1. The corporate evaluation of Asian Development Bank (ADB) technical assistance (TA) was based on a mixed-methods approach that triangulates qualitative and quantitative data collected from various sources. A main source of information came through desk review of key documents. These included key policy and implementation documents on TA—e.g., the 2008 TA policy paper¹ and corresponding ADB operations manual provisions. They also included ADB TA completion reports (TCRs), evaluation studies conducted by ADB’s Independent Evaluation Department (IED) including previous evaluation studies on TA,² and evaluations conducted by other international financial institutions. The evaluation also analyzed TA portfolio data. Key informant interviews were undertaken with staff from ADB headquarters and resident missions, government agencies, the World Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank. Structured survey questionnaires were administered by e-mail to randomly selected key informants (e.g., managers of TA, government counterparts, and consultants).

2. In terms of results, the evaluation undertook a comparison of trends in TCR ratings before and after the adoption of the TA policy and an examination of the disconnect between TCR and validated TCR ratings. Further assessment of specific TA projects was completed as part of country case studies. However, the main purpose of looking at TCRs was to consider the effectiveness of the ADB processes and procedures for assessing TA.

3. The IED evaluation team undertook field visits to the People’s Republic of China (PRC), Indonesia, the Kyrgyz Republic, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Tonga. Cambodia and the Lao People’s Democratic Republic (Lao PDR) were visited as part of an assessment of regional TA in the Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS),⁴ looking particularly at examples from biodiversity conservation and capacity building. The case study countries were selected in close coordination with regional departments to represent a reasonable spread across country groups,⁵ gross national income per capita, and TA portfolio (Table).⁶

4. The country case studies involved (i) desk review of country strategies and programs and other relevant documents, including evaluation studies done by IED; (ii) portfolio analysis of TA operations before and after 2008; (iii) validation of available TCRs; (iv) interviews with management and staff of concerned regional departments at ADB headquarters; and (v) interviews with resident mission staff, government counterparts, development partners, and consultants during missions.

---

³ Independent evaluation studies include TA performance evaluation reports, country and sector evaluations, and thematic studies, such as special evaluation studies on knowledge products and services and financing partnership facilities.
⁴ The GMS program was selected for the regional case study because it was ADB’s first subregional program. Established in 1992, it involves Cambodia, Yunnan Province and Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region in the PRC, the Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand, and Viet Nam.
⁵ Country groups based on eligibility to borrow from the Asian Development Fund (ADF) and access to ordinary capital resources (OCR) are (i) Group A ADF-borrowing countries are Afghanistan, Bhutan, Cambodia, Kiribati, the Kyrgyz Republic, the Lao PDR, Maldives, the Marshall Islands, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tajikistan, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu; (ii) Group B blend countries borrowing from both the ADF and OCR are Armenia, Bangladesh, Georgia, India, the Federated States of Micronesia, Mongolia, Pakistan, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Sri Lanka, Timor-Leste, Uzbekistan, and Viet Nam; and (iii) Group C OCR-borrowing countries are Azerbaijan, the PRC, Cook Islands, Fiji, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Turkmenistan.
⁶ No country classified under fragile and conflict-affected situations was selected as part of the study. Solomon Islands was proposed but after discussions with the Pacific Department, it was agreed that Tonga would be more appropriate and accessible due to recent natural disasters.
## Profile of Case Study Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>GNI PC ($)</th>
<th>TA Operations 2007–2013</th>
<th>Sector/Thematic Focus of the Case Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRC</strong></td>
<td>East Asia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4,940</td>
<td>Number: 271&lt;br&gt;Amt.: $156.18 million</td>
<td>• TA delegation&lt;br&gt;• TA contributions to policy and sector reform, knowledge agenda&lt;br&gt;• innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INO</strong></td>
<td>Southeast Asia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>Number: 70&lt;br&gt;Amt.: $177.65 million</td>
<td>• irrigation and water resources;&lt;br&gt;• education&lt;br&gt;• financial sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KGZ</strong></td>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Number: 19&lt;br&gt;Amt.: $10.77 million</td>
<td>• TA operations in a transition economy&lt;br&gt;• PPTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHI</strong></td>
<td>Southeast Asia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>Number: 81&lt;br&gt;Amt.: $95.75 million</td>
<td>• Strengthening private-public partnership&lt;br&gt;• Local government revenue generation and land administration reforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SRI</strong></td>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2,580</td>
<td>Number: 38&lt;br&gt;Amt.: $29.44 million</td>
<td>• use of TA loans&lt;br&gt;• contributions of TA projects to safeguards&lt;br&gt;• support to post conflict areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TON</strong></td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3,820</td>
<td>Number: 11&lt;br&gt;Amt.: $6.09 million</td>
<td>• Public sector management focusing on support for economic and strategic management&lt;br&gt;• Private Sector Development Initiative&lt;br&gt;• support to a Tonga energy roadmap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number: 83&lt;br&gt;Amt.: $128.17 million</td>
<td>• environment, agriculture and natural resources management (including core agriculture support program and core environment program)&lt;br&gt;• public sector management (Phnom Penh plan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GMS = Greater Mekong Subregion, GNI PC = gross national income per capita, INO = Indonesia, KGZ = Kyrgyz Republic, PHI = Philippines, PPTA = project preparatory technical assistance, PRC = People’s Republic of China, SRI = Sri Lanka, TA = technical assistance, TON = Tonga.

Note: Country classification is based on eligibility to borrow from the Asian Development Fund (ADF) and access to ordinary capital resources (OCR). These are (i) Group A ADF-borrowing countries: Afghanistan, Bhutan, Cambodia, Kiribati, the Kyrgyz Republic, the Lao PDR, Maldives, the Marshall Islands, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tajikistan, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu; (ii) Group B blend countries borrowing from both the ADF and OCR: Armenia, Bangladesh, Georgia, India, the Federated States of Micronesia, Mongolia, Pakistan, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Sri Lanka, Timor-Leste, Uzbekistan, and Viet Nam; and (iii) Group C OCR-borrowing countries: Azerbaijan, the PRC, Cook Islands, Fiji, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Turkmenistan.


5. Each study looked at nine key focus areas.\(^7\) In each of the selected developing member country, ADB’s strategic approach to TA at country and sector level was evaluated, and the performance of TA projects was examined based on available TCRs. The choice of sectors and themes to further explore during field visits was decided in consultation with the respective regional departments and resident missions. These were mainly sectors that received significant support from ADB operations during the previous 5–10 years and offered opportunities for learning. The evaluation focused mainly on TA approved in 2007–2012 that had been completed or was substantially mature.

\(7\) These are (i) strategic planning; (ii) country demand and ownership; (iii) the purposes of TA; (iv) the sources, levels, and adequacy of TA financing; (v) the role and impact of ADB’s business processes; (vi) the extent of decentralization of TA project administration to executing agencies and/or resident missions; (vii) the use of ADB staff and consultant resources; (viii) internal and external coordination; and (ix) the sustainability of TA outputs and outcomes.
6. The evaluation undertook a desk review of a sample of TCRs from 2007–2012 to assess and analyze TCR performance ratings. ADB had 251 TA projects that were completed during 2007–2012 and for which a TCR had been completed. A 50% sample (125 TA projects) was considered to provide a sufficient base to assess the TCRs. The sample was selected in a two-staged process. All TCRs from the case study countries were included. Thereafter, a randomized approach was used to select the remaining TCRs to make up a 50% sample. A simplified TCR validation format was used. The rating criteria and scale of ADB’s project performance evaluation report guidelines was used, covering assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability of the TCR design, implementation and outcomes, respectively. The TCRs do not include a rating of each evaluation criterion, but most contained sufficient information to generate a rating for each criterion, except for efficiency where only TCRs of TA projects of more than $1 million were rated.

7. The evaluation conducted three surveys to gather information on experiences and perceptions about ADB TA design and administration from ADB staff, consultants, and government (executing and implementing agencies) involved in TA projects approved during 2007–2012. A separate questionnaire was designed for each group of respondents, and each respondent was chosen randomly. Random sampling with replacement was done in two stages. In the first stage, a random sample of 100 respondents was generated for each group. Based on the response rate for each group, another random sample of 100 was generated. This second sample could include those who did not respond to the survey when first sent. The surveys received response rates of 10% from ADB staff, 21% from consultants, and 5% from government. The results and qualitative responses, particularly those from consultants, were used to supplement report findings, particularly in Chapters 4–6 on TA preparation, TA implementation, and human resources and consultants.

8. A smaller survey was conducted in the context of the PRC case study. This survey targeted the executing agencies with experience with delegated TA. Ten of the thirteen executing agencies with delegated TA experience responded.

9. The evaluation design had a limited scope, resulting in a number of limitations. The evaluation was not a performance assessment. Country studies were purposefully selected in consultation with departments and were aimed at using case study methodology to explore success and failures to provide lessons. The TCR validations were not an independent assessment of TA performance, since they rely exclusively on the TCRs themselves and information contained in the associated documentation. Although it covered 50% of the completed TCRs since the TA policy was adopted in 2008, the TCR validation sample was composed largely of TCRs from the case study countries. The evaluation covered TA projects (project preparatory TA, capacity development TA, policy and advisory TA, research and development TA). The survey response rates were relatively low, limiting the ability to make generalizations from the responses. As such, the survey information is used to supplement other findings. The evaluation did not assess TA loans or examine capacity development components of loans, although the interaction between loans and TA is often important to deliver results. ADB’s experience with delegating TA implementation to executing agencies was limited to the PRC, as this was the only country that proceeded beyond the pilot phase.

---

8 Case study countries are overrepresented in the sample.