

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AND RATING METHODOLOGY

Table 1: Evaluation Framework

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Remarks/Proposed Evaluation Methodology	Evaluation Sources
Relevance	<p>How well is Asian Development Bank's (ADB's) regional cooperation and integration strategy (RCIS) positioned vis-a-vis the changing global, regional and subregional landscape in Asia and the Pacific (e.g. in terms of moving beyond the first generation model to the second generation focus on productivity-led growth, vulnerability and inequality and new sectoral/ thematic priorities like labor mobility, food security, regional disaster risk management, etc.).</p> <p>How relevant/appropriate is the design of the RCIS to the different levels of development of the countries?</p> <p>To what extent was/is the RCIS consistent or in line with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the pre-2006 strategies/ policies? (b) the current corporate strategies, particularly Strategy 2020 and the 2014 Mid-Term Review of Strategy 2020? (c) strategies and priorities of ADB's developing member countries (DMCs), multilateral development bank (MDB's), development partners and other regional/ subregional stakeholders? (d) inclusive growth strategic agendas of Strategy 2020? 	<p>Document review took stock of all the changes at the global, regional, subregional and country level program configurations post RCIS. Case study missions visited selected DMCs and held meetings and interviews with regional stakeholders to elicit views on questions related to relevance or addressing the needs of the RCI stakeholders.</p>	<p>Strategy 2020, 2014 Strategy 2020 Midterm Review; DMC Medium-Term Development Plans/Medium-Term Expenditure Frameworks or equivalent documents;</p> <p>Findings from case studies; Notes from meetings and key informant interviews.</p>
	<p>Was the emphasis/importance accorded equitable across the regions and RCI pillars?</p> <p>How do other comparators define RCI?</p> <p>Is the definition appropriate to guide the second generation RCI activities suggested</p>	<p>Other development partners' definitions were reviewed.</p> <p>RCI priorities suggested by the Midterm Review of Strategy 2020 were reviewed to see if these can be accommodated with the current regional project</p>	<p>Strategy 2020; Strategy 2020 Midterm Review; Thematic Evaluation Study on ADB's Support for Inclusive Growth; DMC Medium-Term</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Remarks/Proposed Evaluation Methodology	Evaluation Sources
	<p>by the Midterm Review of Strategy 2020?</p> <p>Were the expected outcomes for each RCI role clearly defined?</p>	<p>definition.</p> <p>During the project data analysis exercise, Pillar 1 was broken down to see the extent of cross-border infrastructure vs. related software and cross-pillar and multi-pillar work.</p> <p>During the project data analysis, the program classification was validated. Data analysis was also undertaken to see the extent of cross-program work to date and also to classify RCI regional technical assistance by their associated regional/subregional program, by the countries they cover as well as the RCI pillars that they contribute to. Selected case studies were also undertaken.</p> <p>Assessments of strategic fit looked at the consistency of RCIS with prevailing policies in 2006 and with latest strategies. Strategy 2020, Mid-Term Review of Strategy 2020, and Inclusive Growth Special Evaluation Study were reviewed to determine the linkage between the RCI pillar and the inclusive growth pillar.</p> <p>Interviews with key stakeholders from concerned ADB departments were also undertaken to validate and supplement findings from data analysis exercise.</p>	<p>Development Plans/Medium-Term Expenditure Frameworks or equivalent documents;</p> <p>Other MDB's RCIS/policy equivalent; Assessment of equivalent RCIS/policies of other MDBs, if any;</p> <p>ADB project databases and project documents;</p> <p>Findings from case studies and notes from meetings and key informant interviews.</p>
	<p>To what extent was the RCIS consistent with the countries' national development plans?</p> <p>Do the existing regional/subregional programs adequately cover ADB's DMCs sufficiently (in particular, the needs and demands of small and isolated DMCs) or are DMCs being covered by too many programs?</p> <p>Do these programs include provisions to scale down ADB assistance over time?</p>	<p>Most, if not all, ADB DMCs have national strategies that highlight regional cooperation. However, the extent to which DMC national strategies highlight <u>regional integration</u> was investigated. Selected case study missions were undertaken.</p> <p>Comparator assessment reviewed development partners' RCI approaches. Partner with most advanced RCI approach was visited by the study team (i.e. World Bank). Other partners were reviewed based on available documents.</p> <p>Document review looked at ADB's and other</p>	<p>Findings from case studies and comparator assessment; Lessons and best practices from relevant agencies; Notes from stakeholder interviews and document review; Analysis and findings from perception surveys and interviews.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Remarks/Proposed Evaluation Methodology	Evaluation Sources
	<p>Do ADB RCI practices conform with international good practices?</p> <p>What can ADB learn from the experience of other agencies and international best practice to improve the RCIS going forward?</p>	<p>development partners' harmonization efforts. Perception data was also obtained from surveys and interviews.</p>	
<p>Responsiveness</p>	<p>Were ADB's policies and strategies aligned with the RCI agenda?</p> <p>How well did the regional and country strategies respond to the RCI agenda?</p> <p>To what extent has the RCIS achieved, or is likely to achieve, its intended objectives, including those set out in its results framework?</p> <p>Were the indicators for each pillar fine-tuned in consultation with concerned departments, as envisaged in the RCIS?</p> <p>Were baseline data and targets to measure progress on indicators established by departments for their respective pillars/ sectors, as envisaged in the RCIS?</p> <p>Does ADB's Strategy 2020 take into account the main thrusts and priorities of the RCIS? How do other corporate policies and strategies (e.g. post-RCIS regional country partnership strategies [RCPSs] and CPSs) take account of the RCIS?</p> <p>Do the RCPSs complement, substitute for, or compete with ADB country strategies and programs?</p>	<p>Responsiveness pertains to the effectiveness of ADB's strategic and organizational response to the RCI agenda, including its ability to learn from past experience. The RCI Thematic Group provided the TES Team with a draft Self-Assessment of the RCIS's results frameworks indicators. This was assessed and validated by the TES.</p> <p>The extent of RCIS' responsiveness was also gauged from the extent of changes in the RCIS policies, operational procedures (OP), staff instructions (SI), etc..</p> <p>RCI is highlighted in four different areas of Strategy 2020. The extent of RCIS alignment with other corporate policies and strategies was assessed through an assessment of strategic fit This looked at links between RCPSs and country operations.</p>	<p>(preliminary) Findings from the Self-Assessment of the RCIS results framework; Review of amendments and changes to the relevant OP/SI. Findings from data/portfolio analysis, document review, and interviews.</p>
	<p>Did ADB:</p> <p>(a) put in place the necessary institutional structures for RCI (i.e. regional cooperation divisions in the regional departments, regional/ subregional program secretariats and the RCI</p>	<p>Document review looked at the accomplishments of the coordination divisions, program secretariats and RCI Thematic Group. This was supplemented by perception data from surveys and interviews.</p> <p>Document review and interviews also looked at the</p>	<p>Relevant staff, budget and training information on staff related to RCI from the ADB Budget, Personnel and Human Resources Division and the RCI Thematic Group; Document</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Remarks/Proposed Evaluation Methodology	Evaluation Sources
	<p>Thematic Group)?</p> <p>(b) establish the necessary linkages between the RCPs and ADB country operations?</p> <p>(c) put in place the necessary financing mechanisms for RCI (e.g. trust funds, ADF regional set-aside mechanism)?</p> <p>(d) allocate necessary resources for implementing RCI including sufficient incentives for staff to undertake RCI-related work?</p>	<p>effectiveness of the ADF regional set-aside mechanism and the performance of the three regional funds. A rapid assessment of the Regional Cooperation and Integration Fund (RCIF) assessed the results that have been achieved to date by the projects financed under this fund.</p> <p>Data analysis and document review looked at the levels of operational and technical support in the form of staff, budget, and training.</p> <p>This was supplemented by perception data from surveys and interviews.</p>	<p>review of available RCI Thematic Group documents;</p> <p>Findings from the rapid assessment of the RCIF, perception surveys and interviews.</p>
Results	<p>What are the main outputs and outcomes in each of the four RCIS pillars, across pillars, in the four main ADB regional/ subregional programs, and across the programs?</p> <p>To what extent is the ADB on track to achieve the Strategy 2020's operational goal of having RCI lending reach at least 30% of total ADB operations by 2020?</p> <p>To what extent are the regional outcomes achieved to date sustainable?</p> <p>What is the scope for replicating successful regional/subregional program outcomes in other programs?</p> <p>What were the short and medium term impacts of RCI work across the regional, subregional, country and project levels?</p> <p>What value addition did ADB contribute in terms of the different RCI roles?</p>	<p>The project stocktaking showed that there was an uneven distribution of RCI project evaluation evidence across the pillars. Most evaluation evidence focused on Pillar 1 (cross-border infrastructure and related software). Other pillars had substantially less evidence while RCI knowledge products had extremely limited evaluation evidence.</p> <p>At the project level, document review of completed new project completion reports (PCRs), project performance evaluation reports (PPERs), and field data was undertaken.</p> <p>The project stocktaking also showed that there was an uneven distribution of RCI project evaluation evidence across the regional/subregional programs, with most evaluation evidence available for the Greater Mekong Subregion program. The Central Asia Regional Economic Cooperation Program , however, had good results monitoring of transport and trade facilitation results indicators. Other programs had substantially less evaluation and monitoring evidence. Case study field trips filled in the data gaps from the discussion of RCI project results with the relevant RCI stakeholders. Portfolio analysis and interviews with key relevant</p>	<p>Document review of ADB Knowledge products; findings from case studies and notes from relevant key stakeholder interviews.</p> <p>PCRs, Validation reports, and/or PPERs, if any; Findings from case studies. Sustainability success rates</p> <p>Strategy 2020 Midterm Review; Findings from portfolio analysis and notes from relevant key stakeholder interviews.</p> <p>Findings from case studies and notes from relevant key stakeholder interviews.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Remarks/Proposed Evaluation Methodology	Evaluation Sources
		stakeholders were also undertaken.	
	<p>Have adequate institutional arrangements been made to ensure continuity of implementation and achievement of results? Are ADB’s efforts to build regional institutions’ capacity sufficient and sustainable? Are the mix of modalities adopted for implementing the RCI projects appropriate? What are the results of projects financed by the RCIF? What are the advantages of merging the monetary and financial cooperation, trade and investment and special initiative teams of the Office of Regional Economic Integration (OREI) into the Regional Cooperation and Integration Division of the Economic Research, and Regional Cooperation Department and OREI’s finance and Asian Bond Markets Initiative to the Sustainable Development and Climate Change Department.</p>	<p>Much of the information to answer this question was collected at the RCI project stocktaking. The regional/subregional case studies verified the initial findings at the regional level. A rapid independent evaluation of the RCI-funded projects was also undertaken as a stand-alone exercise through portfolio analysis and interviews.</p>	<p>Findings from stock-taking exercise; Notes from relevant key stakeholder interviews. Completion reports of regional projects with regional capacity development components; Findings from case studies. Findings from rapid assessment of RCIF. Evaluation results of RCIF projects, stakeholder perceptions</p>
	<p>How effective are the partnerships of ADB with other regional institutions for regional integration and to what extent do these contribute to sustainable results? Do the number of regional private sector operations need to be increased?</p>	<p>Comparator assessment, findings from field interviews with regional institutions and perceptions findings (mainly interviews) provided answers to this question. Case studies were also drawn from this exercise. Interviews with key stakeholders particularly from the ADB Private Sector Operations Department re adequacy of regional private sector operations were also undertaken.</p>	<p>Regional policies and strategies and regional benchmark indicators of development partners; Results of Perception Survey; Notes from relevant key informant interviews; Findings from case studies.</p>

ADB = Asian Development Bank, DMC = developing member country, MDB = multilateral development bank, OREI = Office of Regional Economic Integration, PCR = project completion report, PPER = project performance evaluation report, RCI = regional cooperation and integration, RCIF = regional cooperation and integration fund, RCIS = regional cooperation and integration strategy.

Source: Independent Evaluation Department.

Table 2: Rating Methodology

Criterion	Subcriterion Rating Description	Rating Value	Weight (%)	Subcriteria
Relevance of the RCI Agenda in addressing the needs of RCI stakeholders	Highly relevant Relevant Less relevant Irrelevant	3 2 1 0	33%	The rating for relevance is based on the following subcriteria: A. Coherence of the RCI agenda's policies and strategies B. Relevance of the RCIS design C. Relevance of other RCI features D. Consistency with countries' expectations E. Conformity with International good practice
Responsiveness of the Enabling Environment for RCI Agenda	Highly responsive Responsive Less responsive Unresponsive	3 2 1 0	33%	The rating for responsiveness is based on the following subcriteria: A. Strategic response 1. Achievements against the RCIS's Results Framework 2. Consistency of ADB's policies, strategies and initiatives with the RCI agenda. B. Organizational response 1. Institutional Structures 2. Resourcing the RCI Agenda
Results orientation	Substantial Significant Moderate Negligible	3 2 1 0	33%	The rating for results is based on the following subcriteria: A. RCI Operational Results B. Performance of Evaluated RCI Activities C. Impact D. Value Addition Across the RCI Roles
Overall Assessment (weighted average of above criteria)				Highly successful: Overall weighted average is greater than 2.7. Successful: Overall weighted average is greater than or equal to 1.6 and less than 2.7. Less than successful: Overall weighted average is greater than or equal to 0.8 and less than 1.6. Unsuccessful: Overall weighted average is below 0.8.

Notes: For achievements against the Regional Cooperation and Integration Strategy's results framework, the following criteria were used: *fully achieved* = > 80% achievement, *largely achieved* = 60%–79% achievement, *partly achieved* = 40%–59% achievement, *unachieved* = <40% achievement.
Source: Independent Evaluation Department.