

expenditures in that country. Second, SEDF deviated from the budget allocation of its program components as outlined in the RETA. Approximately 50% of the SEDF program budget was to be allocated to improving access to financial services, 33% of the budget to improve business development and support services, and 17% to improve the enabling environment. After excluding general administration and contingency fees from expenditures, from FY:03 to FY:06, access to finance component received an average of only 32% of the budget, business development services received an average of 36% of the budget, and business enabling environment received an average of 32% of the budget. Third, SEDF did not direct any consultancy work to support and complement SMESDP, an ADB sector development program for SME development to foster the growth and competitiveness of SMEs. According to the RETA, SEDF was expected to form information-sharing and project development linkages with SMESDP. Fourth, significant differences persisted between ADB and SEDF regarding eligibility of projects to be financed by the RETA. As a result, claims/invoices for a number of projects presented by SEDF for reimbursement were not processed. Furthermore, a large amount of RETA funds remain undisbursed. However, the TORs of those projects whose invoices were processed did correspond to the RETA's objectives and scope, and the profile of the consultants was well suited to the expected outputs. The performance of the consultants engaged under the RETA (by SEDF) ranged from satisfactory to outstanding as per the consultant performance evaluation reports submitted to ADB. As a result, the productivity of the inputs (conversion into outputs) was high.

The RETA was to be implemented over two years. However, the completion of this TA was extended twice, for a cumulative period of 12 months. It was first extended to June 30, 2005 to allow more time for consulting services for subprojects funded by the RETA to be rendered. It was extended a second time to December 31, 2005 to enable ongoing subprojects being supported by the RETA to be completed, a completion review of the RETA to be undertaken, and claims for consulting services to be processed. In fact, the RETA could not be financially closed till recently due to SEDF delay with respect to submission of remaining invoices and the certificate of full payment.

ADB's performance was less than satisfactory because it was hampered by EA non-cooperation. Differences persisted throughout the duration of the entire RETA over project and invoice eligibility requirements, acceptable receipt format and timing, and linkage formulations with SMESDP.

Evaluation of Outputs and Achievement of Outcome

In terms of absolute numbers, SEDF did exceed or meet its operational targets/outputs under its three components, specifically access to finance, enabling environment, as well as business development and support services. However, in terms of regional output activity, SEDF was less effective as most of its output was derived in Bangladesh. In terms of client satisfaction, SEDF was fully satisfied with its outputs. According to SEDF progress reports, the output quality was high and relevant which demonstrated that the reports, workshops, training, and institutional building undertaken by the consultants were satisfactory and that the terms of reference were met.

Overall Assessment and Rating

The TA is rated as partly successful.¹

Major Lessons

Differences persisted throughout the duration of the RETA over project and invoice eligibility requirements, acceptable receipt format and timing, and linkage formulations with SMESDP most likely due to lack of effective and conclusive dialogue/discussions between SEDF and ADB during TA formulation.

A consensus on all the implementation arrangements (such as how and when receipts should be sent, project and invoice eligibility requirements, etc) should be reached between the EA and ADB before the TA is approved. This would minimize delays in the TA completion as well as ensure smoother project implementation.

Recommendations and Follow-Up Actions

In the design and formulation of the RETA, information sharing and project development linkages were expected between SEDF and SMESDP. Such linkage formulation is ideal in theory but in reality, implementation issues persist which are hard to resolve. Future TA designs should refrain from such interdependence across similar loans/programs.

Prepared by Syed Ali-Mumtaz H. Shah

Designation

Financial/Capital Markets Specialist
SAGF

¹ Using OED's criteria for overall project performance based on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability as stated in the *Guidelines for Preparing Performance Evaluation Reports for Public Sector Operations*, January 2006 (see Appendix).

Assessment of Overall Project Performance
RETA 6087: Small- and Medium-Sized Enterprise Growth and Development in the South Asia Region

Criterion	Weight (%)	Assessment	Rating Value	Weighted Rating
1. Relevance	20%	Relevant The RETA's goal was consistent with ADB's overall Country Strategy and Programs for Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, and Nepal. The objective was to enhance the growth of competitive SMEs in the private sector of the BBNNI region, recognizing the role of the private sector as a catalyst for sustainable economic growth resulting in poverty reduction	2	0.40
2. Effectiveness	30%	Less Effective The outcome of the RETA was only partially achieved since majority of the financed assignments were in Bangladesh or with Bangladeshi firms. More assignments dispersion across other countries in the BBNNI region was needed.	1	0.30
3. Efficiency	30%	Less Efficient The RETA was less efficient due to significant delays during implementation for a variety of reasons.	1	0.30
4. Sustainability	20%	Likely SEDF's growing reputation and unique branding as a high quality business-like partner has resulted in increased demand for SEDF assistance from stakeholders including the private sector and governments in the BBNNI region.	2	0.40
Overall Assessment (weighted average of above criteria)		Partly Successful		1.40