



Memorandum

Economic Research and Regional Cooperation Department
Development Economics and Indicators Division

28 October 2015

FOR APPROVAL

To: Shang-Jin Wei *S. Wei*
Chief Economist and Director General, ERCD

From: Rana Hasan *Rana Hasan*
Director, ERDI

Subject: **C-TA0012-REG: TA Cluster Subproject 2 – Developing Impact Evaluation Methodologies, Approaches, and Capacities in Selected Developing Member Countries (DMCs)**
—Request for Approval of TA Cluster Subproject Implementation *n.c.*

A. INTRODUCTION

1. On 14 January 2013, the Asian Development Bank (ADB) approved the provision of a Technical Assistance Cluster (C-TA) for Developing Impact Evaluation Methodologies, Approaches, and Capacities in Selected Developing Member Countries (DMCs) in an aggregate amount not exceeding \$4.5 million equivalent.¹ The C-TA is financed by ADB, on a grant basis, from ADB's TA funding program (TASF-V). The first of the three subprojects under the TA was approved on 25 February 2013 and has committed most of its funds. This memo seeks the Chief Economist's approval for the second subproject.

B. STATUS OF SUBPROJECT 1

2. As of 30 September 2015, the subproject 1 has completed contract awards of \$843,566.0 or 56.2% of the total funding, and disbursement of \$335,670.0 or 22.4% of total funding. A total amount of \$1,539,823.0, or a little over 100% of the total funding is expected to be utilized as support or committed support to five impact evaluation studies, three knowledge sharing/training events, and preparation of an impact evaluation guidebook. Memo for subproject 1 approval, breakdown of subproject commitments, contract awards, and disbursement are in Attachment 1.

C. PROPOSED TA CLUSTER SUBPROJECT 2

3. As most of the funds of subproject 1 have been committed and there is significant demand for additional funding to support impact evaluation studies, we propose to start implementing subproject 2 with a total amount of \$1.50 million in line with the TA design. A list of indicative studies that may request funding from subproject 2 is in Attachment 2.

¹ See TA report at <http://www.adb.org/projects/documents/developing-impact-evaluation-methodologies-approaches-capacities-selected-dmc-tar>

1. Impact, Outcome and Outputs

4. The impact will be improved development effectiveness of ADB-designed projects responsive to the development needs of DMCs. The outcome will be that impact evaluation is mainstreamed² in ADB operations through each subproject resulting in well-designed and monitored ADB projects in DMCs. Key outputs of Subproject 2 will include (i) five or more impact evaluation studies conducted, (ii) at least one pilot study conducted, (iii) an impact evaluation data portal established, and (iv) a workshop for knowledge sharing and/or capacity building on impact evaluation conducted. The Design and Monitoring Framework is in Attachment 3.

2. Methodology and Key Activities

5. Subproject 2 will comprise two main components: (a) the conduct of five or more impact evaluation studies applying various methodologies and survey instruments; and (b) the development of impact evaluation methodologies, approaches, and capacities.

6. Under component (a), the subproject will continue to fund impact evaluation studies initiated by the regional departments. Five or more studies are aimed with at least one study in each of the five regions (Central and West Asia, East Asia, the Pacific, South Asia, and Southeast Asia). In principle, \$200,000 will be allocated to each region for conduct of impact evaluation studies under the subproject. The interventions to be evaluated include ADB lending and non-lending projects, and DMCs' programs and projects to which ADB has related operational activity, or where the intervention proposed for study relates to ongoing or future areas of support identified in country business operational programs or country partnership strategies.

7. Component (b) of the subproject will support the following activities to enhance DMCs and ADB's capacity for conducting innovative impact evaluations, evidence-based policy dialogue and management of knowledge generated from the impact evaluation studies: (i) reviewing impact evaluation methodologies and improvements in techniques and tools for sector- and theme-specific studies and assisting preparation of impact evaluation proposals; (ii) conducting one or two pilot studies that apply the best practice application of impact evaluation methodology to inform current and/or future ADB operations. The pilot study intends to reinforce mainstreaming of best practice impact evaluation in sectors that have received relatively little evaluation coverage to date. The projects should have significant involvement of ADB staff in designing and guiding executing the pilot study; (iii) conducting impact evaluation awareness raising and capacity building for DMC stakeholders and ADB staff; (iv) establishing and maintaining a central impact evaluation data portal containing information on project baseline, mid-line, and end-line surveys (e.g., reports, questionnaires, metadata—details on sampling methodology, interviewer manuals, field data); and (v) conducting knowledge-sharing activities (i.e., regional conferences where impact evaluation studies conducted will be presented; and workshops and seminars where experts will be invited to share methods, practices, and lessons on impact evaluation) and publishing and disseminating impact evaluation studies (publishing impact evaluation studies for distribution to ADB and government counterparts, and uploading studies to the ADB website).

² Impact evaluation is mainstreamed in ADB operations when it is integrated in the process of designing projects in DMCs based on gained experiences from actual conduct of impact evaluation studies adopting appropriate methodology, knowledge-sharing workshops and conferences, and capacity building activities.

3. Cost and Financing

8. Subproject 2 is estimated to cost \$1,500,000, to be financed on a grant basis by ADB's Technical Assistance Special Fund (TASF-V). Details of the cost estimates and financing plan are in Attachment 4.

9. The proposed subproject has been registered with OSFMD Registration No. ERCD-C-06/2015. An updated status of commitments of TA funds is in Attachment 5.

4. Implementation Arrangements

10. The subproject will commence on 1 November 2015 and will be completed on 31 March 2017. The implementation arrangements described for subproject 1 (paras. 8 to 13 in the memo in Attachment 1) will continue to apply in general. Consultants will be engaged by ADB in accordance with ADB's *Guidelines on the Use of Consultants* (2013, as amended from time to time). The outline terms of reference for the consultants are in Attachment 6. Disbursements will be made in accordance with ADB's *Technical Assistance Disbursement Handbook* (2010, as amended from time to time).

11. Based on the experience of implementing subproject 1, the following specifications and/or clarifications are provided.

- (i) There were initially limited funding requests for subproject 1. Therefore, the Impact Evaluation Committee (IEC) adopted a "first come first serve" approach to approving proposals. As a result, some regions have more than one project funded with total amount exceeding \$200,000, while some others have none. In light of the expressed demand for IE study funding under subproject 2, and to strike a balance between allocating the TA funds equally across regions and ensuring funds are used on a timely basis, an indicative allocation of \$200,000 for each regional department will be applied in Component (a). Each regional department will have until 30 June 2016 (8 months) to receive IEC approval of an IE study proposal. If no proposals are approved by that time, the IEC will consider proposals from other departments that have used their indicative allocations on a "first come first serve" basis.³ In addition, if the study fails to move ahead by making its first contract award within six months after IEC approval of the proposal, the IEC can cancel the funding commitment and re-allocate the funds to other studies. The regional department whose IE study is cancelled due to non-disbursement may re-submit proposals for IEC review in lieu of the cancelled study.
- (ii) Regional departments can propose to evaluate programs and projects in DMCs that are not directly supported by ADB with funding under component (a), given DMC's endorsement and proper justifications subject to IEC review.
- (iii) The pilot study under component (b) will be proposed by ERCD staff with endorsement from the regional department whose DMC will be the site of the proposed evaluation. The proposal will require the endorsement by the Director of ERDI and/or the Chief Economist, and be subject to IEC review. The proposal will be considered on a "first come first serve" basis and not counted toward the regional allocation for component (a). Consultants will also be engaged under component (b) to assist in developing proposals,

³ Total use of the funds under component (a) by a single regional department may not exceed a \$400,000 under this subproject, and allocations beyond the indicative allocation of \$200,000 will be subject to IE committee approval.

establishing and maintaining the impact evaluation data portal, and coordinating various activities under the TA.

D. RECOMMENDATION

12. Relevant department/offices have been consulted and comments received were incorporated as appropriate (Attachment 7).

13. Pursuant to para. 27 of OM Section D12/OP, the Chief Economist's approval is requested for the implementation of the proposed C-TA **Subproject 2** for Developing Impact Evaluation Methodologies, Approaches, and Capacities in Selected Developing Member Countries in an amount not exceeding the equivalent of US\$1,500,000 on a grant basis from ADB's TA funding program (TASF-V).

14. Such approval will be reported to the Board in the Quarterly Summary Report on TA Cluster Subprojects.

Attachments: (1) Subproject 1 approval memo, list of evaluation studies and activities with committed funding from Subproject 1, and contract awards and disbursement of Subproject 1
(2) Indicative Projects for Evaluation Funding under Subproject 2
(3) Design and Monitoring Framework (validated on-line)
(4) Cost Estimates and Financing Plan
(5) TA Registration and Status of Fund Commitment
(6) Outline Terms of Reference
(7) Comments Matrix

cc: The Secretary; General Counsel; Controller; Directors General, CWRD / EARD / IED / OSFMD / PARD / SARD / SDCC / SERD / SPD; Deputy Chief Economist, Director, OSP2; Senior Advisor VP KM&SD; D. Pham, CTIS-TA; Project File



ADB

Asian Development Bank

Memorandum

Economics and Research Department
Economic Analysis and Operations
Support Division

20 February 2013

FOR APPROVAL

To: Changyong Rhee
Chief Economist

CRH Feb 25, 2013

From: Cyn-Young Park
Assistant Chief Economist, EREA

Cyn-Young Park

Subject: **C-TA0012-REG: TA Cluster Subproject 1 – Developing Impact Evaluation Methodologies, Approaches, and Capacities in Selected Developing Member Countries (DMCs)**
—Approval of TA Cluster Subproject Implementation

K

A. INTRODUCTION

1. On 14 January 2013, the Asian Development Bank (ADB) approved the provision of a Technical Assistance Cluster (C-TA) for Developing Impact Evaluation Methodologies, Approaches, and Capacities in Selected Developing Member Countries (DMCs) in an aggregate amount not exceeding \$4.5 million equivalent. This will be financed by ADB, on a grant basis, from ADB's TA funding program (TASF-IV). This memo seeks the Chief Economist's approval for the first subproject.

B. PROPOSED TA CLUSTER SUBPROJECT

1. Impact, Outcome and Outputs

2. The impact will be improved development effectiveness of ADB-designed projects responsive to the development needs of DMCs. The outcome will be that impact evaluation is mainstreamed¹ in ADB operations through each subproject resulting in well-designed and monitored ADB projects in DMCs. Key outputs of Subproject 1 will include (i) five impact evaluation studies and their published study reports, (ii) a capacity building workshop and/or regional conference on impact evaluation, (iii) a pilot test of sector- or theme-specific impact evaluation study, and (iv) dissemination events.

2. Methodology and Key Activities

3. Subproject 1 will comprise two main components: (a) the conduct of five impact evaluation studies applying various methodologies and survey instruments; and (b) the development of impact evaluation methodologies, approaches, and capacities in both ADB and its DMCs.

¹ Impact evaluation is mainstreamed in ADB operations when it is integrated in the process of designing projects in DMCs based on gained experiences from actual conduct of impact evaluation studies adopting appropriate methodology, knowledge-sharing workshops and conferences, and capacity building activities.

a. Conduct of Impact Evaluation Studies (Component 1)

4. The first component will support the conduct of a number of impact evaluation studies while ensuring that at least one study is supported in each of the five regions (Central and West Asia, East Asia, the Pacific, South Asia, and Southeast Asia). On average, \$200,000 will be allocated to each region for conduct of impact evaluation studies under the subproject. Activities under the individual studies may include designing the study methodology and survey instruments; conducting baseline, mid-line, and end-line surveys; and producing the study reports. As learned from the experience of the TA for Implementing Impact Evaluation at ADB,² the C-TA may support key phases of individual studies; for example, to be approved by the Impact Evaluation Committee (IEC), only the design and conduct of the baseline survey may be implemented under the C-TA, while the mid-line and end-line surveys can be financed through separate initiatives.³ The set of individual studies will depend on the proposals to be submitted by the regional departments for approval by the IEC.

b. Development of Impact Evaluation Methodologies, Approaches, and Capacities (Component 2)

5. The second component under Subproject 1 will entail a number of activities, including (i) reviewing impact evaluation methodologies and improvements in techniques and tools for sector- and theme-specific studies; (ii) conducting at least one pilot study to test sector- or theme-specific techniques and tools; (iii) conducting impact evaluation awareness raising and capacity building for DMC officials and ADB staff; (iv) establishing and maintaining a central impact evaluation data portal containing information on project baseline, mid-line, and end-line surveys (e.g., questionnaires, sampling methodology, interviewer manuals, field data); and (v) conducting knowledge-sharing activities (i.e., regional conferences where impact evaluation studies conducted will be presented; and workshops and seminars where experts will be invited to share methods, practices, and lessons on impact evaluation) and publishing and disseminating impact evaluation studies (publishing impact evaluation studies for distribution to ADB and government counterparts, and uploading studies to the ADB website).

3. Cost and Financing

6. Subproject 1 is estimated to cost \$1,500,000, to be financed on a grant basis by ADB's Technical Assistance Special Fund (TASF-IV). Details of the cost estimates and financing plan are in Attachment 2.

7. The proposed subproject has been registered with OSFMD Registration No. XXXXX. An updated status of commitments of TA funds is in Attachment 4.

4. Implementation Arrangements

8. ADB will be the overall executing agency for the C-TA, which commenced on 31 January 2013 and will be completed on 31 March 2017. Subproject 1 may be completed by January 2015. An IEC will be established, comprising representatives (one principal and the alternate)⁴ from ADB's regional departments, Economics and Research Department (ERD), Regional and Sustainable

² 2010. ADB. *Technical Assistance on Implementing Impact Evaluation at ADB*. Manila.

³ If only the study design or baseline survey can be implemented under the TA, the IEC may require commitment from regional departments concerned to have mid-line and/or end-line surveys and/or studies undertaken in the future.

⁴ Alternate representatives will also be nominated to represent principal representatives in case the principal representatives are not available for a meeting.

Development Department (RSDD), and Operations Services and Financial Management Department (OSFMD), to be chaired by one of the regional department representatives. The Independent Evaluation Department (IED) will be invited as an observer. The IEC will provide overall guidance and oversight for the C-TA, including allocation of resources under each component. To ensure the relevance and feasibility of each impact evaluation study to be conducted, impact evaluation project proposals and budgets to be considered for funding under the proposed C-TA will be reviewed and approved by the IEC. ERD will backstop the regional departments by providing advice on impact evaluation project design with support from external experts, as required. For Component 1, the regional departments will submit proposals for impact evaluation studies to ERD for technical and feasibility review, and subsequent approval by the IEC. Upon clearance by the IEC, no-objection will be sought from the respective governments of DMCs to be covered under this C-TA prior to commencing the impact evaluation studies. The IEC approval will require commitment from regional departments to have mid-line and/or end-line surveys/studies undertaken in case only the study design or baseline survey can be implemented under the C-TA. The regional departments will be responsible for the final outputs of the impact evaluation studies, including reports, and for the quality of their respective studies. ERD will provide support to regional departments on the technical design and implementation of impact evaluation studies, and in the preparation and finalization of impact evaluation studies and reports. Results of impact evaluation studies will be published as part of project completion reports or as stand-alone working papers. The collection of data sets will be supervised by the impact evaluation study team members and staff assigned by the IEC to ensure their quality. Evaluation teams within ERD will propose, and if approved by the IEC, implement activities that fall under Component 2 of the C-TA in collaboration with regional departments.⁵

9. Selection of impact evaluation proposals will be based on, but not be limited to, the following criteria: (i) relevance of questions to be addressed by the proposed evaluation, (ii) effectiveness of proposed evaluation design to learn policy lessons, (iii) adequacy of chosen methodology and alternatives, (iv) cost effectiveness of proposed study design, (v) required technical expertise (in-house/external/local institutions), (vi) evaluation time required, (vii) commitment from regional departments to have mid-line and/or end-line surveys/studies undertaken in case only the study design or baseline survey can be implemented under the C-TA, and (viii) ownership by relevant DMC agencies.

10. Each of the impact evaluation studies will require a team of consultants, both international and national, to be engaged separately. The consultants will (i) provide technical guidance and feedback on the evaluation studies, (ii) develop the design of the impact evaluation studies together with the ADB team, (iii) assist in guiding and overseeing the implementation of impact evaluation studies, (iv) assist in survey designs, (v) implement the surveys, and (vi) assist in data analysis and report evaluation. Cost estimates for consulting services will be prepared in consultation with the divisions implementing the individual impact evaluation studies. Consultant packages for each impact evaluation study will comprise both firms and individuals, as appropriate. About 7 person-months of international and 15 person-months of national consulting services will be required for Subproject 1. Consultants will be engaged by ADB in accordance with its Guidelines on the Use of Consultants (2010, as amended from time to time). The outline terms of reference for consultants are in Attachment 3.

11. Procurement of equipment (computer hardware and software) by ADB will be in accordance with ADB's Procurement Guidelines (2010, as amended from time to time). Procurement will take place in coordination with ADB's Office of Information Systems and Technology and Office of

⁵ Proposals from regional departments, RSDD, and OSFMD are also welcome under Component 2. If approved by the IEC, the activities shall be jointly implemented by the initiator and ERD.

Administrative Services. When the C-TA is completed, any procured equipment will remain ADB property and/or will be disposed of in accordance with PAIs concerned. Disbursements under the C-TA will be made in accordance with ADB's *Technical Assistance Disbursement Handbook* (2010, as amended from time to time).

12. The C-TA will involve partnership with recognized impact evaluation research institutes and global centers of excellence, such as the International Initiative for Impact Evaluation, Innovations for Poverty Action, or the Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab. Such partnerships will largely be in terms of exchange of knowledge and participation of resource persons in training and consultation workshops. The TA will shoulder the incremental cost for resource persons if necessary.

13. ERD will report on the progress of the C-TA and the individual studies through the established project performance management systems in coordination with the regional departments and other concerned departments. A consolidated TA completion report will be prepared for the C-TA with inputs from the regional departments. For preparation of the consolidated completion report, each impact evaluation study team will provide complete information to the TA project officer.

C. RECOMMENDATION

14. Relevant department/offices have been consulted and comments received were incorporated as appropriate (Attachment 5).

15. Pursuant to para. 27 of OM Section D12/OP, your approval is requested for the implementation of the proposed C-TA **Subproject No. 1** for Developing Impact Evaluation Methodologies, Approaches, and Capacities in Selected Developing Member Countries in an amount not exceeding the equivalent of US\$1,500,000 on a grant basis from ADB's TA funding program (TASF-IV).

16. Such approval will be reported to the Board in the Quarterly Summary Report on TA Cluster Subprojects.

Attachments: (1) Design and Monitoring Framework (validated on-line)
(2) Cost Estimates and Financing Plan
(3) Terms of Reference
(4) TA Registration and Status of Fund Commitment
(5) Comments Matrix

cc: The Secretary; General Counsel; OIC, OREI; Controller; Directors General, CWRD / EARD / IED / PARD / RSDD / SARD / SERD; Deputy Chief Economist, Director, OSP2; Senior Advisor VP KM&SD; D. Pham, CTIS-TA; Project File

DESIGN AND MONITORING FRAMEWORK

Design Summary	Performance Targets and Indicators with Baselines	Data Sources and Reporting Mechanisms	Assumptions and Risks
Impact Improved development effectiveness of ADB-designed projects responsive to the development needs of DMCs	Increased number of completed ADB-financed projects rated <i>effective</i> in achieving outcome from 69% (average of 2009–2011) to 75% by 2020, based on ADB's measure of development effectiveness	Project completion reports Evaluation reports and other operational documents	Assumption DMC governments have adequate support and are open to incorporating impact evaluation studies in the design of loans and grants. Risk Project designs may involve additional cost from incorporating impact evaluation, which may discourage DMCs.
Outcome Impact evaluation is mainstreamed in ADB operations	By 2017, at least 15 new projects in ADB incorporate impact evaluation in project design with increased DMC involvement (2012 baseline: five in 2012 [outputs from the TA for Implementing Impact Evaluation at ADB]) ^a	Reports and recommendations of the President Reports to IEC TA performance reports TA completion reports Project completion reports Other operational documents Back-to-office reports	Assumptions There is adequate support from ADB Management and DMC governments to conduct impact evaluation studies on projects. For sustained implementation, succeeding impact evaluation studies will continue to be financed through other and/or succeeding TA projects and lending operations. Staff in regional departments are willing and committed to incorporating impact evaluation in the design of their projects. Risks Initially, staff may have difficulty in incorporating impact evaluation in project designs, which may impact on full acceptance of impact evaluation. There is always cost associated with incorporating impact evaluation in project designs. Inadequate funding may not allow rigorous impact evaluation.
Outputs 1. Impact evaluation studies adopting appropriate	Cluster 15 impact evaluation studies conducted	Reports to IEC TA performance	Assumptions Regional departments are able to identify projects and programs that are feasible for

Design Summary	Performance Targets and Indicators with Baselines	Data Sources and Reporting Mechanisms	Assumptions and Risks
methodology with effective technical support	<p>applying appropriate methodologies</p> <p>Subprojects 1 5 impact evaluation studies</p>	<p>reports</p> <p>Back-to-office reports</p> <p>Progress reports on TA implementation</p>	<p>baseline impact evaluation studies within the time frame of the TA.</p> <p>ADB staff are interested in learning impact evaluation methodologies and incorporating impact evaluation in their operations.</p>
2. Impact evaluation awareness-raising seminars and capacity building workshops for ADB staff and DMC officials	<p>Cluster 3–6 workshops, seminars, and/or conferences on impact evaluation methodologies</p> <p>1–2 pilot tests of sector- or theme-specific techniques and tools</p> <p>Number of DMC officials and ADB staff trained in conducting impact evaluation studies</p> <p>Subproject 1 1–2 workshops, seminars, and/or conferences on impact evaluation methodologies per subproject</p> <p>One pilot test of sector- or theme-specific techniques and tools for the C-TA</p>	<p>Reports to IEC</p> <p>TA performance reports</p> <p>Back-to-office reports</p>	<p>Availability of institutions and experts on impact evaluation applications and methodologies</p> <p>Risks Availability of data to conduct proper groundwork to help design and implement the impact evaluation study</p> <p>Availability of participants in workshops and seminars with regard to work load</p>
3. Reports and dissemination workshops on lessons learned from review of methodologies and conduct of pilot studies	<p>Dissemination seminars, workshops, and conferences</p> <p>Updating of central impact evaluation database and/or information repository</p> <p>Publication of papers and reports</p> <p>Citations of papers and reports under the TA as references in other publications</p>	<p>Reports to IEC</p> <p>TA performance reports</p> <p>Back-to-office reports</p> <p>Published papers and reports</p> <p>Scholarly publications and presentations at conferences</p>	

Activities with Milestones	Inputs	
TASF – US\$1,500,000		
1. Impact Evaluation Studies (project and sector/theme)		
Activity	Scheduled Start	Scheduled Finish
1.1 Organization and convening of Impact Evaluation Committee	Feb 01, 2013	Feb 28,2013
1.2 Screening and selection of projects for impact evaluation studies; obtaining of no-objection from concerned DMC governments	Mar 01, 2013	Apr 15, 2013
1.3 Engagement of consultants	Apr 16, 2013	May 15, 2013
1.4 Consultation with DMCs	May16, 2013	Jun 15, 3013
1.5 Conduct of impact evaluation studies	Jun 16, 2013	Oct 31, 2014
2. Awareness-raising seminars and capacity building workshops		
2.1 Capacity building workshop or regional conference on impact evaluation	Feb 01, 2014	Feb 28, 2014
3. Reports and dissemination workshops		
3.1 Publication of impact evaluation studies	Nov 01, 2014	Dec 30, 2014
3.2 Dissemination of reports	Jan 01, 2015	Jan 31, 2015

ADB = Asian Development Bank, C-TA = cluster technical assistance, DMC = developing member country, IEC = Impact Evaluation Committee, TA = technical assistance.

^a ADB. 2010. *Technical Assistance for Implementing Impact Evaluation at ADB*. Manila (TA 7680-REG)

Sources: Asian Development Bank; and ADB. 2011. *Development Effectiveness Review*. Manila.

COST ESTIMATES AND FINANCING PLAN^a

(\$'000)

Item	Total
Asian Development Bank^b	
1. Consultants	
a. Remuneration and per diem	
i. International consultants ^c	467
ii. National consultants ^c	220
b. International and local travel	108
c. Surveys ^d	370
d. Reports and communications	5
2. Equipment ^e	5
3. Workshop, training, seminars, and conferences ^f	140
4. Miscellaneous administration and support costs ^g	35
5. Contingencies ^h	150
Total	1,500

^a The cost estimates and financing plan are indicative as resource allocation across items is driven by resource needs of each proposed activity and will be determined by the Impact Evaluation Committee.

^b Financed by the Technical Assistance Special Fund (TASF-IV) of the Asian Development Bank (ADB).

^c Also includes remuneration and per diem for research assistants.

^d Includes the purchase of survey or study data.

^e Includes information technology equipment and software. Upon technical assistance completion, any procured equipment will either remain ADB property or will be disposed of in accordance with PAI 5.09.

^f Includes travel and per diem for workshop participants, costs for external resource persons and peer reviewers for workshops and related activities, and travel of staff as resource persons.

^g Includes publication-related costs.

^h Equivalent to 10% of total.

Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.

OUTLINE TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR CONSULTANTS FOR SUBPROJECT 1

A. International Consulting Services

1. **Impact evaluation advisor** (1.5 person-months, intermittent). The impact evaluation advisor should have more than 15 years of experience and a well-established reputation in impact evaluation research and practice. The advisor will mainly provide technical guidance and feedback on the evaluation studies under this technical assistance (TA). Specifically, the advisor will

- (i) review and provide detailed comments and suggestions on the inception reports prepared by the impact evaluation specialists,
- (ii) review and provide detailed comments and suggestions on the draft final impact evaluation studies,
- (iii) provide guidance on questions raised by the evaluation team regarding the evaluation studies,
- (iv) participate in the dissemination activities as requested, and
- (v) provide guidance on the contents of the study website.

2. **International impact evaluation specialists** (4 person-months, intermittent). The international impact evaluation specialists should have sufficient expertise and experience in impact evaluation of public interventions and a good understanding of the project sector in developing member countries (DMCs) of the Asian Development Bank (ADB). They will design the evaluation, guide and oversee its implementation, and produce high-quality deliverables. Specifically, the specialists will

- (i) conduct a desk review of project documents and coordinate with the project team in designing and implementing the evaluation;
- (ii) conduct a literature review with assistance from the national impact evaluation specialists;
- (iii) identify and access existing data sources with assistance from the national specialists;
- (iv) design an evaluation framework and develop an action plan for implementation;
- (v) prepare an inception report that includes a description of the intervention to be evaluated, evaluation questions, evaluation design, implementation plan, and other information requested by the project team;
- (vi) design survey instruments and guide the national specialists and survey team in the conduct of surveys;
- (vii) conduct empirical analysis of the impacts of the project;
- (viii) prepare a final report with details of the impact evaluation study, highlighting lessons learned and recommendations for future operations; and
- (ix) assist in disseminating the evaluation findings through academic publications, policy briefs, and/or seminars and workshops.

3. **Copy editor** (1 person-month). The copy editor will ensure that the outputs under this TA adhere to ADB style and usage, and conform to high publication standards. The consultant should have expertise in copy editing and desktop publishing, and preferably have extensive experience in similar assignments involving preparation of economic publications.

4. **Impact evaluation trainers** (0.5 person-month, intermittent). The impact evaluation trainers should be familiar with the impact evaluation literature and key development issues in

ADB's DMCs. They should also have practical experience in impact evaluation in developing countries. The trainers will

- (i) design training courses for ADB's DMC officials covering common experimental and non-experimental methods of impact evaluation, their respective merits and drawbacks, and circumstances where they are applicable;
- (ii) prepare training materials, including case studies to illustrate possible scenarios that the participants may face; and
- (iii) prepare reports on course effectiveness based on feedback from participants and other indicators.

B. National Consulting Services

5. **National impact evaluation specialists** (6 to 7 person-months, intermittent). The national impact evaluation specialists should have sufficient expertise and experience in survey design and implementation and good knowledge of the project sector and of impact evaluation methodologies and application. Guided by the international impact evaluation specialists, they will assist in survey design, implement the surveys, and assist in data analysis and report preparation. Specifically, the specialists will

- (i) assist the international specialists in literature review and in identifying and accessing existing data sources;
- (ii) assist the international specialists in developing the impact evaluation framework and action plan;
- (iii) conduct pretests of survey instruments and assist the international specialists in improving the survey design;
- (iv) guide the survey team and implement surveys for data collection;
- (v) coordinate between the international specialists, project team, and executing agencies;
- (vi) assist the international specialists in data analysis and report preparation; and
- (vii) participate in and contribute to the dissemination activities.

6. **Project coordinator** (1.5 to 2 person-months, intermittent). The project coordinator should have sufficient experience in coordinating research projects. Specifically, the project coordinator will

- (i) follow up and update the TA project team and the Impact Evaluation Committee with progress of the evaluation study;
- (ii) prepare periodic reports on project progress, and/or as requested;
- (iii) monitor budget utilization by regional departments;
- (iv) design, maintain, and update the study websites;
- (v) consolidate TA reports as needed; and
- (vi) coordinate events related to the project.

7. **Research assistants** (as needed). The research assistants should be familiar with the impact evaluation literature and have experience in data processing and analysis. Under the guidance of the impact evaluation specialists, the research assistants will

- (i) collect, clean, and analyze data;
- (ii) assist in preparing presentations, reports, and other publications; and
- (iii) provide inputs to the study website.



Asian Development Bank

Date 20 February 2013

To: **Manmohan Parkash**
Advisor, OSFMD and Head, Operations Management Unit, OSOM

From: **Kee-Yung Nam**
Senior Economist, EREA

Subject: **Registration of TA for TASF Fund Commitment in 2013**

Please register the commitment of funds in the 2013 TASF for the following project:

Country: Regional	Project No.: 46185-002	
Cluster subproject? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
Project Name: Developing Impact Evaluation Methodologies, Approaches, and Capacities in Selected Developing Member Countries - Subproject 1		
Product Name: Developing Impact Evaluation Methodologies, Approaches, and Capacities in Selected Developing Member Countries - Subproject 1		
Type of TA: <input type="checkbox"/> PPTA <input type="checkbox"/> CDTA <input type="checkbox"/> PATA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RDTA		
Amount to be committed from 2013 TASF Budget: \$1500000	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TASF - IV <input type="checkbox"/> TASF - Other Sources	Date of concept paper approval: 28-Aug-2012
To be charged against the planning figure of operational group: <input type="checkbox"/> OPR <input type="checkbox"/> OG1 <input type="checkbox"/> OG2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> KM & SD <input type="checkbox"/> F & A <input type="checkbox"/> PS & CO <input type="checkbox"/> IED		
Notes / Remarks:		

For COSO Use:

Registration No. ERD-C-01/2013

The above technical proposal has been entered in the Registry of Commitment of Funds against the 2013 TA program.

Manmohan Parkash
Advisor, OSFMD and Head, Operations Management
Unit, OSOM

**C-TA 0012 Developing Impact Evaluation Methodologies, Approaches, and Capacities
in Selected Developing Member Countries**

**Summary of Interdepartmental Comments for Subproject 1
7 February 2013 - Comments Matrix**

Who	Comment	Actions Taken/Response
Jun-Ho Kim Procurement Specialist OSFMD	1. No details of consultant selection method for the assignments are specified. It is assumed that QCBS with a quality-cost ratio of 80/20 will be used for firm consultant selections. As a reminder, any deviation in the future, i.e., if other methods need to be used, requires the user division to seek approvals of OSP1 to change selection methods.	Duly noted with thanks.
	2. It is indicated national experts are required for the assignments. Please clarify which nationals of experts should be engaged, i.e., how national experts are allocated to the target countries, in the main text and TOR to the extent available. Please note a national consultant qualifies as a national consultant when he/she is a citizen of the country where the assignment takes place under the TA.	Duly noted with thanks. National experts will be engaged in countries where the IE studies will be conducted.
	3. We take note TA proceeds finance the incremental cost for resource persons only, i.e., not finance their honorarium or remunerations.	We confirm OSFMD's understanding as this refers to partnerships with recognized impact evaluation research institutes and global centers of excellence, largely in terms of exchange of knowledge and participation of resource persons in training and consultation workshops.
	4. Para. 11 reads that procured equipment will be owned and disposed of by ADB in accordance with the guidelines. Please note that this is governed by PAI 5.09, not the guidelines. We therefore recommend replacing the guidelines with "PAIs concerned".	Para. 11 revised accordingly to address OSFMD comment.
	5. In the cost estimates, purchasing survey data is proposed. I suggest including procurement of data is conducted as part of the consulting service contracts. This is to ensure efficiency in the implementation of the project.	Attachment 2 revised accordingly to address OSFMD suggestion.

Who	Comment	Actions Taken/Response
	6. Publication is indicated as part of the TA outputs. Please be reminded the publication of ADB materials by external publishers or other relevant service providers needs to be contracted by OAS in consultation with DER.	Duly noted with thanks.
Editha Santos Associate Financial Control Officer CTIS-TA2 Controller's Department	<p>On Attachment 2 (Cost Estimates and Financing Plan):</p> <p>1. Footnote c – It was indicated that research assistants will be engaged under the TA. Please note of BPMSD, CTL and OSFMD memo of 29 January 2013 on "Engagement of Administrative Assistants and Contractors for TA Projects."</p> <p>2. Footnote e – It was also mentioned that resource persons will be recruited. Please note that the maximum engagement period of each resource person must not exceed 10 days in accordance with PAI 2.04, paras 75-77.</p>	<p>Duly noted with thanks.</p> <p>Duly noted with thanks.</p>
Aysha Qadir Counsel OGC	<p>Many thanks for forwarding, for OGC's review, the draft Memorandum on approval of TA Cluster (C-TA0012-REG) subproject implementation. As you're aware, in terms of OM D12/OP, paragraph 27, each subproject proposal of the TA Cluster will be subject to consultations with departments and/or offices concerned before submission to the head of the department or office for approval. Given that the memorandum to the head of the department or office proposing the start of a subproject will specify the (i) overall progress of the TA cluster to date; (ii) outcome, and intended outputs of the subproject; (iii) cost estimates and budget; (iv) implementation arrangements; (v) implementation schedule, (vi) terms of reference of consultants; and (vii) other aspects, as appropriate, we're of the view that consultations with CTL and OSFMD may only be needed. You may not need to consult OGC, unless OGC's specific legal input is required on a particular aspect of the subproject proposal.</p> <p>Accordingly, please let me know if you need our advice on any specific legal aspect concerning the proposal.</p>	Duly noted with thanks.

C-TA 8332 Developing IE Methodologies, Approaches, and Capacities in Selected DMCs

Table 1. Evaluation Studies and Activities with Committed Funding from Subproject 1
(\$, as of 30 September 2015)

Category / Item	Budget / Proposal
IE Studies	998,850
PARD	
PNG - IE of Road Access on Poverty and Other Social Welfare Indicators in Rural Highlands Communities	174,300
SARD	
SRI - Endline Survey and IE of Eastern and North Central Provincial Council Road Project	130,000
IND & BAN - IE of Rural Electrification on Women's Quality of Life and Empowerment	197,750
IND - IE of Government of India's LED based Energy Efficient Lighting Program	100,000
SRI - IE of Clean Energy and Access Improvement Project Rural Household Connection Fund *	227,500
SERD	
PHI - IE on Employment Facilitation for Inclusive Growth	169,300
Conference and Training	296,128
IE Conference and Training Events (2013 and 2014)	216,128
IE Conference and Training Event (2015)	108,000
IE Guidebook	216,845
Total Budget / Proposal	1,539,823

* The study will change evaluation methodology and the revised proposal will be resubmitted to the Impact Evaluation committee for review.

Table 2. Contract Awards and Disbursement of Subproject 1
(\$, as of 30 September 2015)

Category	Allocation	Contracts	Disbursed (Contracts)	Undisbursed (Contracts)	Uncommitted (TA)	Undisbursed (TA)
Consultants	800,000	610,094	140,657	469,438	189,906	659,343
Equipment	15,000	15,000	0	15,000	0	15,000
Training/Seminar	290,000	181,603	169,865	11,738	108,397	120,135
Studies	270,000	25,968	25,061	907	244,032	244,939
Miscellaneous	35,000	1,000	87	913	34,000	34,913
Contingency	90,000	9,901	0	9,901	80,099	90,000
Total TA	1,500,000	843,566	335,670	507,897	656,434	1,164,330

C-TA 8332 Developing IE Methodologies, Approaches, and Capacities in Selected DMCs

Indicative Projects for Evaluation Funding under Subproject 2^a

Country Name	Project Title	Expected Time for IE to begin	Estimated Amount for Funding Needed
MON (EARD)	Improving School Dormitory Environment for Primary Students in Western Region	February 2016	\$150,000
PRC (EARD)	Guizhou TVET Development Program	December 2015	\$300,000
PRC (EARD)	Proposed results-based lending for Ningxia Liupanshan Poverty Reduction Rural Road Program	January 2016	\$200,000
PRC (EARD)	Xinjian Hetian Comprehensive Urban Development and Environmental Improvement	September 2016	\$120,000
PRC (EARD)	E-commerce Expansion and Rural Household Welfare ^b	December 2015	\$300,000
PNG (PARD)	Impact Evaluation of ICT application for Strengthening Health Service Delivery	2016	\$200,000
PNG (PARD)	Impact Evaluation of Secured Transaction Reforms on Enterprises Access to Credit	2016	\$170,000
IND (SARD)	Supporting National Urban Health Mission	Baseline in 2017	\$300,000
NEP (SARD)	Rural Reconstruction and Rehabilitation and Sector Development Project	March 2016	\$100,000
NEP (SARD)	Governance Support Program (GSP)	March 2016	\$80,000
CAM (SERD)	Stipend Program in TVET sector (as a part of TVET Sector Development Project)	Baseline in 2016; and follow up in 2018 and 2020	\$200,000 plus \$150,00 (social mobilization intervention for randomized encouragement)

a. The list is indicative. Actual funding will be decided by the Impact Evaluation Committee based on review of the proposal submitted.

b. This is to be proposed as pilot study for funding under component (b).

DESIGN AND MONITORING FRAMEWORK

Impact the TA is Aligned with			
The impact will be improved development effectiveness of ADB-designed projects responsive to the development needs of the DMCs.			
Results Chain	Performance Indicators with Targets and Baselines	Data Sources and Reporting	Risks
Outcome Impact evaluation is mainstreamed in ADB operations through each subproject resulting in well-designed and monitored ADB projects in the DMCs.	By 2017, a. Impact evaluation is incorporated in the design of at least 5 new projects in ADB with increased DMC involvement (baseline: N/A)	a. Reports and recommendations of the President, TA performance and completion reports, Project Completion reports, other operational documents, BTORs	Initially, staff may have difficulty in incorporating impact evaluation in project designs, which may impact on full acceptance of impact evaluation. There is always cost associated with incorporating impact evaluation in project designs. Inadequate funding may not allow rigorous impact evaluation.
Outputs 1. Impact evaluation studies adopting appropriate methodology with effective technical support conducted	1a. Five or more impact evaluation studies conducted (baseline: N/A)	1a. TA performance and completion reports, Project Completion reports	Availability of data to conduct proper groundwork to help design and implement the impact evaluation study.
2. Impact Evaluation awareness-raising seminars and capacity building workshops for ADB staff and DMC officials	2a. One workshop for knowledge sharing and/or capacity building on impact evaluation conducted (baseline: N/A)	2a. TA performance and completion reports, Project Completion reports	Availability of participants in workshops and seminars with regard to work load.
3. Reports and dissemination workshops on lessons learned from review of methodologies and conduct of pilot studies	3a. At least one pilot study conducted (baseline: N/A) 3b. One data portal established for data repository and dissemination (baseline: N/A)	3a. Report(s) on the pilot study 3b. Data Portal	

Key Activities with Milestones**Output 1: Impact evaluation studies adopting appropriate methodology with effective technical support conducted**

- 1.1 Screening and selection of projects for impact evaluation studies; obtaining of no-objection from concerned DMC governments (November 2015–December 2016)
- 1.2 Engagement of consultants (December 2015–March 2017)
- 1.3 Conduct of impact evaluation studies (December 2015–March 2017)

Output 2: Impact evaluation awareness-raising seminars and capacity building workshops for ADB staff and DMC officials conducted

- 2.1 Conduct of workshop for knowledge sharing and/or capacity building on impact evaluation by March 2017

Output 3: Reports and dissemination workshops on lessons learned from review of methodologies and conduct of pilot studies

- 3.1 Selection and conduct of pilot study (November 2015–March 2017)
- 3.2 Establishment of impact evaluation data portal (January 2016–March 2017)

Inputs

ADB: \$1,500,000 (TASF-V)

Assumptions for Partner Financing

Not applicable.

ADB = Asian Development Bank, BTORs = Back-to-Office Reports, DMCs = Developing Member Countries, N/A = not applicable, TA = technical assistance, TASF-V = Technical Assistance Special Fund-V.
Source: ADB.

COST ESTIMATES AND FINANCING PLAN^a

(\$'000)

Item	Total
Asian Development Bank^b	
1. Consultants	
a. Remuneration and per diem	
i. International consultants ^c	500
ii. National consultants ^c	230
b. International and local travel	110
c. Data and surveys ^d	450
d. Reports and communication	15
2. Equipment ^e	5
3. Workshop, training, seminars, and conferences ^f	80
4. Miscellaneous administration and support costs	35
5. Contingencies	75
Total	1,500

^a The cost estimates and financing plan are indicative as resource allocation across items is driven by resource needs of each proposed activity and will be determined by the Impact Evaluation Committee.

^b Financed by the Technical Assistance Special Fund (TASF-V) of the Asian Development Bank (ADB).

^c Also includes remuneration and per diem for research assistants.

^d Includes the conduct of surveys or purchase of data.

^e Includes information technology equipment and software. Procurement of equipment by ADB will be in accordance with ADB's *Procurement Guidelines* (2015, as amended from time to time). Upon technical assistance completion, any procured equipment will either remain ADB property or will be disposed of in accordance with PAI 5.09.

^f Includes travel and per diem for workshop participants, costs for external resource persons and peer reviewers for workshops and related activities, and travel of ADB staff as resource persons.

Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.



Asian Development Bank

Date 6 October 2015

To: **Manmohan Parkash**
Advisor, OSFMD and Head, Operations Management Unit, OSOM

From: **Yi Jiang**
Senior Economist, ERDI

Subject: **Registration of TA for TASF Fund Commitment in 2015**

Please register the commitment of funds in the 2015 TASF for the following project:

Country: Regional	Project No.: 46185-003		
Cluster subproject? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
Project Name: Developing Impact Evaluation Methodologies, Approaches, and Capacities in Selected Developing Member Countries (Subproject 2)			
Product Name: Developing Impact Evaluation Methodologies, Approaches, and Capacities in Selected Developing Member Countries (Subproject 2)			
Type of TA:	<input type="checkbox"/> PPTA	<input type="checkbox"/> CDTA	<input type="checkbox"/> PATA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RDTA
Amount to be committed from 2015 TASF Budget: \$1500000			Date of concept paper approval: 28-Aug-2012
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TASF-V <input type="checkbox"/> TASF-Others <input type="checkbox"/> TASF-IV
To be charged against the planning figure of operational group:			
<input type="checkbox"/> OPR <input type="checkbox"/> OG1 <input type="checkbox"/> OG2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> KM & SD <input type="checkbox"/> PS & CO <input type="checkbox"/> FR <input type="checkbox"/> AC <input type="checkbox"/> IED			

For OSFMD Use:

Registration No. ERCD-C-06/2015

The above technical proposal has been entered in the Registry of Commitment of Funds against the 2015 TA program.

Manmohan Parkash
Advisor, OSFMD and Head, Operations Management Unit, OSOM

OUTLINE TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR CONSULTANTS FOR SUBPROJECT 2

1. The consultancy listed below is indicative as resource allocation across items is driven by resource needs of each proposed activity and will be determined by the Impact Evaluation Committee.

2. **Impact evaluation specialists** (international, 21 person-months, intermittent). The international impact evaluation specialists should have sufficient expertise and experience in impact evaluation of public interventions and a good understanding of the project sector in developing member countries (DMCs) of the Asian Development Bank (ADB). They will design the evaluation, guide and oversee its implementation, and produce high-quality deliverables. Specifically, the specialists will

- (i) conduct a desk review of project documents and coordinate with the project team in designing and implementing the evaluation;
- (ii) conduct a literature review with assistance from the national impact evaluation specialists;
- (iii) identify and access existing data sources with assistance from the national specialists;
- (iv) design an evaluation framework and develop an action plan for implementation;
- (v) prepare an inception report that includes a description of the intervention to be evaluated, evaluation questions, evaluation design, implementation plan, and other information requested by the project team;
- (vi) design survey instruments and guide the national specialists and survey team in the conduct of surveys;
- (vii) conduct empirical analysis of the impacts of the project;
- (viii) prepare a final report with details of the impact evaluation study, highlighting lessons learned and recommendations for future operations; and
- (ix) assist in disseminating the evaluation findings through academic publications, policy briefs, and/or seminars and workshops.

3. **Impact evaluation advisors** (International or national, 5 person-months, intermittent). The impact evaluation advisor should have more than 10 years of experience and a well-established reputation in impact evaluation research and practice. The advisor will mainly provide technical guidance and assistance to develop solid impact evaluation proposals. Specifically, the advisor will

- (i) review available information about ADB existing and pipeline projects;
- (ii) provide technical guidance and assistance to ADB staff and/or the DMC stakeholders to develop solid impact evaluation proposals;
- (iii) conduct field investigation, if needed, to help design the impact evaluation;
- (iv) review and provide constructive feedback on impact evaluation reports as requested;
- (v) participate in the workshop for knowledge sharing and/or capacity building on impact evaluation as requested; and
- (vi) conduct other related tasks as requested.

4. **Impact evaluation specialists** (national, 42 person-months, intermittent). The national impact evaluation specialists should have sufficient expertise and experience in survey design and implementation and good knowledge of the project sector and of impact evaluation methodologies and application. Guided by the international impact evaluation specialists, they

will assist in survey design, implement the surveys, and assist in data analysis and report preparation. Specifically, the specialists will

- (i) assist the international specialists in literature review and in identifying and accessing existing data sources;
- (ii) assist the international specialists in developing the impact evaluation framework and action plan;
- (iii) conduct pretests of survey instruments and assist the international specialists in improving the survey design;
- (iv) guide the survey team and implement surveys for data collection;
- (v) coordinate between the international specialists, project team, and executing agencies;
- (vi) assist the international specialists in data analysis and report preparation; and
- (vii) participate in and contribute to the dissemination activities.

5. **Program officer** (national, 6 person-months, intermittent). The project coordinator should have sufficient experience in managing research projects and coordinating among multiple stakeholders. Specifically, the project coordinator will

- (i) follow up and update the TA project team and the Impact Evaluation Committee with progress of the evaluation studies;
- (ii) prepare periodic reports on project progress as requested;
- (iii) establish and maintain an impact evaluation data portal containing project-related information such as questionnaires, interviewer manuals, survey data and evaluation reports;
- (iv) support knowledge sharing activities; and
- (v) coordinate conference and other events related to the project.

6. **Research associates** (international or national, as needed). The research assistants should be familiar with the impact evaluation literature and have experience in data processing and analysis. Under the guidance of the impact evaluation specialists, the research assistants will

- (i) collect, clean, and analyze data;
- (ii) assist in preparing presentations, reports, and other publications; and
- (iii) provide inputs to the study website.

TA Cluster Subproject 2 – Developing Impact Evaluation Methodologies, Approaches, and Capacities in Selected Developing Member Countries (DMCs)

Comments Matrix for the Draft Approval Memo

Comments	Responses/Actions Taken
Brian Chin, Social Sector Economist, SAHS/SARD	
<p>Thank you for sharing ERCD/ERDI's draft memo. SARD's comments are below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Suggest to limit the number of attachments particularly if the TA report is available online. 2. Attachment 4 on the DMF still uses the old template. Use the new template based on the revised guidelines issued this year. There is no need to repeat indicators for the cluster and all indicators should have targets. 3. Para 14 states Attachment 9 when it should be Attachment 8. 4. Include one more indicative project in Attachment 3 with details below: <p>Officer-in-charge: Rachana Shrestha Name of the project to be evaluated: Governance Support Program (GSP) Country Name: Nepal Expected time for IE (e.g. baseline survey, endline survey, analysis, etc.) to begin - March 2016 Estimated amount of funding needed - \$80,000</p>	<p>Revised as advised.</p> <p>Updated as advised.</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Added</p>
Emma Veve, Director, PAUS/PARD	
<p>Thank you for sharing the draft memo with PARD. We have no comments.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Radhakrishna Narasimham, Principal Project Management Specialist, OSOM/OSFMD	
<p>General Comment:</p> <p>OSFMD supports in principle the idea of Impact Evaluation of ongoing projects by RDs. It would be useful for this TA to have a mechanism to facilitate RD's course correction in implementation to address any findings in this exercise.</p> <p>Our specific comments are given below:</p> <p>Memo</p> <p>Para 11.</p> <p>(i) We suggest that \$200,000 is given to each RD to decide which of their projects they would evaluate. Keeping a deadline of 30 June 2016 may force RDs to evaluate projects not ready for evaluation to use the money immediately. This may fund premature evaluations whose outcomes could bias RDs' future project selections.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Revised to soften the deadline.</p>

Comments	Responses/Actions Taken
<p>(ii) While the principle is acceptable in theory, it may not work in practice. Governments, particularly of CIS countries have often been reluctant to discuss policies not specifically covered by ADB missions, even though such policies have created sectoral distortions, which have impinged on the achieving on ADB's envisaged outcomes.</p> <p>TA Report</p> <p>Para 1. <i>"Impact evaluation may be defined as an assessment of changes in the well-being of individuals that can be attributed to a particular project, program or policy. Thus the central question of an impact evaluation is what would have happened to those receiving the intervention had they not received it."</i> This is a counterfactual question, which can have more than a single probable answers. It would be prudent not to be judgmental on counterfactual scenarios.</p>	<p>Noted. IE committee can review and decide whether to support a particular proposal during implementation.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Jessana Yanuario, Senior Financial Management Officer, OSFM/OSFMD	
No comments from FM perspective.	
Lennie De Sagun, Associate Financial Control Officer, CTLA-TA/CTL	
<p>CTLA-TA comments on draft memo:</p> <p>4. Implementation Arrangements</p> <p>Noted that implementation arrangements will generally follow that of Subproject 1. Perhaps it would be worth mentioning again in this memo that disbursements will be made in accordance with ADB's Technical Assistance Disbursement Handbook.</p> <p>And as we usually suggest for consulting services, please consider output-based contracts (lump sum), in line with MTR action plan, items 2.9.2 and 2.10.2.</p> <p>Thank you for requesting our comments.</p>	<p>Included.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Christopher Edmonds, Senior Economist, PAUS/PARD (IEC Chairperson)	
<p>I have a few additional comments or suggestions for the draft memo. submitted in my capacity as Chair of the Interdepartmental Impact Evaluation Committee Chair and PARD's designated representative on the committee. Apologies for sending these comments a bit late, but competing work demands made this unavoidable.</p> <p>A general comment is that as a subproject of an approved cluster TA, the memo. for proposed subproject 2 should follow the approved cluster TA, and departures from the approved TA should be clearly justified and</p>	

Comments	Responses/Actions Taken
<p>cleared by the interdepartmental IE Committee nominated to oversee TA implementation. Specific suggestions include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. [paras. 6 and 7] Suggest that a maximum of 3 IE studies (from the component a) for any RD to ensure IE studies do not become concentrated in one or two RDs. Out of the same concern for spreading TA resources, it is suggested that pilot studies under component b be limited to one study per RD. These measures should help ensure the focus of the TA remains on supporting and building ADB-wide capacity and IE study research outputs (the intended outcomes of the TA). <li>2. [para. 7] Please add indicative financing levels for the proposed activities under Component b in the memo. as is currently done for Component a, and make it clear that all IE studies proposed for financing under the TA are subject to IE Committee clearance (as established under the approved cluster TA). <li>3. [para. 7] While it may be difficult for ADB to develop truly new methodologies, or to "test" them as per the language of the original TA report, the TA maintains a role in methodological support and demonstration to operations—particularly for challenging infrastructure sectors, which have few IEs to date, but are core areas for ADB investment. To address this concern, suggest pilot studies should be redefined as "studies that exemplify the good practice application of cutting edge impact evaluation methodologies to the ADB project portfolio, and thereby reinforce mainstreaming of good practice impact evaluation in sectors that have received relatively little evaluation coverage to date". Also suggest language be added to the para. to highlight that pilot projects need to relate to ADB operations (at least loosely) and to involve significant involvement of ADB staff in designing and guiding execution of the study. This added language will hopefully ensure the TA remains focused on the outcome stated in the DMF. <li>4. [para. 7] Suggest activity (i) of component b from the prior TA be retained, or clear reasons be given for dropping the review and support function of the TA. Related to this, component b would benefit from clearer definition of what is termed "the development of impact evaluation capacities in DMCs and in ADB." In the 	<p>Revised per discussion at the IEC meeting on 16 October, 2015. For pilot studies, the country restriction is not necessary and IEC will review and clear the study proposals.</p> <p>Discussed at IEC meeting. Indicatively, \$350,000 for 1-2 pilot studies, \$80,000 for IE workshop/conference, \$60,000 for supporting IE proposal development, and \$10,000 for establishing the portal. To be consistent with the TA report and subproject 1, they are not included in the memo.</p> <p>Revised as suggested, except for "related to ADB operations (at least loosely)". The term is hard to define. The IEC will review and clear the study proposal.</p> <p>Revised as discussed at the IEC meeting.</p>

Comments	Responses/Actions Taken
<p>approved cluster TA, this was defined as "development of impact evaluation methodologies, approaches, and capacities". The purpose in the cluster TA for this component is to develop IE methods, approaches and resources that can facilitate broader IE coverage of the ADB portfolio, however, with the focus on methods and approaches removed, the purpose of the component is less clear. Moreover, with the proposed deletion of previous activity (i), it is less clear what aspect of the proposed component addresses capacity building with "methodologies" removed from component 2, there is no longer any aspect of the TA that clearly supports the overall TA intention of "Developing Impact Evaluation Methodologies, Approaches, and Capacities", as per the title of the TA. A methodological focus needs to be retained under component 2 for the TA to retain a clear justification.</p>	
<p>5. [para. 7] Suggest that gathering and making reports from ADB IE studies be added to subcomponent (iv) of component b of the proposed TA.</p>	<p>Revised to be consistent with TA report and subproject 1.</p>
<p>6. [para. 7] The proposed activity (iii) under component b raises concerns, so suggest the proposal to allow TA funds to support "scoping analysis" be dropped. There has been no call for such analysis in the implementation of TAs to date, and TA should conserve resources to focus on the execution of IE studies rather than using resources to fly ADB consultants (or ADB staff defining themselves as "Resource Persons" for the TA) around for "scoping" of potential IE activities. Experience to date suggests such exploratory work can be conducted through remote contacts or by leveraging other planned travel of ADB staff.</p>	<p>Revised as discussed at the IEC meeting</p>
<p>7. [para. 11, subsection i] With ADB contract processing timeframes and slow country approval processes, cancellation after 3 months without disbursement, as per para 11(i) is excessively restrictive. This should be raised to 6 or 9 months.</p>	<p>Changed to 6.</p>
<p>8. Suggest that para 11(ii) be worded more precisely to ensure relevance of evaluations to ADB operations. Perhaps "programs or projects to which ADB has related operational activity (TAs or grants or loans), or where the intervention proposed for study closely reflects</p>	<p>Revised in para. 6 and para 11(ii) is shortened.</p>

Comments	Responses/Actions Taken
<p>efforts under preparation for ADB support."</p> <p>Hope these points are useful in refining the draft memo. and in helping to guide implementation of subproject 2 of TA 8332, and that they will be reflected in the final version of the memo.</p> <p>In keeping with the IE Committee's role in guiding implementation of the cluster TA and ensuring wider engagement of all ADB Departments in IE activities, I suggest we schedule a meeting of the Committee as soon as possible to allow Committee members to discuss proposed changes to the cluster TA before the memo. is finalized.</p>	
Melanie Marron San Luis, Consultant - Legal Associate, and Annalisa Carlota, Counsel, OGC	
<p>Thank you for circulating the subject draft memo to OGC. We reviewed the draft and have the following comments for your consideration:</p> <p>1. In Section 4 (paras. 10 and 11 on Implementation Arrangements):</p> <p>a. Please specify the implementation schedule relating to Subproject 2. As per para. 27 of OM D12/OP, a memorandum proposing the start of a subproject should specify the implementation schedule, among others. Please note that such implementation schedule should be in accordance with the time frame stated in para. 15 of the Cluster TA Report.</p> <p>b. Since equipment will be procured as per Attachment 5 (Cost Estimates and Financing Plan), please state that procurement of equipment by ADB will be in accordance with ADB's Procurement Guidelines (2015, as amended from time to time)</p> <p>c. Please include a statement as follows: Disbursements under the C-RDTA will be made in accordance with ADB's Technical Assistance Disbursement Handbook (2010, as amended from time to time).</p> <p>2. Please consult SPD as to whether the new DMF format should be used in Attachment 4 (DMF), as per the Updated Design and Monitoring Framework Guidelines issued last 18 March 2015.</p> <p>I have discussed the above comments with Ms. Annalisa Carlota, Counsel, OGC. We hope you find these comments useful. Please let us know if you have any questions or concerns.</p>	<p>Specified in para. 10.</p> <p>Included.</p> <p>Included.</p> <p>SPD consulted and new DMF format is being used.</p>

Comments	Responses/Actions Taken
Guido Geissler, Senior Planning and Policy Specialist,	SPOP/SPD (IEC Member)
<p>Thank you very much for the opportunity to review the below mentioned DRAFT memo for subproject 2. Please see below a few comments from IEC members of SPD.</p> <p>SPD supports the trigger of subproject 2. However, we would like to raise the following for your consideration:</p> <p>Paragraph 5 - 2 components: May we suggest to change the sentence under (b) in line with the original C-RDTA. The sentence should read: "[...] (b) the development of impact evaluation methodologies, approaches, and capacities in both DMCs and ADB." This will emphasize that these resources are specifically provided for advancing ADB's tool set for IE and not only IE capacity. ADB's real contribution to the IE discussion is to figure out how IE can be applied in the much stickier context of infrastructure investments.</p> <p>Component (a) - Impact Evaluation and ADB projects - The emphasis of subproject 2 needs to be on expanding the number of impact evaluation studies. I don't think that IE is "mainstreamed in ADB operations". We need to expand the basis of ADB IE to learn and to share with others within ADB and across the development community. We can only credibly do this when we have a sufficient large basis of impact evaluation studies. We need to do all efforts to move far beyond the 5 envisaged IE because as we know the "attrition rate" is pretty high. We would also recommend to expand paragraph 6 and capture the spirit of paragraph 11 of the C-RDTA paper. It needs to be clear that the TA will support IE studies from the beginning to the end and the emphasis be placed on design, approaches and methodologies.</p> <p>Component (b) - We would recommend that component (b) also includes reference to "development of impact evaluation methodologies, approaches and capacities in line with the paragraph 5. We do not think that this agenda item is concluded under subproject 1. It is unclear to us why we would conduct 2 pilot studies that "adopt innovative approaches and address important development policy questions". We recommend to delete reference to the pilot studies or emphasize that these pilot studies are conducted to test sector- and theme-specific techniques and tools. From our perspective, all the 5 IE studies mentioned in component (a) are indeed pilot testing IE. It is expected that these are "innovative" in nature and therefore, if we want to say something about innovative approaches, we should do this in the context of ADB projects. We would insist on a narrow definition of the pilot studies to ensure that the focus is on ADB projects. If we read this correctly, this would allow us to finance IE of others than</p>	<p>Revised to be consistent with TA report and subproject 1.</p> <p>We can support more studies depending on the size of each study while five remains the goal. Both para. 11 of TA report and para. 4 of the memo for subproject 1 approval apply, whichever is more applicable.</p> <p>Revised per discussion at the IEC meeting. Please also see comments 1-6 from PARD and their responses.</p>

Comments	Responses/Actions Taken
<p>ADB and we do not think that this is adequate use of scarce TA resources. As we mentioned above, all efforts should focus on ADB projects and programs to expand IE and come closer to mainstreaming IE in ADB operations.</p> <p>Paragraph 11 (ii) - It is not clear what is meant with this item. Why would we use TA resources to evaluate those interventions? We would insist that the TA resources under this C-RDTA are used directly in the context of an ADB project. However, the IEC would probably have a chance to review these proposals and decide for each proposal on the merit of funding under the C-RDTA.</p> <p>Paragraph 11 (iii) - It is not clear what these pilot studies are. We recommend to delete this item in line with the comments above about focus on ADB project or program IE studies or emphasize that the pilot studies are conducted to test sector- and theme-specific techniques and tools. From our perspective, currently all effort should be geared towards developing a strong pipeline of IE studies. Across ADB, we approve over 130 projects and more than 300 TAs per year, even the envisaged 15 IE studies under the C-RDTA are not too ambitious. We feel it is also important to set aside resources for learning across all IE studies and spread the word that IE is useful and adds value to a project. We need to sell the ideas to our mission leaders and this is best done in providing evidence that IE is indeed useful and adds value.</p> <p>Appendix 3 - Indicative Projects - E-commerce Expansion and Rural Household Welfare - This is not ADB's core business and I am not sure why we would use TA resources for something outside of ADB's core areas. I would rather encourage RDs to come up with many more IE studies in transport, energy, water - hard core infrastructure because it is in these areas that we really can contribute something of value to the growing IE community.</p> <p>Role of the IEC - We might also like to say something about the role of the IEC. I definitely would emphasize that funding proposals of any kind under the subproject 2 need a review and consent from the IEC.</p>	<p>Revised per discussion at the IEC meeting. See comment 8 from PARD and the response above. Please see comment 8 from PARD and its response above.</p> <p>Paras. 7 and 11(iii) are revised per discussion at the IEC meeting. Please also see comments 1-6 from PARD and their responses above.</p> <p>The list of projects is indicative as of now. IEC will review and clear any particular proposal during subproject implementation.</p> <p>Indicated in para. 11.</p>
<p>M Shahadat Russell, Procurement Specialist, OSP1/OSFMD</p> <p>The draft memo for C-TA0012-REG: TA Cluster Subproject 2 Developing Impact Evaluation Methodologies, Approaches, and Capacities in selected Developing Member Countries (DMCs) has been reviewed. Draft is well prepared. During the review, it was noted that Sub-project 2 will cover impact evaluation studies in five regions (CW, EA, Pacific, SA & SE). For the studies, each of these region will be</p>	<p>\$200K is expected to be sufficient for 1-2 studies in general. All DMCs are eligible, but the studies will be carried out on a selective basis. So there is no intention to cover all countries.</p> <p>The list in attachment 3 is indicative showing potential demands for funding.</p>

Comments	Responses/Actions Taken
<p>allocated with \$200K only. Is this enough? How many countries will be covered in each region? Attachment 3 shows EARD (MON & PRC), SARD (IND & NEP) and PARD (PNG), SERD (CAM) only. There were no indication of CW countries. If CW is not covered, then please revise the number of region in para 6. Para 10 mentioned that ADB's Guidelines for Consulting Services will be followed for engaging consultants without indicating the selection method. On the other hand, four key positions are defined in ToR. Please, indicate your memo whether you are planning to engage these key positions through a firm or as an individual consultant. ToR also mentioned a position called Research Assistant. We suggest you to revise the title to Research Coordinator as Consulting Guideline is used for engaging key experts only not support staffs.</p>	<p>However, actual funding will be decided by the Impact Evaluation Committee based on review of the proposal submitted. CW did not provide this information, but they still can access the funds.</p> <p>The TA will fund a number of studies proposed by relevant departments and approved by the IE committee. The actual needs for consulting services will be specified in the proposals subject to IE committee review. Therefore, the current consultants listed are indicative, and they may be engaged on an individual basis or through firm depending on how the department who proposes would like to do.</p> <p>We'll use research associate if it is fine with OSFMD or research coordinator as advised.</p>
Yi Jiang, Senior Economist, ERDI/ERCD	
<p>ERCD supports that two pilot studies will be carried out under component (b). As a proposal for studies under component (a) needs to be signed off by the relevant director and director general of the regional department before submitted to IEC for review, it is necessary to clarify that the proposal for studies under component (b) needs to be signed off by the director of ERDI and the Chief Economist.</p>	<p>Clarified.</p>
Yo Ikeda, Senior Procurement Specialist, OSP1/OSFMD	
<p>For consulting services for this type of assignment, I would like to suggest individual consultants for timely and flexible fielding in response to the ad hoc needs during TA implementation. Individual consultants will also secures direct interaction with each expert in delivering outputs.</p> <p>In case you prefer a firm contract, I would like to suggest clarifying the selection method otherwise QCBS (not a good fit to this TA) will be assumed. I would like to suggest FBS which shortlist six firms and ranks proposals by technical evaluation only. Contract negotiations do not require supporting documents for unit rates, that results a contract negotiation within a shorter or more predictable time period. However, any proposal which exceeds the maximum budget will be rejected.</p> <p>Other method may be CQS or LCS, both of which use a shortlist comprising only 3 firms. CQS invite a proposal from the technically first ranked firm based on EOIs but it asks consultants to establish unit rates with supporting documents during negotiation that takes time. CQS</p>	<p>Subproject 2 will follow subproject 1 in implementation arrangement. Para 10 of subproject 1 memo (as well as Para. 16 of the TA report) has specified how the consultants will be engaged.</p>

Comments	Responses/Actions Taken
<p>contract should be within \$200,000. LCS invites proposals from all three shortlisted firms and invites the lowest priced firm for a contract negotiation if their proposal is technically qualified. LCS contract should be within \$100,000.</p> <p>FBS does not have a budget ceiling. CSRN advertisement asks 15 days for any method.</p> <p>If TA budget has a line for equipment, please mention about disposal arrangement upon completion.</p> <p>To use individual consultants, the following may be of your help:</p> <p>(i) team leader should be ADB's TA mission leader - it is not good to designate one of the individual experts as a team leader because individual consultants are engaged by separate contracts with ADB without interdependency, under which they have their own outputs;</p> <p>(ii) in the above context, assignments should be independent not asking a team output. It is TA mission leader who consolidates their outputs into a TA output. However, TOR may ask expert/s to "assist ADB TA mission leader / TA team in coordinating team activities and consolidating individual outputs." if necessary,</p> <p>(iii) subcontracting or purchase of expensive items under an individual consultant contract should be discouraged, and</p> <p>(iv) if there are many individual consultants at the same time, it is suggested for TA paper / plan to indicate that the user division will set up a team of staff for contract administration on regular basis to ensure smooth administration as part of your justification to use number of individual consultants.</p> <p>I would appreciate it if the draft could indicate a country of assignment of each national consultant in TOR - if they work in PHI, they must be a citizen of PHI (footnote 6, para. 1.3 of the guidelines). National consultants may take a regional task to assist international experts if the task does not account for a substantial part in their TOR. If the TA envisages international travel by a national expert, please add the requirements to their TOR that helps ICS process.</p> <p>When the cost estimates includes budgets for meetings, workshops, conferences, seminars, or surveys, a suggestion is that subcontracting or purchase of relatively expensive items under an individual consultant contract should be discouraged. It would be appreciated if the project staff could consult with CTLA so that TA pays for these activities directly, not from a part of an individual consultant contract although planning or</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Included.</p> <p>Noted with thanks.</p>

Comments	Responses/Actions Taken
<p>preparation of specifications, or implementation and survey supervision can be a part of consultant TOR. If TA buys equipment, I would like to suggest clarifying the disposal procedures as per relevant PAI.</p> <p>For TOR, I would like to suggest replacing pass/fail term such as "at least" or "minimum" with "will be advantage" or "preferred" as our evaluation does not take pass/fail approach in evaluating expert qualification.</p> <p>Resource person: when verifying experts' nationality (member country eligibility), please always ask passport. UN document such as laissez-passer is not acceptable.</p> <p>We may consider a lumpsum contract if necessary. However, the lumpsum contract has little flexibility for a contract variation unless the project staff prepares an additional TOR that clarifies distinct outputs for additional payments. It may also result in more input in the home office, limiting the OJT (on the job technical transfer) opportunities or expert's interactions with the government counterpart staff. If the assignment requires specific timing for expert fielding or field time input, it should be clarified in the TOR.</p> <p>PAI 2.04 allows a single candidate if the assignment meets requirements in the PAI; however, engagement by this provision will limit the contract extensions and other variations. Please consult with our CAU team in advance.</p>	