



Completion Report

Project Number: 48197-001
Technical Assistance Number: 8636
February 2016

Mainstreaming Results-Based Public Sector Management—Supporting the Initiatives of the Asia- Pacific Community of Practice on Managing for Development Results

This document is being disclosed to the public in accordance with ADB's Public Communications Policy 2011.

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.

TA Number and Name:			Amount Approved: \$500,000	
TA 8636-REG: Mainstreaming Results-Based Public Sector Management–Supporting the Initiatives of the Asia-Pacific Community of Practice on Managing for Development Results			Revised Amount: \$550,629	
Executing Agency:	Source of Funding:		Amount Undisbursed:	Amount Utilized:
Asian Development Bank	People's Republic of China Regional Cooperation and Poverty Reduction Fund - \$500,000 Cooperation Fund in Support of Managing for Development Results - \$50,629		\$39,636	\$510,993
TA Approval Date:	TA Signing Date:	Fielding of First Consultants Date:	TA Completion Date	
8 April 2014	8 April 2014	14 July 2014	Original: 30 June 2015 Actual: 5 November 2015	
			Account Closing Date	
			Original: 30 June 2015 Actual: 27 January 2016	
<p>Description. Managing for development results (MfDR) is an approach to management that orients policies, institutions, and individuals to focus more on results than activities and inputs to achieve intended outcomes. The Asian Development Bank (ADB)'s MfDR support focuses on three pillars: (i) mainstreaming MfDR in ADB; (ii) promoting MfDR with other development partners; and (iii) assisting Developing Member Countries (DMCs) on MfDR. Since 2006, ADB has supported the Asia Pacific Community of Practice on Managing for Development Results (APCoP). APCoP's activities are directed by a Coordinating Committee of 5 DMC officials around the core of mainstreaming MfDR approaches in public sector management (PSM) functions of planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p>Expected Impact, Outcome, and Outputs. At the impact level, the Technical Assistance (TA) envisioned that MfDR approaches would be further advanced in participating countries. The outcome was stated as "increased application of MfDR by APCoP members in their country contexts." The TA aimed at 3 outputs: (i) results-based PSM assessments/country-level activities undertaken; (ii) South-South dialogue enhanced by bringing together APCoP members at the subregional level to share their country-level MfDR implementation experiences; and (iii) best practices in PSM distilled and dissemination through a regional knowledge-sharing conference of APCoP members, and through publications.</p> <p>Delivery of Inputs and Conduct of Activities. The TA provided a facility to respond to the demand from DMCs to promote improving development results; reinforced international development effectiveness commitments on results; and was aligned with ADB's Strategy 2020 drivers of change on governance and capacity development, knowledge solutions and partnerships. ADB's Mid-Term Review action plan of 2014 reinforced the continued relevance of the TA's proposed outcomes and its support for regional CoP as it highlighted the importance of "promoting knowledge solutions" through improved knowledge management, especially encouraging the development and sharing of best practices amongst and with DMCs.</p> <p>5.5 person-months of international and 20.4 person-months of national consultants were recruited as individual consultants (compared to 4.5 person-months international and 36 person-months national as envisioned in the TA report). Terms of reference were well prepared. Two minor changes of TA scope and implementation arrangements were approved on 30 June 2015 and 19 October 2015. The first was to (i) broaden the scope of country level activities beyond results-based management (RBM) assessments to include direct country-level support to priority RBM initiatives in Indonesia, Nepal, and Sri Lanka; (ii) add an additional amount of \$50,629, sourced from the uncommitted balance of the Cooperation Fund in Support of Managing for Development Results to allow for continuation of country level activities; (iii) reduce the number of country level activities from 4 to 3 due to the limited funds; (iv) extend the TA until 5 November 2015 to provide sufficient time to finalize country level activities; (v) call off the planned knowledge-sharing seminar in Singapore that was included under output 2, following the transfer of the responsible staff in the Singaporean Ministry of Foreign Affairs; and (vi) increase the duration of the international consultant position from 1 person-month to 3 person-months, while the position of the international logistics coordinator (1 person-months, international) was forgone. The second minor change in scope and implementation arrangements consisted of the replacement of the planned Sri Lanka country level activity by a knowledge-sharing activity for regional CoPs (from Africa, Latin America, and Asia and the Pacific), conducted jointly with the Korea Development Institute (KDI) in Seoul.</p>				

The original executing agency for the TA was ADB through the Results Management Unit (SPRU) of the Strategy and Policy Department. On 16 June 2014, the TA was transferred from SPRU to the Poverty Reduction, Social Development, and Governance Division of the Regional and Sustainable Development Department (RSDD).¹ The rationale given was that the transfer “would enable ADB to more efficiently leverage the progress made since 2004 and consolidate the coordination of this work across ADB.” The actual transfer of the TA took effect on 1 December 2014, as SPRU continued implementation of two workshops as part of its commitment to the People’s Republic of China (PRC). The performance of the executing agency is assessed to be highly satisfactory. The transfer to SDCC had a positive impact as it has allowed for closer alignment of APCoP activities with other Governance Thematic Group PSM operational support, knowledge sharing and partnership development activities. The performance of the APCoP Coordination Committee is also rated as highly satisfactory in actively leading the APCoP agenda, and working closely with the Secretariat. The two country level activities in Indonesia and Nepal were demand-driven and implemented in close cooperation with operational departments and relevant sector and thematic groups.

Evaluation of Outputs and Achievement of Outcome. Overall, the TA was effective in reaching its outcome. The envisaged increased application of MfDR by APCoP members in their country contexts was achieved. Under the *first output* (results-based PSM assessments/country-level activities undertaken) two activities were undertaken: (a) *Nepal: Leadership or Results: Training program for Mid-Career Officials in the Nepal Civil Service*, conducted from 22 September to 2 October 2015 in the Nepal Administrative Staff College, Kathmandu, Nepal, attended by 26 government officials and involving centers of excellence as resource persons; 91% of participants were very satisfied or satisfied with the content and 80% very satisfied or satisfied with the relevance of the content; and (b) *Indonesia: Senior Experts Meeting & Roundtable Discussion: Engaging the Private Sector in Health Service Delivery* conducted on 28 October 2015 in Bali, Indonesia. The event involved 20 participants and resource persons from the Ministry of Health Republic of Indonesia and the Secretary of the Philippines Department of Health, private sector representatives, and ADB staff and discussed how to achieve and reinforce service delivery standards in the private healthcare sector in Indonesia (report available on request, no evaluation conducted). The work also generated an assessment of health service delivery standards in Indonesia. While the design and monitoring framework envisioned 4 country level activities, only 2 were undertaken, largely due to a lack of demand for the small-sized TA interventions that could be covered under the TA budget and within the short TA time frame.

Under the *second output* (South-South dialogue enhanced by bringing together APCoP members at the subregional level to share their country-level MfDR implementation experiences) the following major knowledge sharing and country level activities were conducted: (a) *Workshop on Special Topic Courses on Evaluation*, 27–31 October, Suzhou, PRC, co-financed by the Asia-Pacific Finance Development Center (ADFC) of the Ministry of Finance, PRC. The event was attended by 32 participants from Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and 27 resource persons from ADB and other organizations (<http://bit.ly/1lmz9gT>). 83% of participants stated that the event “contributed” to their learning on evaluation, while 17% stated that it “somewhat contributed.” 80% stated that the course was “relevant” to government and 20% stated that it was “somewhat relevant;” (b) *Workshop on Evaluation for Policymaking*, 24–28 November, 2014 held in Nanning, PRC, co-financed by the AFDC. The workshop was attended by 43 participants from Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, PRC, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka and Viet Nam and involved 7 resource persons from ADB and other organizations (<http://bit.ly/1HPz7s1>). 90% of participants stated that the event contributed to their learning on evaluation and 10% stated that it somewhat contributed. 76% of participants commented that it was “relevant or somewhat relevant” for government while 6% stated that it was “not relevant.” and (vi) *Workshop on The Communities of Practice on Managing for Development Results: Instruments for Effective Development*, held at and cofinanced by the Korea Development Institute, Seoul, Republic of Korea, November 1–3, 2015. The event involved the 3 regional MfDR CoPs, 24 participants and 6 resource persons. 93% of participants rated the seminar “excellent” for usefulness and 75% reported “enhanced learning.” The second output was fully achieved although the event that was originally planned to be conducted in Singapore was held in Seoul.

Under the *third output* (best practices in PSM distilled and dissemination through a regional knowledge-sharing conference of APCoP members, and through publications) the *Leadership Forum on Performance, Capacity, and Change* was conducted on 23–24 March in ADB headquarters, Manila, Philippines. It was attended by 72 participants and involved 15 resource persons and a number of senior ADB staff. The leadership forum aimed at (i) sharing country experiences and deciding on country level work to be supported under the TA; (ii) sharing innovative tools and practices and (iii) discussing options for the future of APCoP, taking into account the demand from DMCs (<http://bit.ly/1yueRBJ>). The event was also conducted as a Governance Thematic Group learning program for ADB staff. 49% of participants assessed the overall quality of the program as “excellent,” while 27% considered it “good” and 24% considered it “average.” 100% would recommend the event to others. Also, more than 10 knowledge products were prepared under the TA, such as event reports (including a large number of good practice cases), video interviews with resource persons, and sector MfDR assessments. The output was fully achieved.

¹ Effective 1 June 2015, RSDD was renamed to Sustainable Development and Climate Change Department (SDCC), while RSGG was renamed to SDGG.

Overall Assessment and Rating. The project is rated as successful. The TA design was relevant although the demand for capacity development support under the TA appears to have been slightly overestimated. This may be partly due to the fact that the available amounts were too small to support any major country-level MfDR reform effort. Resources were used economically in the implementation of the activities listed above and the ratings of events and country-level activities were positive across the board. Therefore, the project is rated as highly efficient. However, given that with few exceptions, MfDR systems still remain to be more widely adopted in the Asia and the Pacific region, it is less than likely that the knowledge sharing and learning activities conducted under the TA will be sustainable. Despite extensive efforts to identify demand for support on the conduct of MfDR assessments, and the development of MfDR applications, only two out of the four planned country-level activities could be conducted and only one (Indonesia health) included an assessment of existing institutions and a consensus building exercise that could result in the development of MfDR applications for future implementation.

Major Lessons. While there has been progress on RBM reforms in some countries, such as the Philippines and Malaysia, there remains significant scope for further capacity development and knowledge management activities on RBM in the Asia and the Pacific region. Assistance programs should be led by regional departments, with operational support from the Governance Thematic Group, as needed. Opportunities for including RBM-related policy reforms in sector development programs and policy-based loans should be systematically assessed. Similarly, the quality of country partnership strategy results frameworks often benefits from investments in results-based country development plans. The APCoP appears to have reached the end of its natural life, as most networks inevitably do, despite the results-based agenda continuing to be a priority in most countries. The main reason is that the emergence of other regional networks has led to reduced country interest in APCoP over time and, in effect, crowded out APCoP. For instance, the Public Expenditure Management Network in Asia was established with support from the World Bank in 2012. Similarly, the reinvigorated OECD-Asian Senior Budget Official network also has a strong focus on results-based budgeting. While the Coordination Committee of the APCoP has provided effective guidance to project activities, focusing on knowledge sharing and learning, the APCoP network as such has not been particularly active. It consists of a listserv of several hundred government officials who have been trained by APCoP MfDR in the past on a range of PSM subjects from evaluation to results-based budgeting. APCoP has established solid partnerships with a number of organizations such as ADFC, KDI, Singapore Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and other regional MfDR CoPs.

Recommendations and Follow-Up Actions. The recent transfer of the APCoP MfDR from SPRU to SDGG has opened up avenues for better integrating MfDR-related functions into other PSM activities overseen by the Governance Thematic Group and its Secretariat. Functions include strategic development and operational support, knowledge management, partnerships, and staff skills development. While ADB support to the APCoP MfDR will come to an end with this TA, the Governance Thematic Group will continue to promote results-oriented PSM in DMCs consistent with ADB commitment to development effectiveness objectives. The external Governance Thematic Group listserv will be expanded by the members of the APCoP MfDR network. Contacts with Steering Committee members and other partners will be maintained. Systematic knowledge work on MfDR related country systems will continue, beginning with an assessment of results-based budgeting systems in selected countries and a Governance Brief on Performance Benchmarking. An event with regional MfDR networks will be conducted in KDI in July 2016 focusing on social sectors.

ADB = Asian Development Bank; ADFC = Asia-Pacific Finance Development Center; APCoP = Asia Pacific Community of Practice; CoP = Community of Practice; DMC = Developing Member Country; MfDR = Managing for Development Results; PSM = Public Sector Management; SDCC = Sustainable Development and Climate Change Department; SPRU = Results Management Unit; PRC = People's Republic of China; RBM = results-based management; RETA = regional technical assistance; RSDD = Regional and Sustainable Development Department; TA = technical assistance.

Prepared by: Claudia Buentjen, Principal Public Management Specialist, SDGG