



# Completion Report

---

Project Number: 46500-001  
Technical Assistance Number: 8345  
September 2020

## Establishment of the Pacific Region Infrastructure Facility Coordination Office

This document is being disclosed to the public in accordance with ADB's Access to Information Policy.

Asian Development Bank



In preparing any country program or strategy, financing any project, or by making any designation of or reference to a particular territory or geographic area in this document, the Asian Development Bank does not intend to make any judgments as to the legal or other status of any territory or area.



## TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPLETION REPORT

<b>TA Number, Country, and Name:</b> TA 8345-REG: Establishment of the Pacific Region Infrastructure Facility Coordination Office		<b>Amount Approved:</b> \$11,800,000.00	
		<b>Revised Amount:</b> \$13,155,788.00	
<b>Executing Agency:</b> Asian Development Bank	<b>Source of Funding:</b> TASF-V: \$2.00 million; Government of Australia: \$6.85 million equivalent; Government of New Zealand: \$4.30 million equivalent	<b>Amount Undisbursed:</b> \$1,934,833.61	<b>Amount Used:</b> \$11,220,954.39
<b>TA Approval Date:</b> 27 March 2013	<b>TA Signing Date:</b> 27 March 2013	<b>TA Completion Date</b>	
		<b>Original Date:</b> 30 April 2016	<b>Latest Revised Date:</b> 31 October 2019
		<b>Financial Closing Date:</b> 31 Jan 2020	<b>Number of Extensions:</b> 2
<b>TA Type:</b> Policy and advisory TA		<b>TA Arrangement:</b> Regional	

### Description

The technical assistance (TA) supported the implementation of the Pacific Region Infrastructure Facility (PRIF) through development and operation of the PRIF Coordination Office (PRIF CO). The PRIF was formed to improve development effectiveness and the sustainability of infrastructure investments by: (i) strengthening coordination among PRIF partners; (ii) improving policies and regulations; (iii) improving infrastructure cofinancing; and (iv) improving the capacity of Pacific island countries (PICs) to prioritize, plan, develop, and maintain infrastructure investments. The initial PRIF partners were Asian Development Bank (ADB), Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, European Investment Bank (EIB), European Union (EU), New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, and the World Bank Group. The Japan International Cooperation Agency and United States Department of State joined during implementation of the TA. The TA provided support to 13 PICs<sup>1</sup> and supported five economic infrastructure subsectors (energy; information and communications technology; road, aviation, and maritime transport; waste management; and water and sanitation).

### Expected Impact, Outcome, and Outputs

The expected impact of TA was improved quality of infrastructure investments in the PICs. The expected outcome was that the governments of the PICs receive comprehensive and coordinated support and TA on infrastructure investments. The expected outputs were (i) improved coordination of PRIF partner infrastructure investments in the Pacific, and (ii) governments of the PICs receive technical advice on infrastructure development. The outcome indicators as updated in the major change in 2016 were (i) all participating PICs are engaged in PRIF activities; (ii) PRIF Coordination Office provides TA to a minimum of 10 out of 14 PICs and all technical sectors; (iii) PRIF partners demonstrate that 50% of knowledge products are utilized in investment designs; (iv) all PRIF partner infrastructure investments align with national infrastructure plans; and (v) all new PRIF partner capital works projects include plans for improved maintenance from 30 April 2013 to 30 April 2019.<sup>2</sup>

### Implementation Arrangements

ADB was the executing agency of the TA. A core team of six full-time consultants was engaged for the duration of the project as planned in the TA paper. The core team was supported by specialized short-term consultants using individual consultant selection and indefinite delivery contract (now framework agreement assignment). The consultants were engaged by ADB in accordance with the Guidelines on the Use of Consultants (2013, as amended from time to time). The consultants worked on on-demand activities approved by the PRIF management committee (PMC). The terms of reference for the consultants were prepared by the core team in consultation with the sector working groups (SWGs),

<sup>1</sup> Originally, PRIF provided support to 12 Pacific island countries including, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu. Fiji joined in 2014.

<sup>2</sup> ADB (Pacific Department). 2016. TA 8345 REG Establishment of Pacific Region Infrastructure Facility Coordination Office—Approval of Major Change in Technical Assistance (Additional Cofinancing). Memorandum. 27 January (Internal).

later approved by the PMC. The quality- and cost-based selection (QCBS) method and consultants' qualifications selection method were added during the TA implementation for firm recruitment due to need for larger consultant packages, which required management of multiple consultants within a team. Six consulting firm contracts were issued during the TA implementation, five using QCBS and one using the consultant's qualifications selection method. PRIF CO team and the user unit had occasional issues with less than 10 individual consultants: these issues were resolved amicably without affecting the TA outcome and outputs.

The PMC approved the workplan of the TA on an annual basis. The progress and financial status of the TA was reported to the PMC quarterly. The TA had seven working groups with lead sector coordinators (represented by PRIF partners) who coordinated technical input from sector specialists within PRIF partners. The working groups supported the five economic infrastructure sectors including energy; information and communications technology; road, aviation, and maritime transport; waste management; and water and sanitation; and cross-cutting subsectors such as environment and safeguards and sustainable infrastructure management. The cross-cutting working groups were formed during TA implementation upon consultations with PRIF partners. An independent governance and implementation review was completed in March 2015; a review of optimum operating model was completed in April 2018; and a strategic review was completed in January 2019.<sup>3</sup> The assets procured by the TA were transferred to ADB's Pacific and Liaison and Coordination Office.

### Conduct of Activities

The activities were conducted as planned in the TA report (later updated in a major change). The TA had three minor changes in scope and implementation arrangements and an extension before the major change in 2016 in (i) November 2013 to revise the financing plan to cover the representation expenses during PRIF management committee meetings, SWG meetings, yearly retreat and consultation meetings with other stakeholders; (ii) November 2014 to add QCBS method for firm recruitment; (iii) June 2015 to increase the budget by \$500,000 (TASF-V), primarily to respond to the Government of Vanuatu's request for post-disaster response after Cyclone Pam; and (iv) September 2015 to extend the TA from April 2016 to October 2016 to conclude ongoing activities.<sup>4</sup> Following the additional cofinancing of \$4.0 million from ADB (\$1.0 million), EIB (equivalent of \$1.1 million) and the Government of New Zealand (equivalent of \$1.9 million) in February 2016, the TA was extended for 3 years from the original TA completion date until 30 April 2019.<sup>5</sup> The major change entailed no change in the implementation arrangements or procurement arrangements. The TA outcomes and outputs remained unchanged while some performance indicators were revised and/or added (Appendix 1). Later, a partial cancellation of last tranche payment from the Government of Australia was processed in March 2017, which led to the removal of an activity under output 2 and procurement of a minimum of \$1.0 million of consultancy services per annum from 30 April 2016 to 30 April 2019. The outcome and outputs remained unchanged. The TA was further extended for 6 months in July 2018 to complete ongoing activities from 30 April 2019 to 31 October 2019.<sup>6</sup> Following the last extension, a minor change in TA scope and partial cancellation of the TA funds was approved for \$1.1 million equivalent from the EIB in September 2018 due to the absence of an overarching institutional level framework agreement between ADB and EIB.<sup>7</sup> A reduction of the TA amount led to the reallocation of the TA budget while the outcome or outputs remained unchanged.

Improved coordination of PRIF partners' infrastructure investments in the Pacific was achieved through quarterly PMC meetings; updating partner project database regularly; and providing secretariat support to PMC, SWG and senior management team. New PRIF partners were engaged, for example, the Japan International Cooperation Agency joined PRIF in 2013 and the United States joined PRIF in 2019. Fiji joined PRIF in 2014 as a PRIF developing member country. The governments of the PICs received technical advice on infrastructure development including support in developing national infrastructure investment plans, on-demand short term technical advice, and on-demand response

<sup>3</sup> ADB. 2015. PRIF Operational and Governance Review of the PRIF. Manila; ADB. 2018. *PRIF Review of Optimum Operating Model*. Manila; ADB. 2019. Strategic Policy Review of the PRIF. Manila.

<sup>4</sup> ADB (Pacific Department). 2013. TA 8345 REG Establishment of Pacific Region Infrastructure Facility Coordination Office—Request for Minor Change in Scope. Memorandum. 26 November (Internal); ADB (Pacific Department). 2014. TA 8345 REG Establishment of Pacific Region Infrastructure Facility Coordination Office—Request for Minor Change in Implementation Arrangement. Memorandum. 18 November (Internal); ADB (Pacific Department). 2015. TA 8345 REG Establishment of Pacific Region Infrastructure Facility Coordination Office—Request for Approval of Increase in TA Amount and Minor Change in Scope. Memorandum. 22 June (Internal); ADB (Pacific Department). 2015. TA 8345 REG Establishment of Pacific Region Infrastructure Facility Coordination Office—Minor Change in Scope: Change in Implementation Arrangement: Extension of TA Completion Date. Memorandum. 8 September (Internal).

<sup>5</sup> ADB (Pacific Department). 2017. TA 8345 REG Establishment of Pacific Region Infrastructure Facility Coordination Office—Request for Partial Cancellation of TA Funds. Memorandum. 15 March (Internal).

<sup>6</sup> ADB (Pacific Department). 2018. TA 8345 REG Establishment of Pacific Region Infrastructure Facility Coordination Office—Extension of TA Completion Date. Memorandum. 6 July (Internal).

<sup>7</sup> ADB (Pacific Department). 2018. TA 8345 REG Establishment of Pacific Region Infrastructure Facility Coordination Office—Minor Change in TA Scope and Partial Cancellation of TA Funds. Memorandum. 18 September (Internal).

to natural disaster support. Seventy-eight technical reports and 24 knowledge products were produced during TA implementation, expanding and maintaining the PRIF website document library after completion of each activity, including the Tuvalu Infrastructure Strategy and Investment Plan 2016–2025, Cybersecurity and Safeguarding Electronic Transactions in the Pacific Islands, Infrastructure Resilience and Building Standards in Pacific Island Countries, Pacific Region Solid Waste Management and Recycling—Pacific Country and Territory Profiles, and Road Pavement Design for the Pacific Region—Desk Research on the Use of Locally Available Materials.

#### Technical Assistance Assessment Ratings

Criterion	Assessment	Rating
Relevance	The TA focuses on infrastructure and also takes into account broader issues of development effectiveness as identified by ADB's Pacific Approach. In addition to donor harmonization, PRIF involved explicit work to improve prioritization, planning, and budgeting by the PRIF member countries over the medium to longer term. <sup>8</sup> The TA aligned with the Pacific regional business plan, 2013–2015 as a 2013 nonlending activity and supported the plan's emphasis on strengthening core government functions, including policy formulation and public sector management. <sup>9</sup> By facilitating coordination between PRIF partners, regional organizations and other development partners active in the Pacific region, and providing technical assistance, technical diagnostics and practical research and analysis services to countries, the TA addressed critical gaps in the delivery of assistance and investments in the PICs, given the complexities, limited capacity and high costs of designing and implementing projects. The initial implementation arrangements were revised by adding firm selection methods to support delivery of complex activities. In addition, the independent strategic review of PRIF concluded that the TA had "established a clear record of performance" and that its "work qualifies as a best practice in respect to aid effectiveness in low-income countries" (footnote 3).	Relevant
Effectiveness	The PICs received comprehensive and coordinated support from PRIF. The TA provided support to all the participating PICs with coordination and knowledge products including Cybersecurity and Safeguarding Electronic Transactions in the Pacific Islands, Infrastructure Resilience and Building Standards in Pacific Island Countries, Pacific Region Solid Waste Management and Recycling—Pacific Country and Territory Profiles, and Road Pavement Design for the Pacific Region—Desk Research on the Use of Locally Available Materials. PRIF operated on demand-basis, receiving requests from the PRIF member countries to support the infrastructure policy, planning, and/or implementation. Eleven of thirteen PRIF member countries received support for infrastructure policy, planning, and/or project implementation. Eight countries were supported in developing their national infrastructure plans (Appendix 1). PRIF partners expressed satisfaction that the coordination services and technical assistance services provided during the project especially through the SWG meetings—helped to improve the quality of their investments in the Pacific. Regional stakeholders and countries have also expressed satisfaction through recurring and regular assistance requests to PRIF. PRIF assisted the development of national infrastructure investment plans for Cook Islands, Nauru, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Samoa, Tuvalu, and Tonga. The use of national infrastructure plans varies for all the countries. Governments of Pacific developing member countries (DMCs) used the plans to seek co-financing and collaboration opportunities with PRIF partners and other sources, including the People's Republic of China, Green Climate Fund and United Arab Emirates. PRIF provided infrastructure sector coordination support in Kiribati between 2013 and 2016 by coordinating donor funded infrastructure projects and provided guidance for PRIF partners in delivering future coordination assistance to governments in the Pacific Region.  The PRIF partner surveys and questionnaires to measure the level of use of PRIF knowledge products in investment designs and inclusion of improved maintenance plans in PRIF partner capital works projects were not completed during TA implementation.  Output 1 of the TA is "improved coordination of PRIF partner infrastructure investments in the Pacific", with indicator 1e "PRIF CO demonstrated facilitation of cofinancing for at least two infrastructure projects per annum." It is inherently difficult	Effective

<sup>8</sup> ADB. 2009. *Pacific Approach 2010–2014*. Manila.

<sup>9</sup> ADB. 2012. *Pacific: Regional Operations and Business Plan, 2013–2015*. Manila.

Criterion	Assessment	Rating
	<p>to attribute facilitation of cofinancing, even in instances where PRIF partners discussed specific projects during PMC meetings. For example, PRIF conducted a pre-feasibility study of a proposed Nauru port upgrade that informed PMC discussions and subsequently, the project design. The project was co-financed by a number of partners including ADB and the Government of Australia. Despite PRIF's early work on feasibility and convening discussions among PRIF partners, it is difficult to measure and demonstrate PRIF's role in facilitating cofinancing without an explicit reference to the PRIF CO in cofinancing announcements. In light of this, achievements against other indicators under Output 1 better demonstrate the effectiveness of the PRIF CO in improving coordination on infrastructure investments among PRIF partners. In particular, the sharing of pipelines per indicator 1d provided visibility of planned infrastructure investments and facilitated effective coordination.</p> <p>The collection of pipeline data from PRIF partners required concerted efforts and follow-ups due to internal approval processes and pipeline information sharing policies of PRIF partners. The timelines of developing knowledge products were extended due to unavailability of data in the Pacific. However, this provided an opportunity for PRIF to collect the latest data. The Pacific Infrastructure Performance Indicators report developed by PRIF in 2016 validates the issue of lack of data in the Pacific.<sup>10</sup> It was also acknowledged by the partners in one of the SWG meetings that the discussions were helpful for EU, ADB and the Green Climate Fund to prepare a significant €310 million water and sanitation project in Suva.</p>	
Efficiency	<p>The cost of PRIF coordination and technical support amounted to about 0.3% of the value of annual investments of the Pacific by PRIF partners. This is deemed efficient, in view of the unanimous decision of PRIF partners to pursue the initiative into a subsequent phase, extending the TA completion date from April 2013 to April 2019 with additional cofinancing provided to undertake additional activities.</p> <p>During implementation, the TA encountered some delays in missions due to the introduction of more stringent mission clearance requirements, and new procurement guidelines that required time for familiarization, which affected the timeliness of engaging firms and processing multiple consultant selections concurrently. The strategic review of PRIF in 2019 observed that administrative constraints appeared to have led to the "creation of short-term pressure which in turn undermine budget continuity and PRIF CO effectiveness," hence confirming that the management of the core staff could be improved (footnote 3). The EIB committed \$1.1 million equivalent for PRIF Phase III. Internal discussions with Strategy, Policy and Partnerships Department and Controller's Department identified that ADB's system was unable to be process this additional financing. This financing was cancelled in September 2018, which affected the TA's commitments and work plan (footnote 8).</p>	Efficient
<b>Overall Assessment</b>	<p>The TA achieved its outputs, which supported achievement of the overall outcome and 3 out of 5 outcome performance targets. The TA improved coordination between PRIF partners for infrastructure investments by regularly hosting the quarterly and annual meetings, SWG meetings, and coordinating the sharing of pipeline project database. The TA provided technical advice on infrastructure development to its PRIF DMCs by developing 22 research and analysis knowledge products; providing advisory services on infrastructure policy and planning to 11 PRIF DMCs; publishing 24 knowledge products; developing SWG workplans to prioritize activities; and providing post-disaster support for Vanuatu disaster response and Fiji emergency response to tropical cyclone Winston. The TA did not achieve 2 out of 5 outcome performance targets related to monitoring and evaluation. An M&amp;E expert was engaged to undertake the partners survey, which was not completed after multiple follow-ups.</p>	Successful
<b>Sustainability</b>	<p>Opportunities for the sustainable implementation of new skills was provided through TA, capacity building activities, coordination, and collaboration in Pacific DMCs— notably in infrastructure investment planning. This was delivered through close work with government counterparts and regional organizations in the Pacific as well as through PRIF knowledge products.</p>	Likely sustainable

<sup>10</sup> PRIF. 2016. *2016 Pacific Infrastructure Performance Indicators 'PIPIs'*. Sydney.

### Lessons Learned and Recommendations

Design and/or planning	The TA design and monitoring framework was well devised with sufficient flexibility to respond to the countries' demands and to the PRIF partners' demands as the TA progressed—a key feature of the PRIF's coordination arrangements.
Implementation and/or delivery	The implementation of PMC-approved activities led to the production of 78 technical reports and publications. This was executed through the recruitment of 146 consultant contracts including 6 consulting firms, 132 individual consultants and 8 resource persons. The implementation of the TA was generally successful but some activities encountered delays for a variety of reasons, including the lack of familiarity of consultants with ADB systems, including the Consultant Management System and the introduction in late-2018 of the Technical Assistance Claims Partner; changes in priorities from client governments during the course of TA activities; the introduction of more stringent mission clearance requirements in 2018; intermittent work overloads of the PRIF CO team; and occasional issues with consultants. The changes to mission clearance requirements from PIC governments required additional documentation and processing time. Given that missions were scheduled to coincide with the availability of government counterparts, it was necessary to reschedule due to delays in mission approvals. The TA also encountered some delays in procurement during the overall TA implementation period, particularly during the procurement of firms using quality- and cost-based selection method and processing multiple individual consultant selection in parallel following approval of multiple activities by the PMC. A monitoring and evaluation specialist was recruited as a consultant to undertake activities related to outcome performance indicators c, d and e (Attachment 1). The consultant did not complete this assignment despite concerted follow-up with the consultant and the performance evaluation for this consultant was completed to reflect the non-completion of the assignment. There was not sufficient time prior to the completion of PRIF Phase III to carry out a selection process for a replacement monitoring and evaluation specialist and completion of the work. PRIF CO will follow up on the reporting under TA-9819 REG, the new phase of PRIF.
Management of staff and consultants	Significant changes to the PRIF CO staff (3 to 6 full time staff with 14 different consultants hired under 21 individual contracts) led to challenges in the delivery of services. An operational review conducted in 2018 proposed new operational structures to address “the need for longer-term funding certainty and broader funding base” and “the desire to provide greater stability in PRIF CO management and PRIF CO core team.” Majority of the individual consultants engaged for the TA performed satisfactorily. A few individual consultants were noted to be excellent in their work and the new phase of PRIF, TA 9819-REG continues to work with them. <sup>11</sup> PRIF CO team and the user unit had occasional issues with less than 10 individual consultants, which were dealt with amicably without affecting the TA outcome and outputs.
Knowledge building	A total of 24 knowledge products were developed during this TA. Examples of successful and effective hand-over projects include the Pacific utilities benchmarking performance work of PRIF to the Pacific Water and Wastewater Association (PWWA) and to the Pacific Power Association (PPA). The 2016 PWWA benchmarking report was released during the Pacific Water conference and Expo in Tonga, August 2016. The report was based on the indicators developed during 2013 PWWA benchmarking exercise supported by PRIF. <sup>12</sup> Similarly, the benchmarking of the 2015 Fiscal Year data for the PPA Utilities was the first year in which the Association had taken full responsibility of collection and verification of the data as well as and the production of the key performance indicator after receiving support from PRIF for its earlier reports. <sup>13</sup> The knowledge products by PRIF covered challenging issues such as: transport accessibility for people with disabilities, solid waste management, the capital cost of renewable energy projects in the Pacific, and the constraints in the application of building codes and standards in the Pacific. The building codes publications has attracted requests from PICs to review their country's building codes. The key challenge met is the lack of opportunities for Pacific Islanders to build stable career paths and fully benefit from new knowledge acquisition.
Stakeholder participation	PRIF partner and stakeholder involvement and participation in PRIF activities, including attendance at SWG coordination meetings or support to the 51 subprojects' implementation committees. Among the key challenges met was the wide range of assistance expectations from the PRIF partners and

<sup>11</sup> ADB (Pacific Department). 2019. *Pacific Region Infrastructure Facility Coordination Office-Leveraging Infrastructure for Sustainable Development: Technical Assistance Report*. Manila.

<sup>12</sup> PWWA. 2016. *Benchmarking Report 2016: Pacific Water and wastewater Association Five Years of Performance Assessment (2011–2015)*. Samoa; PWWA. 2013. *Pacific Water and Wastewater Utilities Benchmarking Report 2013*. Fiji.

<sup>13</sup> PPA. 2017. *Pacific Power Utilities Benchmarking Report - 2015 Fiscal Year*. Fiji; PPA, PRIF. 2016. *Pacific Power Utilities Benchmarking Report – 2013 & 2014 Fiscal Years*. Fiji.

	the stakeholders and the reconciliation of those expectations with the available PRIF CO resources. This was achieved through the dynamic “management committee/SWG” driven work prioritization mechanism. The sharing of pipeline projects of PRIF agencies was conducted on average every six months, which required additional effort to collect the data. This could be improved in a future phase of PRIF.
Partner financing and cofinancing	Fluctuations in committed and in effective financial contributions from the PRIF partners led to some uncertainties in allocating resources and in budgeting assistance programs. It was not possible to process the European Investment Bank planned cofinancing commitment of \$1.1 million equivalent due to legal issues preventing the ability to conclude a cofinancing mechanism and agreement with ADB. During the TA period, ADB built on the constructive working relationship with the Governments of Australia and New Zealand. The TA received continuous support from the Government of Australia and the Government of New Zealand in the form of support for the extension of the TA by 3 years, from 2016 to 2019 and additional cofinancing from the Government of New Zealand for additional activities during the extended period. The PRIF partners also supported a further extension from April 2019 to October 2019 to complete the ongoing activities. Furthermore, the Government of New Zealand agreed to roll over the unutilized funds in the amount of \$1.45 million from the TA to its new phase, TA-9819 REG (footnote 8).
Replication and/or scaling up	A subsequent phase with an approved budget of \$9.09 million was approved on 3 October 2019. An increase in TA amount and minor change in scope memo is being processed by the user unit to include a \$2 million contribution from the United States. This will be the first contribution from the United States. Following the recommendations from the PRIF Governance and Implementation Review, the communication strategy for the new phase addresses the need for a regional perspective in partner coordination and improvement in information sharing and coordination with regional agencies; increase in in-country coordination with the PRIF partners through SWGs; increase in the level of support for national infrastructure investment plans including the inclusion of asset management and maintenance, capacity building; and recruitment of PRIF CO team leader to take an increasingly strategic view of the work program, development of strategic products and discussion papers in collaboration with the PRIF CO team and SWGs. In addition, the PMC meetings are now planned to create more time for strategic PMC discussions by approving some concept notes out of session.
Post-TA financial resource	Not applicable as the second phase of the TA has been approved (TA-9819 REG).

#### Follow-up Actions

<p>1. Improving staff management practices to improve continuity in services and PRIF CO effectiveness.</p> <p>Work to maximize PRIF CO's effectiveness will require a multi-faceted approach to staff management. Noting that it is critical for PRIF CO to establish strong networks with PRIF partners and Pacific DMCs, ADB will consider longer-term contracts for the PRIF CO core team of consultants, which would facilitate continuity and the ability to foster productive working relationships. ADB will also strengthen the technical expertise of PRIF CO, particularly in the fields of economics, climate change and gender equality and social inclusion, in accordance with the needs of the Pacific and ADB's Strategy 2030.</p> <p>2. Maintaining flexibility in the development of PRIF's portfolio of interventions through a dynamic prioritization of work to respond to rapid changes in the Pacific, including advancements in technology and changes to national political agendas in the Pacific. In recognition of the importance of PRIF to make concerted efforts to keep abreast of the political and development contexts in the Pacific region to ensure it is agile and able to respond to a range of changes and shocks.</p>
--

Prepared by: Mary Kim

Designation and Division: Senior Programs Officer,  
Pacific Liaison and Coordination Office

## DESIGN AND MONITORING FRAMEWORK

<b>Impact</b> The quality of infrastructure investments in Pacific island countries <sup>a</sup> has improved.		
<b>Results Chain</b>	<b>Performance Indicators with Targets and Baselines</b>	<b>Achievements</b>
<b>Outcome</b>  Pacific island countries receive comprehensive and coordinated support and TA on infrastructure investments	By 30 April 2019	
	<p>a. All participating Pacific island countries are engaged in PRIF activities (revised February 2016)</p> <p>b. PRIF CO provides TA to a minimum of 10 out of 14 Pacific island countries and all technical sectors (revised February 2016)</p> <p>c. PRIF partners demonstrate that 50% of knowledge products are utilized in investment designs (added February 2016)</p>	<p>a. Cook Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu.</p> <p>Achieved.</p> <p>b. Cook Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu covering Water, Energy, Transport, ICT, Environmental and social safeguards, urban development, and infrastructure management.</p> <p>Achieved.</p> <p>c. Monitoring and/or reporting through donor surveys and questionnaires not completed at time of this report.</p> <p>Not achieved.</p>
	d. All PRIF partner infrastructure investments align with national infrastructure plans (added February 2016)	<p>d. PRIF partner infrastructure investments are broadly aligned with national infrastructure plans. In terms of priority investment projects, PRIF supported the development of national infrastructure investment plans for Cook Islands, Nauru, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Samoa, Tuvalu, and Tonga. The use of national infrastructure plans varies for all the countries. It is, however, noticed that the governments use the plans more than the PRIF partners and seek funding from other sources too, like People's Republic of China, GCF and UAE. The status of other countries is:</p> <p>Cook Islands: 18 out of 24 projects (75%) completed or ongoing, of which 44% are PRIF partners funded.</p> <p>Tonga: 11 out of 13 projects (84.6%) are either completed or ongoing, of which 90% are PRIF partner funded.</p> <p>Samoa: 21 out of 33 projects (63.6%) are either completed, ongoing or committed, 47% of which are PRIF partner funded.</p> <p>Solomon Islands: 18 out of 19 projects (95%) are either completed or ongoing, 83% of which are PRIF partner funded.</p> <p>Nauru: 18 out of 32 projects (56%) are either completed or ongoing, 44% of which are PRIF partner funded.</p> <p>Vanuatu: 8 out of 26 projects (30%) are either completed or ongoing, 37% of which are PRIF partner funded. Cyclone Pam rehabilitation and reconstruction needed to be prioritized.</p> <p>Tuvalu: 5 out of 12 projects (41.6%) are either completed or ongoing, 40% of which are PRIF partner funded.</p>

Results Chain	Performance Indicators with Targets and Baselines	Achievements
	e. All new PRIF partner capital works projects include plans for improved maintenance from 30 April 2013 to 30 April 2019 (added February 2016)	e. Monitoring and/or reporting through donor surveys and questionnaires not completed at time of this report.  Not achieved.
<p><b>Outputs</b></p> <p>1. Improved coordination of PRIF partner infrastructure investments in the Pacific</p> <p>2. Governments of the Pacific island countries receive technical advice on infrastructure development</p>	<p>1a. PRIF CO coordinates a minimum of four PMC meetings per annum</p> <p>1b. PRIF CO coordinates one SMT meeting per annum</p> <p>1c. PRIF CO provides support to SWG coordinators for two SWG meetings per annum</p> <p>1d. PRIF partners contribute project pipeline data, and update existing project data, every 6 months (added February 2016)</p> <p>1e. PRIF CO demonstrates facilitation of cofinancing for at least two investment projects per annum (added February 2016)</p> <p>1f. All PRIF partners coordinate existing infrastructure projects and proposed project pipelines (added February 2016)</p> <p>2a. Development of sector research and analysis programs supported by development partner SWGs for at least four sectors</p> <p>2b. 66% of participating countries (8 out of 12) receive infrastructure policy, regulatory, and project advice</p> <p>2c. More than three knowledge products per annum published.</p>	<p>1a. 4 PMC meetings in each of 2013–2018, 3 PMC meetings in 2019 (TA ended in October 2019). Achieved</p> <p>1b. SMT meetings Annual SMT meetings held 2013–2017, none in 2018 and 2019. Partially achieved.</p> <p>1c. PRIF CO provided support to all meetings of SWGs, in each case at least two per annum. Achieved.</p> <p>1d. List of PRIF partners pipeline projects updated every 6 months on average. Achieved.</p> <p>1e. PRIF helped with coordination and collaboration between partners during its SWG meetings that led to cofinancing of projects. It is difficult to quantify the number of cofinanced projects resulted from SWG meetings. Number of cofinanced projects recorded in the database approximately 54 from a total of 484 ongoing and completed projects. From the total investment of \$4.39 billion, this represents \$960 million, or 22%. Achieved.</p> <p>1f. All PRIF partners shared information on existing projects and proposed project pipeline at SWG meetings. Achieved.</p> <p>2a. 22 research and analysis knowledge projects completed, supporting energy, water, transport, and ICT sectors. Achieved.</p> <p>2b. 11 countries have received advisory services on infrastructure policy, planning and/or support for project implementation: Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, Marshall Islands, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Vanuatu, and Tuvalu. Achieved.</p> <p>2c. 24 knowledge products published in 6 years, more than three per year, (excluding case studies and project brochures). Achieved.</p>

<b>Results Chain</b>	<b>Performance Indicators with Targets and Baselines</b>	<b>Achievements</b>
	<p>2d. All SWGs develop annual work programs (added February 2016)</p> <p>2e. PRIF CO provides disaster support for at least one country per annum (added February 2016)</p>	<p>2d. Work programs including prioritized TA and/or knowledge product proposals for each SWG developed every quarter or bi-annually for PMC approval.</p> <p>Achieved.</p> <p>2e. Support provided following PMC approval and as per disaster opportunity: Vanuatu Disaster Response and Fiji Emergency Response to Tropical Cyclone Winston.</p> <p>Partially achieved.</p>

**Actual Key Activities with Milestones****1. Improved coordination of Pacific Region Infrastructure Facility partner infrastructure investments in the Pacific**

- 1.1 Update PRIF coordination and communications strategy and action plan, including opportunities for improved coordination with PRIF partners (including development partner country post representatives), regional agencies, and other regional TA programs (e.g., Private Sector Development Initiative,<sup>b</sup> Pacific Business Investment Facility<sup>c</sup>): Updated in 2015.
- 1.2 Update PRIF partner activity database by the end of June and end of December each year: Updated every 6 months on average.
- 1.3 Maintain and update PRIF website, prepare online newsletters, and manage social media interface: PRIF website updated at every project completion. Newsletters issued every 3 months on average.
- 1.4 Implement the PRIF coordination and communications strategy, including reporting to all PMC meetings on progress: Meetings summary records issued for all PMC meetings.
- 1.5 Provide secretariat support to all PMC, SMT, and SWG meetings: Provided for all PMC, SMT, and SWG meetings.
- 1.6 Support PMC chair to raise the strategic level of engagement at the PMC: Assistance to PMC chair for the preparation of all PMC meetings. (added February 2016)
- 1.7 Assist the PMC to engage with potential new PRIF development partner members and new participating Pacific island countries: Complied. US joined PRIF in 2019. Fiji joined in 2014. (added February 2016)
- 1.8 Coordinate and circulate quarterly reports: Complied. (added February 2016)
- 1.9 Facilitate information sharing and peer reviews between PRIF partners, and among other relevant stakeholders, regional organizations, and sector interest groups: Complied. (added February 2016)

**2. Governments of the Pacific island countries receive technical advice on infrastructure development**

- 2.1 Sign full-time contracts for PRIF coordination office staff: Complied.
- 2.2 Assist Pacific island countries in preparing national infrastructure development plans on demand: All countries consulted on their NIIP needs.
- 2.3 Prepare national sector development plans on demand: Eight NIIPs completed as per demand.
- 2.4 Provide short-term technical advice as requested by PRIF partners and Pacific island countries, including in response to natural disasters: 31 TA provided.
- 2.5 Develop a minimum of three knowledge products and eight technical reports per annum in close coordination with PRIF partners, SWGs, and Pacific island countries: 24 KPs (more than three per year) and 78 technical reports (more than 8 per year) developed during the period (6 years). (added February 2016)
- 2.6 Consult with PRIF partners and other relevant organizations to establish strategic themes by September 2016 for PMC approval: Strategic work plan developed and approved in 2016. (added February 2016)
- 2.7 Procure a minimum of \$1.0 million of consultancy services per annum from 30 April 2016 to 30 April 2019: Average TA and KPs procured per year: \$1.1 million. (added February 2016)
- 2.8 Maintain and expand the document repository linked to the PRIF website: PRIF website library updated at every project release.
- 2.9 Implement a quality assurance process for PRIF TA outputs, including liaison with sector lead coordinators: Systematic TA and KP work approval from SWGs (including sector lead coordinators) and PMC implemented in early 2014. (added February 2016)
- 2.10 Prepare an annual PRIF CO work plan by 30 June of each year: PRIF CO work plan issued every year up to 2016, and every quarter onward.
- 2.11 Revise the monitoring and evaluation plan and prepare progress reports on the plan: DMF updated every year. (added February 2016)
- 2.12 Prepare an annual PRIF report by the end of June of each year: Annual report issued every year.
- 2.13 Develop and implement a research agenda: Included into every SWG meeting agenda.

2.14 Liaise with government counterparts of the Pacific island countries and PRIF partners on proposals for assistance on demand: Complied.

**Actual Inputs**

Asian Development Bank: \$2.0 million

Government of Australia: \$6.9 million

Government of New Zealand: \$4.3 million

ADB = Asian Development Bank, DMF = design and monitoring framework, GCF = Green Climate Fund, ICT = Information and Communications Technology, KP = knowledge product, NIIP = National Infrastructure Investment Plan, PRIF = Pacific Region Infrastructure Facility, PRIF CO = PRIF Coordination Office, PMC = PRIF management committee, SMT = senior management team, SWG = sector working group, TA = technical assistance, TASF = Technical Assistance Special Fund, UAE = United Arab Emirates, US = United States.

<sup>a</sup> The PRIF covers 13 Pacific island countries: the Cook Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu. Additionally, monitoring covers Papua New Guinea and Timor-Leste.

<sup>b</sup> ADB. 2013. Pacific Private Sector Development Initiative, Phase III. Manila.

<sup>c</sup> ADB. 2014. Establishment of the Pacific Business Investment Trust Fund and Technical Assistance for the Pacific Business Investment Facility. Manila.

Source: Asian Development Bank.

## TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COST

**Table A2.1: Technical Assistance Cost by Activity**  
(\$'000)

Item	Amount		
	Original	Revised	Actual
1. Consultants	9,430.0	10,474.8	10,005.9
2. Equipment	75.0	94.5	52.3
3. Training, seminars and/or conferences	165.0	212.4	140.9
4. Surveys	90.0	141.3	46.5
5. Miscellaneous TA administration	1,005.0	1,848.3	975.3
6. Pilot testing	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. Contingency	1,035.0	384.5	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>11,800.0</b>	<b>13,156.0</b>	<b>11,220.9</b>

TA = technical assistance.

Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.

**Table A2.2: Technical Assistance Cost by Financier**  
(\$'000)

	Asian Development Bank	Government of Australia	Government of New Zealand	Total Cost
1. Original <sup>a</sup>	500.00	8,900.00	2,400.00	11,800.00
2. Revised <sup>b</sup>	2,000.00	6,855.79	4,300.00	13,155.79
3. Actual	1,950.39	6,268.66	3,001.90	11,220.95
4. Unused	49.61	587.13	1,298.10	1,934.84

<sup>a</sup> Original estimated cost in the Technical Assistance (TA) report.

<sup>b</sup> Cost after additional financing and partial cancellation of the TA during TA implementation.

Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.