b) more guidance on methodology (43%).

And in their opinion, the most important steps to strengthen dissemination are: (a) production of syntheses of evaluation lessons (60%); and (b) timely dissemination feeding into Bank processes (48%).

Focus Group Discussions with IED Staff

Four FGDs were organized with IED staff to obtain qualitative feedback and explanations to supplement the findings from the perception survey. The main messages from the FGDs are:

(i) IED has too many flagships or strategic-level products compared to available staff resources and deliverables tend to be bunched towards the end of the fiscal year. Staff members are stretched across multiple products with insufficient time or resources to follow through on evaluation lessons and dissemination.

(ii) Partly (but not entirely) due to management transition, staff feel the need for better management support to address: (a) insufficient guidance on evaluation methodology, (b) uneven feedback on analytical findings early during the evaluation process, (c) second guessing by IED management sometimes despite contrary evidence, and (d) insufficient support to evaluation teams during the one-stop meeting and (e) discussions with ADB Management affected evaluation quality and staff morale.

(iii) The Annual Evaluation Review (AER) serves solely as a reporting device to the Board. For ADB Management and operational staff it is not useful because it appears concurrently with the annual Development Effectiveness Review (DEfR), which is considered more important by ADB. The AER has been evolving each year but there is little new information beyond what has already been said in other evaluations and the DEfR, other than the management action record system (MARS) which, in its current form, does not contain any evaluation lessons.

(iv) Agreement that PVRs are the weakest of IED evaluation products. PVRs and XVRs constitute almost 80% of IED outputs but their quality is affected by the low priority given to them by staff, and by the weak quality assurance review, which increases the risk of inconsistencies across evaluators. PVRs also depend on the quality of PCRs and XARRs, which also tend to be inadequate.

(v) When staff are assigned as team members of multiple evaluation products they are unable to provide high quality inputs because IED does not have a systematic process for staff time planning as part of work program formulation.

The four FGDs consisted of one each from the three organizational units within IED, plus one FGD exclusively with NS/AS. The FGDs did not take into account the current 2017 AER which introduced reporting of recommendation implementation by report and proposed improvements in MARS.
(vi) Quality suffers from lack of specialization among staff members who may be assigned to multiple tasks from strategic-level evaluations to PVRs rather than working on evaluation products where they have a comparative advantage.

(vii) Both evaluation officers (NS) and administrative staff (AS)—feel that the practice of assigning them to IS rather than to evaluation products and tasks is detrimental to the quality of their work and to IED’s outputs. The current method prevents NS from working on evaluation products they prefer to work on or where they have a comparative advantage, and also leads to uneven workloads across staff.

(viii) When asked what is the one thing they would like to change in IED, the most frequent responses from IED staff were:
(a) Methodology and rigor, and quality control;
(b) Staff mentoring, orientation training, evaluation capacity development within IED;
(c) Better management and planning of tasks, timelines, resources and teams; and
(d) More opportunities to engage with and learn from operations.

25. These findings complement the views of the DEC and ADB Management.

3. Semi-Structured Interviews with DEC, ADB Management, and Senior Staff

26. The views expressed by DEC Chair and members, as well as the few Board members interviewed, differ from those expressed by most ADB management interlocutors in one important respect. Board members interviewed placed a high value on the CES and TES produced by IED in the last few years. They found the evaluations to be very informative and of high quality, and felt that the evaluations enhanced ADB’s focus on the key strategic themes—inclusive growth, environmentally sustainable growth, regional cooperation and integration as well as disaster risk management—which are strongly embedded in ADB’s corporate strategy. While ADB Management recognized IED’s contribution to these strategic themes, management felt these were responding more to the concern of shareholders than to operational needs, and expressed a desire to see a rebalancing of priorities towards evaluation products targeted at operations.

27. The second major issue revolved around quality. Experience arising from the recent evaluation on safeguards illustrated the need to be extremely rigorous and transparent on evaluation methodology and the need to time corporate and thematic evaluations more carefully to achieve maximum impact.

28. The discussions also pointed to quality weaknesses in the validations, which appear to suffer the most from lack of consistency and invariably also from a dearth of evidence. However, there appears to be a misconception in ADB with the lack of evidence being portrayed as a weakness of IED validations. The burden of providing evidence for validations should rest with ADB Management and operations, IED’s task being to validate the assessment in the completion reports prepared by operations. While IED needs to enhance its efforts to achieve consistency in validations, IED also needs to reach

11 The current practice for NS and AS is to be assigned to three IS staff and to work on the tasks assigned to the IS they report to, regardless of their own skill sets or interests. NSs are treated as research assistants of the IS they are assigned to, rather than as evaluation specialists themselves.
a clear agreement with DEC and ADB Management that the burden of providing evidence for validations should rest with ADB operational units.

29. DEC and ADB Management expressed support for the following actions:
   (i) IED could increase the focus on evaluation knowledge, going beyond the current focus on accountability and ratings by investing more in synthesizing knowledge gained and sharing them within ADB and with client countries after evaluations are completed
   (ii) IED and ADB management could jointly consider ways of enhancing dissemination of knowledge gained from evaluation to staff, and how to apply this knowledge to strengthen monitoring and evaluation design in ADB operations.

30. The MARS design could be revised to enhance learning by including information about the evaluation findings and context of the recommendations, and adding an endline summary when all the recommendations have been acted upon to bring the MARS process for each evaluation to closure.
CHAPTER 3

Main Issues and Proposed Actions

31. The Self-Evaluation identified four issues: (i) product mix; (ii) quality assurance; (iii) knowledge and learning; and (iv) MARS—on which actions could be taken in the near term to strengthen the overall effectiveness and impact of IED. These issues are further classified on how they relate to IED’s delivery of its work program and products, effectiveness, efficiency and people (Table 1).

Table 1: Issues for Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Delivery</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product Mix</td>
<td>Overload of strategic-level evaluations, with some duplication</td>
<td>Making strategic products useful for Board members, and for corporate and country strategy</td>
<td>Selectivity in strategic-level evaluations; SAPEs as distinct from CAPEs and CPSFRVs</td>
<td>Variable quality; operational and evaluation experience crucial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>Guidelines for CAPE and CPSFRV lack distinction in methodology and confuse scope</td>
<td>Variable quality reveals gaps in Quality Assurance, especially for validation products</td>
<td>One-Stop Meeting perceived as too late; no technical Quality Assurance for country-level and project outputs</td>
<td>Absence of specialization affects quality; no designated technical “gurus”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and Learning</td>
<td>EVIS, Learning Curves; project document reviews ad hoc</td>
<td>Targeted to Board/DEC and media; little for operational staff</td>
<td>Evaluation lessons not searchable or easily retrievable</td>
<td>Knowledge and Learning function at Front Office but little support to evaluation teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARS</td>
<td>Fragmented, lacks links to evaluation findings and context</td>
<td>Perceived as burden with little value added; No closure</td>
<td>One-time reporting by recommendation to monitor progress not optimal</td>
<td>ADB staff question value added of current structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADB = Asian Development Bank, CAPE = country assistance program evaluation, CPSFRV = country partnership strategy final review, DEC = Development Effectiveness Committee, EVIS = evaluation information system, SAPE = sector assistance program evaluation.
A. Product Mix

1. Problem Diagnostics

32. The product mix at IED contains three distinct types of evaluation products: (i) strategic-level evaluations; (ii) country-level evaluation products; and (iii) sector evaluation products, including project-level PPERs and PVRs, country-level SAPEs and cross-country sectorwide evaluations (SES). The problem diagnostics for each of these types of evaluation products is discussed separately below.

a. Strategic-level Evaluations

33. These include CES and TES. The main findings are:

(i) The number of complex evaluations undertaken annually is on the higher side compared to IED resources and ADB absorptive capacity. Now that the main strategic issues arising out of ADB’s long-term strategy have been covered, it should be more feasible to be more selective.

(ii) There is evidence of work overload on senior evaluation staff who have the evaluation skills to undertake strategic evaluations; and team leaders are not provided with sufficient budget to produce high quality evaluation approach papers (EAP) with a portfolio review and a fully developed methodology.

(iii) The planning and preparation for complex evaluations is constrained by the absence of real budget data. As practiced ADB, allocations are only made and tracked for the variable budget expended on consultants while staff costs and expenses are allocated off-the-top and not tracked separately leading to inefficiencies in resource management.

(iv) While team members may be identified in the EAP, the amount of time that staff members are expected to contribute is not specified. In the absence of systematic work planning of staff resources ad hoc utilization of staff leads to overlapping demands on their time and affects quality.

b. Country-level Evaluation Products

34. These include CAPEs and CPSFRVs, and the main findings are:

(i) In 2012–2016, IED produced an average of 1 CAPE and 5–7 CPSFRVs per year. Both use a four-point rating scale and the ratings tend to converge around the middle two—moderately satisfactory or moderately unsatisfactory.

(ii) Guidelines require either CAPEs or CPSFRVs prior to approving a new CPS.

(iii) Guidelines for producing CAPEs and CPSFRVs, including data collection procedures, are similar.\footnote{Both are covered by the 2015 Guidelines for the Preparation of Country Assistance Program Evaluations and Country Partnership Strategy Final Review Validations.} Validations are just treated as lighter versions of CAPEs. The main difference is that a CAPE covers more than one CPS period, while the CPSFRV covers only one CPS period. Both focus primarily on the performance of the lending portfolio rather than the strategic issues in the CPS. And instead of limiting itself to validating the results and evidence in the CPS final reviews, the CPSFRV substitutes for lack of evidence in the Final Reviews by gathering additional information.
from field visits. Inevitably, the validations generate less evidence than
needed for a full assessment of the CPS, which allows ADB Management
to dispute the CPSFRV findings due to lack of evidence. Since the
CPSFRVs are validations, responsibility for providing evidence should lie
with operational units, not IED.

(iv) Some operations departments mentioned that the findings and lessons
in CAPEs and CPSFRVs are useful for CPS preparation, although some
were also critical of the quality of country products. Some Board
members also found these products to be quite useful.

(v) ADB staff are often unable to distinguish between CAPEs and CPSFRVs
since they resemble each other, but complaints about CPSFRV quality
are more frequent. IED prepares a separate EAP for each validation,
undertakes country visits to fill information gaps in the CPS Final
Reviews, assesses sector and operational results and aggregates them to
arrive at a judgment of CPS performance. In comparator evaluation
organizations, validations use a standardized template and do not
require a separate EAP or country missions.

(vi) The guidelines for IED’s country-level products need to be revisited to
strengthen the evaluation methodology and clearly distinguish the role
and structure of CAPEs from that of the CPSFRVs.

(vii) As discussed in the budget analysis above, on a relative scale, staff costs
on the validations are higher. While consultant costs on CAPEs are more
than six times that on CPSFRVs, when staff costs are added, validations
cost about one third as much as a CAPE. While CAPE costs are in line
with those at comparators like IEG, IED CPSFRVs cost much higher than
IEG validations. But the approaches of IED and IEG on conducting
country strategy validations are quite different. As mentioned earlier,
the IEG validations are limited to desk reviews while IED’s CPSFRVs entail
missions and in-country evidence gathering.

(viii) One notable characteristic is the need to give more attention to skill sets
for country evaluation products. In some instances, IED staff who are
sector experts are asked to work on country evaluations. Their evaluation
or validation products tend to be weaker than those with strategic-level
skills.

c. Sector Evaluation Products

35. Sector evaluation products currently consist primarily of project-level PPERs and
PVRs, although there are instances of SES among high-level evaluations. The main
findings are:

(i) Sector evaluations have been confined largely to PPERs/PVRs since 2012,
when sector evaluations at the country-level (SAPE) were integrated into
the CAPE. The profile of sector work needs to be reconsidered to balance
project level evaluations with meso-level SAPEs, and complex SES.

(ii) ADB Management and senior staff found the discontinued stand-alone
SAPEs done in past to be quite useful and suggested that these be
reintroduced. These products were particularly useful for sector specialists.

(iii) PVRs suffer from weaknesses and lack of consistency in quality due to
lack of clarity on the main function of quality assurers, to check
evaluation methodology or technical quality on sector issues.
2. Proposed Actions

36. Using the D.E.E.P framework recently introduced by IED, the following actions can be taken to address the findings on product mix:

(i) **Delivery.** Rebalance the product mix by:

(a) Rebalancing the number of CES/TES vis-à-vis project evaluations, of which one CES/TES is designated as a flagship with longer lead time for more complex or controversial topics.

(b) Maintain the number of IED country reports, while producing more CAPEs and proportionately reducing the number of CPSFRVs (and their intensity), alternating for each CPS cycle wherever possible.

(c) To the current work program of PPERs, PVRs and XVRs, and SES, reintroduce SAPEs with country missions to assess high priority sector programs at country level focusing more on sector policy, operational design, capacity, and implementation issues.

(ii) **Effectiveness.** Target evaluations to different audiences to ensure absorptive capacity; mobilize essential expertise early to ensure high quality EAP.

(a) Revise the 2015 CAPE and CPSFRV guidelines to clearly demarcate the purpose and structure of CAPEs from CPSFRVs, and consider adopting a broader rating scale to permit greater differentiation of quality among country evaluations.

(b) Redefine the CAPE as country strategy and program evaluation (CSPE) to assess strategy and program design, moving beyond operational ratings.

(c) Draw on SAPEs to produce SES on priority sectors and to inform CAPEs and CPSFRVs, and strengthen quality assurance and engagement with operational units and thematic groups to ensure operational relevance.

(iii) **Efficiency.** Allocate real budgets including staff time to allow better planning; and provide more lead time and resources for complex/controversial evaluations.

(a) Systematize an annual work programming exercise mapping all staff to evaluation products and allocating staff time to products to ensure realistic workflow management and balanced workload for all staff.

(b) Reduce the intensity of the CPSFRVs (considerations may include converting CPSFRV to a desk review of the country strategy and performance of lending and non-lending operational program (complemented by field-based SAPEs).

(c) Redeploy savings from CPSFRVs to increase the number of CAPEs (redefined as CSPE), and for stand-alone SAPEs to inform CAPEs/CPSFRVs and SES.

(d) Take complementary measures to benefit from and maximize efficiency gains from redesigned CPSFRVs, using savings from CPSFRV to finance SAPEs to cover sovereign and non-sovereign operations, and timing SAPEs to inform CAPE/CPSFRV/SES.

(iv) **People.** Reorganize IED into two divisions which enable better mapping of specialists to units and products where they have a comparative advantage, and organize evaluation teams that make better use of NS.

(a) Reorganize IED to bring all specialists with country and corporate evaluation expertise under one division for corporate,
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Thematic, and country evaluations (CES, TES, CAPE, and CPSFRV); and bring all sector experts for sector and project evaluations (SES, SAPE, PVR/PPER) and the private sector under another division.

(b) Organize better evaluation teams by delinking IS, NS and AS and establishing pools of NS and AS from which team members are assigned and staff time programmed to individual evaluation products at strategic, country, and sector levels.

(c) Develop a cadre of specialists with country evaluation expertise, and assign leadership responsibility for CAPEs and CPSFRVs to specialists who demonstrate expertise, capacity, and interest in country evaluations.

(d) Actively promote development assignments for staff exchange with operational units for cross-fertilization to ensure evaluators have sector knowledge and expertise, and operational staff are more familiar with evaluation methods and findings. These development assignments should be strategic for staff and IED.

B. Quality Assurance

1. Problem Diagnostics

37. Weak quality can be a reputation risk to IED. It is therefore imperative that a high-quality system for quality assurance be institutionalized to ensure quality and consistency in all IED evaluation products. The main findings are:

(i) A perception among ADB interlocutors that IED evaluation reports sometimes imposed preconceived ideas or philosophical positions (such as environmental sustainability) even when evaluating subjects where it was less relevant.

(ii) In some evaluations, interlocutors felt the need for IED to strengthen the evidence-base or representativeness of samples to support conclusions.

(iii) DEC members found IED evaluations to be very informative and useful. However, all stakeholders, including the DEC, ADB Management, and the IED staff shared the following concerns about evaluation quality which need to be given high priority:

(a) variability in quality of evaluation products, especially validations; the role of quality assurers for project-level evaluation products remains unclear.

(b) evaluation methodology not always robust or transparent;

(c) quality of recommendations—sometimes too vague and not actionable, often restating what ADB was already doing, hence redundant;

(d) in some evaluations, the messages and tone in the Executive Summary are not consistent with the findings in the main evaluation report.

(iv) All concept papers and reports and recommendations of the President of ADB operations are sent to IED for interdepartmental review. However, IED does not have a standardized format, or guidance and standards for commenting. A more systematic quality assurance process can be introduced to ensure independence and quality, consequently, making IED comments less ad hoc and more consistent.
2. Proposed Actions

38. Relying on the D.E.E.P framework, the following actions can be taken to address quality issues in IED evaluation products:

(i) **Delivery.** Plan and monitor product delivery quarterly rather than financial years to avoid bunching, however, allocate budgets across financial years accordingly. Ensure realistic workflow and balanced workload through annual work programming by mapping the staff time of each staff member to the different evaluation products they are assigned to work on.

(ii) **Effectiveness.** Institutionalize a quality assurance system that provides (a) early support to evaluation teams on methodology, with high-level technical advice by the Front Office on corporate, thematic, and sector evaluations, and (b) review of project-level validations by designated quality assurers in the IED division task with project evaluations. Overall responsibility for quality assurance of all evaluation products should rest with the Deputy Director General (DDG). Other proposed actions are:

- Strengthen the quality assurance system for project evaluations to undertake mandatory reviews of methodology to ensure consistency across all PPERs, PVRs, and XVRs.
- Strengthen IED’s role in commenting on concept papers and reports and recommendations of the President by developing formats, standards, and a quality assurance mechanism to maintain independence and strengthen quality.

(iii) **Efficiency.** Strengthen resource management by tracking consultant costs and staff costs, monitoring staff time and estimating staff costs for each evaluation product, to monitor real budget expenditures.

(iv) **People.** As part of the quality assurance system, designate, resource and deploy separate quality assurance Assurers for project-level validations, reporting to the Director.

C. Knowledge and Learning

1. Problem Diagnostics

39. The main findings on knowledge and learning are:

(i) Operational units focus more on evaluation findings, ratings, and recommendations than lessons from evaluation products.

(ii) Knowledge embedded in evaluation products is not sufficiently mined or disseminated.

(iii) IED has become better in knowledge sharing but most of that work was based in the Front Office with little support to evaluation teams on knowledge and learning activities.

(iv) Lessons from MARS implementation are not distilled and shared.

(v) Very little collaboration between IED and ADB operational units to enhance focus on results and knowledge and learning.

(vi) As part of the learning, work on evaluation capacity development for ADB staff (including IED staff) and country clients by IED needs to be institutionalized.

(vii) Limited opportunities for interaction between IED staff and counterparts in other evaluation agencies.
2. Proposed Actions

40. According the D.E.E.P framework, the following actions can be taken to address knowledge and learning issues in IED:

(i) **Delivery.** Produce and disseminate to operational staff, Board members and external audience:
   (a) Synthesis and evaluation lessons from PPERs/PVRs
   (b) Synopsis of key lessons of success and failure from major evaluations
   (c) Organize collaborative learning events and panel discussions

(ii) **Effectiveness.** Make greater use of information technology systems to disseminate and obtain feedback from social media and surveys on the influence of IED’s work.
   (a) Use blogs to disseminate evaluation findings and engage with operational colleagues on lessons learned.
   (b) Use e-Learning systems to disseminate lessons and encourage learning on demand.
   (c) Conduct regular client surveys to obtain feedback on effectiveness and influence.

(iii) **Efficiency.** Diversify mix of dissemination products making more use of information technology and audiovisual tools, such as brief videos summarizing evaluation findings, or interactive apps used for dissemination of the World Development Reports.

(iv) **People.**
   (a) Be more proactive in outreach and communication by converting the communication team currently in the Front Office into a formal support group dedicated to communication and outreach support to the evaluation teams.
   (b) Strengthen learning and capacity development, both internally in ADB (including IED) and externally to client countries, by converting the existing evaluation capacity development team in a support group for knowledge and evaluation capacity development.
   (c) Both support groups under (a) and (b) will be supervised by the Deputy Director General.
   (d) Initiate and encourage staff exchanges between IED and operational staff.
   (e) Promote knowledge exchange across evaluation agencies by encouraging staff participation in communities of practice under the ECG.

D. Management Action Record System

1. **Problem Diagnostics**

41. The pattern of acceptance and implementation of Independent Evaluation recommendations is tracked by the MARS established in 2008, which tracks agreed recommendations and the management responses, action plans, and follow up activities. The assessment of MARS implementation in the 2016 AER identified several findings that need attention. First, there has been a decline in acceptance of recommendations by ADB Management from 95% in 2012–2013 to 65% in 2014–2015, with many in the later period only partly accepted.\(^\text{13}\) Second, reporting and tracking is

\(^{13}\) The 2017 AER, however, shows a reversal with all recommendations fully or partly accepted.
focused more on individual actions proposed in response to sub-recommendations, rather than for the recommendations themselves. Third, the MARS process currently consists of one-time reporting on each action on the date when the action is due, regardless of whether the action has been completed or not. Incomplete actions are not tracked beyond the due date. Fourth the reported effect of one action can be limited if implementation of complementary actions has not been completed. The AER concludes that “unless the broader context of recommendations is captured effectively, the MARS process risks losing its relevance as a mechanism that links evaluations, corporate strategies, and ADB core operations.” (IED 2016: 45). The Self-Evaluation reiterates the findings of the 2016 AER and highlights the following issues that need to be addressed if the MARS is to serve as a useful instrument and process:

(i) MARS currently functions purely as an accountability tool fragmented across individual recommendations and actions.

(ii) One-time reporting on the due date of each action has made it a static exercise.

(iii) The evaluation context is not recorded and the MARS thus misses an opportunity to serve as an instrument for a learning process approach that can integrate any changes in the strategic or operational context.

(iv) Management and DEC would welcome a shift from a focus on recommendations only to a focus on evaluation context, evaluation findings, and recommendations.

(v) Management would welcome some mechanism or process to bring the MARS to closure, if it allows a revisiting of the context, and if it is not too burdensome.

(vi) DEC would welcome a closing statement to understand the influence of an evaluation and the future strategic directions at ADB.

42. As mentioned in para 37 (iii), there are concerns that the evaluation recommendations are sometimes too vague and not actionable. In the last quarter of 2016, IED started to implement the technical meeting on recommendations between IED and concerned departments before evaluations are finalized. This new meeting is intended to make the recommendations of evaluations clear, substantiated and actionable.

2. Proposed Actions

43. Applying the D.E.E.P framework, possible actions to reform and strengthen the MARS are:14

(i) **Delivery.** Redefine MARS objective as tracking implementation of evaluation recommendations and reporting on implementation lessons:

   (a) Shift unit of analysis from recommendations to the evaluation as a whole.

   (b) Refocus the unit of account from actions on subrecommendations to the full recommendation.

(ii) **Effectiveness.** Revise the MARS to start with a summary of key evaluation findings from an evaluation and end with a closing statement on completion of the MARS tracking process and implementation lessons for each evaluation.

   (a) Agree with ADB on engagement process and format of closing statement on context and lessons learned before retiring evaluations.

14 The 2017 AER includes recommendations on MARS.
(b) Share closing statement on each evaluation with DEC as part of the AER reporting on MARS implementation.

(iii) **Efficiency.** Increase periodicity of MARS updates to annual or biannual reporting on each evaluation, and use engagement process at end of MARS period to prepare closing statement on lessons learned.

(iv) **People.** Re-train relevant staff to ensure people involved in MARS updates are familiar with evaluation context and findings before working on the MARS.
Conclusions and Recommendations

44. To summarize, the Self-Evaluation has four broad findings:

(i) As recommended by previous evaluations of IED, there has been a greater emphasis in recent years on strategic evaluations, which have appreciated by DEC and the Board as being useful and mostly been of high quality but the product mix now needs to be rebalanced to cater to the needs of all IEDs' stakeholders. One obvious way of doing so is to resurrect the sectorwide evaluations (SES) as well as the country sector assessments (SAPE) as stand-alone products rather than a component of the CAPE to cover sector operations at the country level. Also, to invest in stronger project evaluations and interactions.

(ii) IED has kept up with the workload of evaluation and validation products, clearing the backlog on validations noted by the 2012 self-evaluation, but the workload has strained staff resources and in the process, quality, especially for validation products, has suffered indicating the need to strengthen internal quality assurance. Institutionalizing quality assurance mechanisms for project-level and country-level validations would enhance consistency in quality.

(iii) Country-level evaluation products are appreciated by DEC and ADB Management but the CPSFRVs are expensive when contrasted with those of comparator organizations, because of the field verification work that, unlike others, IED does, which sometimes leads to a lack of clear distinction between the content and scope of the CAPEs and the CPSFRVs. Validation products are highly valued by regional departments but have also been more contentious in part because of a lack of clarity on the respective roles of IED and ADB's operational units. This can be rectified by revisiting the CPSFRV methodology and rebalancing the number of CAPEs and CPSFRVs.

(iv) The potential for learning from IED evaluations can be enhanced by modifying the MARS and by investing more directly in disseminating lessons learned from evaluations to operational staff and DMC clients.

45. The Self-Evaluation puts forward recommendations for the four main issues identified as reform priorities—(i) product mix, (ii) quality assurance, (iii) knowledge and learning, and (iv) MARS—to strengthen the effectiveness and impact of IED. A critical starting point for these recommendations is the organizational adjustments needed to encourage staff specialization and more efficient deployment of IS, NS and AS.

1. **Recommendation 1: Product Mix**

   (i) Rebalance the product mix by reducing the number of corporate and thematic evaluations;
(ii) Refine the focus of the CAPE to evaluate the country strategy and assistance program, simplify the design of the CPSFRV, and rebalance the number of CAPEs and CPSFRVs; and

(iii) Redeploy the savings to increase the number of direct operational evaluation products by increasing project evaluations and reintroducing the SES and the SAPEs as stand-alone evaluations of sector programs at the country level.

2. **Recommendation 2: Organizational Adjustments**

(i) Reorganize IED into (a) one division for corporate, thematic and country evaluations (CES, TES, CAPE, CPSFRV); (b) one division for sector and project evaluations (SES, SAPE, PPER/PVR/XVR), including private sector/nonsovereign operations; (c) support groups under the Deputy Director General to assist the evaluation teams on communication and outreach and raise IED work on knowledge and evaluation capacity development for staff both in ADB (including IED) and client countries; and

(ii) Organize better evaluation teams by delinking IS, NS and AS and establishing pools of NS and AS from which team members are assigned and staff time programmed to each evaluation product.

3. **Recommendation 3: Quality Assurance**

(i) Strengthen systems for annual work programming and deployment of mapping all staff (IS, NS, and AS) to evaluation products to ensure realistic time planning and balanced workflow for all staff; and

(ii) Institutionalize a quality assurance system that provides (a) early and continuing support to evaluation teams on methodology, with high-level technical advice by the Front Office on corporate, thematic and sector evaluations, and (b) reviews of project-level validations by designated quality assurers in the division focusing on sectors and projects.

4. **Recommendation 4: Knowledge and Learning**

(i) Adopt a more deliberate approach to knowledge and learning by ensuring that two support groups are institutionalized—one for communication and outreach support to evaluation teams in capturing and disseminating lessons from evaluation products, and another to raise the evaluation capacity development work, both internal and external to ADB, of IED;

(ii) Invest more deliberately in producing synthesis and synopsis of evaluation findings; and make greater use of new technologies and collaborative events to disseminate lessons learned to operational staff and DMC clients; and

(iii) Promote knowledge exchange across evaluation agencies by encouraging staff participation in communities of practice under the ECG.

5. **Recommendation 5: Redesign MARS**

(i) Modify the MARS format to focus on evaluations as a whole rather than individual recommendations and include key evaluation findings and the context of recommendations in the MARS; and
(ii) Modify the MARS process to increase periodicity of updates to annual or biannual reports on each evaluation, and use the engagement process at the end of the MARS monitoring period to prepare a closing statement on lessons learned that can be shared with DEC.
APPENDIX 1: METHODOLOGY OF THE SELF-EVALUATION

1. The Self-Evaluation used multiple methods of data collection and analysis, including semi-structured interviews with Development Effectiveness Committee (DEC) and Board, Asian Development Bank (ADB) management and senior staff; a staff survey and focus group discussions (FGDs) with Independent Evaluation Department (IED) staff; and a review of IED evaluation products, staffing and budgets. Implementation of the recommendations of the 2008 independent review and the 2012 Self-Evaluation were also assessed. The primary period covered by the review was 2012–2016, although the analysis was constrained by limited availability of data on staff costs.

2. A staff survey and FGDs were organized to obtain feedback from IED staff on evaluation products, the quality of evaluations, and influence of evaluations. Survey instruments are provided in Appendix 4. To broaden the universe, the staff survey was administered to all IED staff, including consultants who have worked on multiple evaluations during the review period. Of the 90 people in the universe, 79 completed the survey yielding a response rate of 88%, responses being received from 45 staff and 34 consultants. Responses were similar across these two groups of respondents.

3. Four FGDs were organized with IED staff, one each for staff of the two IED divisions, and one for the staff of the communications and outreach unit in the Front Office. A fourth focus group was organized exclusively with national staff (NS) and administrative staff (AS) to allow them to voice concerns they may have been reluctant to express in the presence of their IS supervisors. The fourth focus group provided insights into the relationship between NS/AS and IS and discussed ways of optimizing utilization of the skills available among NS/AS by modifying arrangements to deploy NS/AS to evaluation products instead of evaluation supervisors.

4. The Self-Evaluation team reached out to all DEC members (Executive Directors or Alternate Executive Directors), some Board members and ADB Management and senior staff (see Table 1) who had recent interactions with IED evaluations (the list of external respondents interviewed is provided in Appendix 3). Semi-structured interviews were conducted to obtain feedback on the relevance and usefulness of IED’s work and how to increase the quality and influence of its evaluation products.

5. Two consultation meetings were held with the IED Leadership Team (ILT), one on options for reforming the MARs, another on interim findings. On completion of all the interviews with DEC Chair, Board members and ADB Management, a consultation meeting was organized with IED staff to obtain feedback on interim findings and possible actions. Suggestions made were duly considered by the Self-Evaluation team and have been incorporated as appropriate within this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with members of ILT</td>
<td>N=7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured interviews with ADB managers and senior staff</td>
<td>N=21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups with IED (4)</td>
<td>N=44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured interviews with Executive Directors and Alternate Executive Directors</td>
<td>N=9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of IED</td>
<td>N=90 (Response rate: 88%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IED = Independent Evaluation Department, ILT = IED leadership team, N = number.
### Table A2.1 IED Evaluation Products completed in 2012-2016 and planned for 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Total 2012-16</th>
<th>Annual average</th>
<th>Planned 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate and thematic evaluations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which: corporate evaluations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact evaluations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation knowledge studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topical/Working papers/Publications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report (Annual Evaluation Review)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Assistance Program Evaluations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Assistance Program Evaluations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validations of CPS Final Review</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Program performance evaluation reports</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which: Non-sovereign operations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA Performance evaluation reports</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validations of PCRs and XARRs</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of which: Validations of XARRs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (country and operational evaluations)</strong></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Total of Evaluation and Knowledge Products</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CPS = Country Partnership Strategy, IED = Independent Evaluation Department, PCR = project completion report, XARR = extended annual review report.

Notes:
1. From 2013, country program evaluations include rapid sector assessments.
2. Topical papers completed in 2016 include papers on Environmental Sustainable Growth and Private Sector Operations.
3. Other knowledge products or publications include books.

## Table A2.2: Summary of IED Staffing, Staff Consultant Inputs, 2005–2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget IS</th>
<th>Budget NS</th>
<th>Budget AS</th>
<th>Actual IS</th>
<th>Actual NS</th>
<th>Actual AS</th>
<th>Actual/Budget Ratio IS</th>
<th>Actual/Budget Ratio NS</th>
<th>Actual/Budget Ratio AS</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>No. of Staff</th>
<th>$ Per Staff</th>
<th>Budget $’000</th>
<th>Actual $’000</th>
<th>Variance $’000</th>
<th>RDTA $’000</th>
<th>CDTA $’000</th>
<th>Total $’000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>3,435</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>3,179</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3,181</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3,220</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>3,685</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>4,146</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>2,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3,806</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>4,373</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>5,051</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>2,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>4,881</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>101.2</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>5,299</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>5,682</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5,430</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5,790</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>107.4</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Independent Evaluation Department (IED) shifted to more high-level evaluations from 2007.
2. IED started validating project completion reports and extended annual review reports from 2007.
3. IED moved the annual portfolio review report to Operations Services and Financial Management Department and combined its annual evaluation review to its annual report and review of actions on recommendations from 2011.
4. Rapid sector assessments feeding into country assistance program evaluations or country partnership strategy final review validations are not counted separately. Similarly, stand-alone sector assistance program evaluations (SAPEs) feeding into these country evaluations are no longer counted separately from 2012.
5. All SAPEs except the 2011 transport SAPE for Sri Lanka served as country assistance program evaluation inputs.
6. Other knowledge products and services include topical/working papers, books and publications, synthesis of evaluation findings, guidelines etc.
7. Except for approved technical assistance amount, 2016 data are estimates.
8. IED project validation reports and validation of project completion reports and extended annual review report targets are subject to change based on the timing of receipt of completed self-evaluations from operations departments.

* Staff-years based on 2016 budget estimates.
* Staff-years based on actual as of 31 May 2016.

Table A2.3: Estimated Unit Cost of Completed Evaluations, 2010–2015 ($ average)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Level:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic and corporate evaluations</td>
<td>124,889</td>
<td>210,100</td>
<td>315,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact evaluations</td>
<td>84,345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual report</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>80,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPE</td>
<td>290,659</td>
<td>349,400</td>
<td>339,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Level:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validations of CPS final review reports</td>
<td>17,635</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>41,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/program/TA performance evaluation reports</td>
<td>27,282</td>
<td>36,805</td>
<td>36,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validations of PCRs and XARRs</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Knowledge Studies/Topical Papers</td>
<td>75,224</td>
<td>81,329</td>
<td>90,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAPE = country assistance program evaluation, CPS = country partnership strategy, n/a = not available, PCR = project completion report, TA = technical assistance, XARR = extended annual review report.

Note: Cost data refers to international and national consultant inputs only.


Table A2.4: Consultant Costs on Country Partnership Strategy Final Review Validations (2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Technical Assistance Consultant Costs</th>
<th>Staff Consultants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>36,000.00</td>
<td>11,537.28</td>
<td>47,537.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
<td>62,580.00</td>
<td>62,580.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>2,400.00</td>
<td>84,836.11</td>
<td>87,236.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>40,300.00</td>
<td>5,251.00</td>
<td>45,551.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>48,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>48,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>6,885.00</td>
<td>70,454.00</td>
<td>77,339.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>125,800.00</td>
<td>125,800.00</td>
<td>125,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62,442.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A2.5: Estimated Staff and Consultant Costs of Selected Evaluation Products Completed in 2016 ($)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Product</th>
<th>Staff Costs</th>
<th>Consultant Costs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC funded</td>
<td>TA funded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPE: Sri Lanka(^a)</td>
<td>254,878</td>
<td>9,635</td>
<td>392,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPE: India(^b)</td>
<td>305,630</td>
<td>225,103</td>
<td>530,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Evaluation Review</td>
<td>114,768</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>214,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES: Middle Income Countries</td>
<td>276,247</td>
<td>131,745</td>
<td>407,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Evaluation: Safeguards</td>
<td>306,198</td>
<td>733,034</td>
<td>1,039,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS Final Review Validation: Bangladesh</td>
<td>110,456</td>
<td>62,580</td>
<td>62,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS Final Review Validation: Viet Nam(^c)</td>
<td>131,287</td>
<td>125,800</td>
<td>125,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPER (Sovereign): Northern Community-Managed Irrigation</td>
<td>75,685</td>
<td>41,330</td>
<td>41,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPER (Sovereign): Customs Modernization</td>
<td>31,729</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPER (Non-Sovereign): Dahanu Solar Power</td>
<td>35,028</td>
<td>8,340</td>
<td>8,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPER</td>
<td>46,750</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation of PCRs (49)</td>
<td>340,017</td>
<td>141,000</td>
<td>141,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation of XARRs (8)</td>
<td>43,932</td>
<td>29,011</td>
<td>29,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topical paper: Environmental Sustainable Growth</td>
<td>64,995</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>148,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topical paper: Private Sector Operations</td>
<td>97,344</td>
<td>121,807</td>
<td>121,807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAPE = country assistance program evaluation, CES = corporate evaluation, CPS = country partnership strategy, PCR = project completion report, PPER = project or program performance evaluation report, TPER = technical assistance performance evaluation report, XARR = extended annual review report.

Notes:
\(^a\) Consultant costs for 2016 CAPE Sri Lanka are comparable to the 2015 CAPEs for Papua New Guinea ($238,725.78) and China ($439,843.21).
\(^b\) India CAPE is continuing into 2017 and appears to be an outlier.
\(^c\) Consultant costs on the Bangladesh CPSFRV are similar to those listed in Table A2.4. Vietnam CPSFRV has cost twice as much in consultant costs. The average for all eight CPSFRVs is $62,443. However, in the Bangladesh and Vietnam CPSFRVs, staff costs alone averaged $120,872 and total CPS Final Review Validations cost averaged $215,062 (one-third the cost of a CAPE).

Source: ADB Work force and Work load analysis; ADB 2016 salary matrix; IED monthly budget monitoring reports.
APPENDIX 3: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED FOR THE SELF-EVALUATION

### Table A3.1 Members of Development Effectiveness Committee and Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Countries Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philsak Yukkasemwong (Thailand)</td>
<td>Executive Director; Development Effectiveness Committee (DEC) Chair</td>
<td>Brunei Darussalam; Malaysia; Myanmar; Nepal; Singapore; Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masashi Tanabe (Japan)</td>
<td>Alternate Executive Director; DEC Member</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharafjon Sheraliev (Tajikistan)</td>
<td>Alternate Executive Director; DEC Member</td>
<td>Afghanistan; Bangladesh; Bhutan; India; Lao People's Democratic Republic; Tajikistan; Turkmenistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannes Schneider (Switzerland)</td>
<td>Alternate Executive Director; DEC Member</td>
<td>Belgium; France; Italy; Portugal; Spain; Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joar Strand (Norway)</td>
<td>Alternative Executive Director; DEC Member</td>
<td>Canada; Denmark; Finland; Ireland; Netherlands; Norway; Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Strauss (US)</td>
<td>Alternate Executive Director</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Won-Mok Choi (Korea)</td>
<td>Former Executive Director; Former DEC Chair and Member</td>
<td>Korea; PNG; Sri Lanka; Taipei, China; Uzbekistan; Vanuatu; Viet Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Rose (United Kingdom)</td>
<td>Alternate Executive Director</td>
<td>Austria; Germany; Luxembourg; Turkey; United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A3.2 ADB Management and Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Groff</td>
<td>Vice President (Operations 2)</td>
<td>Office of the Vice-President (Operations 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Miranda</td>
<td>Former Managing Director General</td>
<td>Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xianbin Yao</td>
<td>Former Director General; Special Senior Advisor</td>
<td>Pacific Department; Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Barrow</td>
<td>Director General</td>
<td>Private Sector Operations Department</td>
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APPENDIX 4: IED STAFF SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Perception Survey on Independent Evaluation at the Asian Development Bank

Dear friends and colleagues,

Independent Evaluation at the Asian Development Bank (ADB) invites you to participate in a survey to gather feedback from all IED staff and consultants on the department’s performance and products. Your feedback will help improve our efficiency, effectiveness, knowledge work, outreach, and overall service level.

The survey will take about 10 minutes to complete. You may stop answering at any stage and resume at your convenience. Respondents and their individual responses will be kept confidential.

Your participation is well appreciated.

Independent Evaluation at ADB
[FOR IED RESPONDENTS]

Section A. Demography and Experience

1) In what capacity do you work in IED?
   • □ Manager/Advisor
   □ Evaluation Staff (please indicate which group from list below)
     □ International Staff (Lead/Principal Evaluator, Senior Evaluator)
     □ International Staff (Evaluation Officer, Young Professional)
     □ National Staff
     □ Administrative Staff
     □ Evaluation Consultant (International Hire)
     □ Evaluation Consultant (National Hire)

2) Gender
   □ Male     □ Female     □ Other

3) How many years have you worked in IED?
   □ 2 years or below □ 2-5 years □ 6-10 years □ 11-20 years □ More than 20 years

4) In all, how many years have you worked in evaluation (please add experience in IED with years in other development agencies)?
   □ 5 years or below □ 6-10 years □ 11-15 years □ 16-20 years □ More than 20 years

5) How many years have you worked in ADB?
   □ 5 years or below □ 6-10 years □ 11-15 years □ 16-20 years □ More than 20 years

6) In all, how many years have you worked in operations (please add experience in ADB operations with years in other development agencies)?
   □ 5 years or below □ 6-10 years □ 11-15 years □ 16-20 years □ More than 20 years

7) Have you been a team leader for any major evaluation reports (country, corporate, thematic, sector or impact evaluations or annual report) in the last five years?
   □ Yes     □ No
8) Have you worked on any major evaluation reports or project/program performance evaluation reports or technical assistance evaluation reports in the last five years?
☐ Yes ☐ No

9) Have you worked on any IED validation reports (country validation or project validation reports) in the last five years?
☐ Yes ☐ No

10) How familiar are you with evaluations conducted by the IED of the ADB?
☐ Very familiar ☐ Somewhat familiar ☐ Not too familiar ☐ Not at all familiar

10b) If "not at all familiar" or “not too familiar” with IED evaluation work, which of the following best explain why you are not familiar with its products?
[Please check as many responses as applicable]
☐ I just joined ADB
☐ My job assignment does not require reading/reviewing IED products
☐ Other reasons [please write and explain briefly in this section]

Those who are unfamiliar with IED's evaluation and answered “not at all familiar” or “not too familiar”, do not need to proceed to the remaining questions. Thank you for participating in the survey.
### [FOR IED RESPONDENTS WHO ARE FAMILIAR WITH IED EVALUATIONS]

**PART I – Overview of Independent Evaluation at Asian Development Bank**

11) How would you describe the IMPORTANCE of the following objectives for independent evaluation at ADB?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Substantial</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Ensuring accountability (success in achieving stated objectives)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Measuring progress against targets</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Evaluating impacts of development interventions</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Validating self-evaluations</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Synthesizing lessons (from prior and existing evaluations or validations)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Promoting learning by sharing evaluation knowledge and outreach</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Building evaluation capacity of operational staff and clients</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Strengthening IED’s role in drawing on evaluation knowledge to advise on ADB policies and strategies</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12) How would you assess the STRENGTHS of evaluations in IED along the following dimensions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Substantial</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Strategic relevance (for policy, strategy or operations)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Independence from operations</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Quality of evaluation methodology</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Expertise and experience of evaluators</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Consistency in quality of evaluation products</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Quality of recommendations</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Collaboration with operations</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4

33

High Substantial Moderate Low Don’t know

h. Knowledge sharing and outreach

13) Which of IED’s evaluation products has been MOST USEFUL in enhancing development effectiveness of ADB’s work? (choose up to 3)

- Country Assistance Program Evaluations
- Thematic/Sector Evaluation Study
- Annual Report
- Project/Program Performance Evaluation Reports
- Country Validation Reports
- Project/Program Validation Reports
- Impact Evaluations
- Others - please specify _____________

14) Which of IED’s evaluation product has been LEAST USEFUL in enhancing development effectiveness of ADB’s work? (choose up to 3)

- Country Assistance Program Evaluations
- Thematic/Sector Evaluation Study
- Annual Report
- Project/Program Performance Evaluation Reports
- Country Validation Reports
- Project/Program Validation Reports
- Impact Evaluations
- Others - please specify _____________

15) In addition to IED’s main products and services what would you like to see more of in the evaluation work program of IED? (Choose as many as you like)

- Impact evaluations
- Real-time and forward-looking evaluations
- Synthesis of evaluation findings and lessons
- Collaboration with operations on monitoring and evaluation systems and methods
- Evaluation capacity development
- Others
  - please specify ________________

PART II – Quality of IED Evaluations

16) How would you describe the QUALITY OF EVALUATION PRODUCTS under each of IED’s product lines in the last 5 years?
In your opinion, which IED evaluation produced in the last five years was of the HIGHEST QUALITY? (optional question)

Please specify ________________________________

Identify the top three CHARACTERISTICS of the evaluation selected in question # 17 that justifies your selection of the evaluation with the highest quality (Choose up to 3) (optional, to be answered only if 17 is answered)

- Robust and transparent methodology
- Focus on policy, operational and analytical issues
- High quality fieldwork to assess results
- Use of beneficiary feedback to validate results
- Use of innovative tools and techniques (new evaluation instruments, IT, social media)
- Solid evidence-base to justify evaluation results
- Generated new evidence that ADB found operationally relevant and useful
- High quality evaluation report
- High quality, actionable recommendations
- Others - please specify ________________________________

Which product type received the most frequent COMPLAINTS ABOUT QUALITY in the last 5 years from ADB Management or operations? (choose one product type)
In your opinion what are the main reasons for the complaints about quality? (choose up to 3)

- Disagreement on findings
- Disagreement on methodology
- Conclusions not supported by sufficient data or empirical evidence
- Evaluation did not use structured evaluation instruments
- Sampling not based on representative or transparent, agreed criteria
- Methodology used to analyze results not transparent
- Lack of comparative analysis
- Conclusions and recommendations too vague
- Disagreement on recommendations
- Other, please specify __________________________

What are the most important ACTIONS that IED staff should take to enhance the quality of evaluations? (Choose up to 3)

- Improve quality of evaluation questions
- Include evaluation framework with explicit results chain(s) in Evaluation Approach Paper
- Use comparative analysis or counterfactuals to enhance robustness and credibility
- Use structured evaluation instruments for data collection from country or project case studies
- Make greater use of quantitative methods
- Use mixed methods to combine quantitative with qualitative results
- Rely on high quality evaluation consultants
- Greater use of high quality, external peer reviewers
- Others
  - please specify ________________

What are the most important STEPS that IED management should take to enhance quality of evaluations? (Choose up to 3)

- Increase rigor of formal quality assurance processes
- Simplify formal quality assurance processes
Design workshops (Before Action Reviews, CAPE learning week, consultative workshops,) before EAP

Provide more guidance on evaluation methodology during the EAP review process

Encourage teamwork during evaluation process

Ensure consistency in quality

Provide early feedback on interim evaluation findings

Create a common pool of specialists in quantitative and methodological skills to benefit IED evaluations

Increase training opportunities for IED staff

Incentives to learn from/disseminate to other evaluation agencies

Others - please specify

What are the most important steps that IED could take to increase the quality of its dissemination efforts? (Choose up to three)

Ensure timeliness of dissemination activities by feed into processes in ADB (relevant Board discussion, policy/strategy formulation, CPS preparation, etc)

Produce evaluation synthesis that focuses on evaluation findings and lessons more than ratings

Disseminate evaluation synthesis widely across ADB

Organize dissemination events in collaboration with operational units

Organize dissemination events in member country(ies)

Invest more in knowledge sharing and learning (evaluation synthesis, collaborative learning events)

Use audiovisuals and blogs to disseminate evaluations and synthesis products widely

Others - please specify

Which of the following are the key STRENGTHS of the evaluation staff in IED? (Choose the top 3 strengths)

Regional experience

Operational expertise

Evaluation expertise

Quantitative skills

Qualitative research skills

Networks with operational staff

Independence from operations

Others - please specify

What are the most important SKILL GAPS among IED evaluation staff that affect the quality of its evaluation work? (Choose up to 3)

Lack of familiarity with Bank operations

General evaluation methodology

Impact evaluation skills

Comparative analysis

Qualitative research skills

Textual analysis using software

Participatory evaluation methods

Use of information technology and social media

Others - please specify
26) Is IED as a unit missing any other skills which could have helped to improve the quality of your evaluation work? Please specify
__________________________________________________________________________

27) What skills that would you like to acquire to enhance the quality of your own evaluation work at IED? *(Choose the top 3 skills you need)*

- Familiarity with Bank operations
- General evaluation methodology
- Impact evaluation skills
- Comparative analysis
- Qualitative research skills
- Textual analysis using software
- Participatory evaluation methods
- Use of information technology and social media
- Others
  - please specify ____________________
PART III – Influence of IED’s Products and Services

28) To what extent do IED studies provide inputs, influence or add value to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great extent</th>
<th>Large extent</th>
<th>Some extent</th>
<th>A Little extent</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ADB policies and strategies</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Sector and thematic operational plans</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Preparation of country partnership strategies</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. ADB supported projects and programs</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. ADB corporate and business processes</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments (if any)

29) In the last five years, which IED evaluation had the GREATEST IMPACT on ADB’s strategy, policy or operations? (optional question)

Please specify ________________________________

30) Identify the top three CHARACTERISTICS that led to high impact of the evaluation mentioned in question # 29? (Choose up to 3) (optional, to be answered only if 29 is answered)

- ☐ Timeliness of the evaluation
- ☐ Strategic relevance (for policy, strategy or operations)
- ☐ Effective dialogue with operations
- ☐ Independence from operations
- ☐ Collaboration with other development partners
- ☐ Collaboration with in-country researchers/think tanks
- ☐ Use of beneficiary feedback to validate results
- ☐ Quality of methodology
- ☐ Quality of the evaluation report
- ☐ Quality of evaluation findings
- ☐ Quality of recommendations
- ☐ Quality of dissemination and knowledge sharing
- ☐ Others

- please specify __________________________
31) If we define success as influencing and improving ADB's development effectiveness, what is your intuitive score of IED's evaluation products in the past 5 years?

- Highly successful
- Successful
- Less than Successful
- Unsuccessful
- Not rated

32) What are the most important steps that IED could take during the evaluation process to increase the influence of its evaluations? (Choose up to 3)

- Sustain dialogue with relevant operational unit before, during, and after evaluation
- Enhance quality of methodology (impact evaluations, comparative analysis, more rigorous case studies)
- Undertake evaluations in collaboration with government or in-country evaluators
- Integrate beneficiary feedback systematically in evaluations
- Use information technology and social media to reach broader group for dialogue on results
- Include evaluation findings and lessons that go beyond accountability aims of evaluation
- Formulate recommendations in consultation with evaluee
- Invest more in knowledge sharing and learning (evaluation synthesis, collaborative learning events)
- Others
  - please specify __________________

33) How can IED be more effective in contributing to, and influencing, ADB's development effectiveness? (Please choose up to 3)

- Deeper analysis
- Clearer recommendations
- Greater independence
- Production of Synthesis of evaluation findings and lessons
- More outreach to Operations
- More engagement with Clients
- More engagement with beneficiaries and civil society organizations
- Others
  - please specify __________________

34) Additional comments (if any)

[Blank Space]
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