

Lao People’s Democratic Republic
Northern Region Sustainable Livelihoods Through
Livestock Development Project
(ADB Project number 35297-013, ADB Loan numbers 2259/8229,
ADB Grant numbers 0055/0056; and IFAD Loan 711-LA)

IOE-IED Joint Project Performance Evaluation
Approach Paper

A. Background

1. **The joint project performance evaluation.** This approach paper describes the proposed project performance evaluation (PPE) of the Laos Northern Region Sustainable Livelihoods Through Livestock Development Project (NRSLDLP). The PPE will be jointly conducted by the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD (IOE) and the Independent Evaluation Department of the Asian Development Bank (IED).
2. In line with their respective evaluation policies, for completed investment projects IOE and IED undertake: (i) validations of project completion reports, which are based on a desk review of project completion reports (PCR) and other documents; and (ii) project performance evaluation (PPEs¹), involving a country visit for the selected projects.
3. A PPE is conducted after a desk review of the PCR and other available documents, with the aim of generating additional evidence on project achievements and validating the conclusions of the PCR. The main objectives of a PPE for both IOE and IED are: (i) to assess the results of the project; (ii) to generate findings and recommendations for designing future projects and implementing ongoing operations in the country; and (iii) to identify issues of corporate, strategic or operational interest that merit further evaluative work by IFAD and ADB.
4. **Level of jointness.** Both IOE and IED recognize the merits of undertaking joint evaluations. The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) finds that joint evaluations have the potential to bring strong benefits to all partners and stakeholders. They offer opportunities to harmonize and align the overall processes of evaluation, to build participation and ownership, to share the burden of work involved, to increase the acceptance and legitimacy of findings and recommendations, for mutual capacity building and learning between the partners, and to reduce the overall number of evaluations undertaken – thereby reducing transaction costs and administrative demands on aid recipient countries.² With this understanding, IOE and IED propose a high level of “jointness” for this PPE. This will include a joint preparation process, mission, and report.
5. **Rationale for the selection of the project.** The project in the Lao People’s Democratic Republic (Lao PDR), implemented between 2006 and 2014, has been selected for a joint-PPE as the project was jointly financed by IFAD and ADB, along with the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC). Also, the project’s substantive features have special importance for the rural poor, as these are related to the core activities of cultivation, farming and livestock production, and are critical for the livelihood of ethnic groups and women in the country and more broadly in the Asia-Pacific region.
6. The proposed PPE will investigate and study these and other similar issues in greater detail. It will pay special attention to the capacity building measures

¹ Known as PPE in IFAD and Project Performance Evaluation Report (PPER) in ADB

² OECD. 2006. *Guidance for Conducting Effective Joint Evaluations*. Paris.

supported by both organizations. In light of the growing partnership between IFAD and ADB, the PPE will seek to assess the additional contribution of the project due to this partnership, while keeping in view the respective strengths and comparative advantages that IFAD and ADB bring to the agricultural and rural sector in Asia-Pacific.

7. **Evaluation capacity development.** The joint evaluation will have a strong focus on learning and knowledge sharing, which will take place at two levels: (i) between IED and IOE on evaluation methodologies and processes; and (ii) among IED, IOE and in-country and regional stakeholders through the implementation of evaluation capacity development (ECD) activities.
8. Supporting ECD is priority of both IOE and IED. In this regard, the PPE will be aligned and coordinated with ECD activities in Lao PDR that will also be jointly supported by and benefit the Department of Evaluation of the Lao PDR Ministry of Planning and Investment and other relevant stakeholders. The ECD activities will be launched with a training on project evaluation which will take place in Luang Prabang from 20 to 24 February 2017. The joint evaluation of the NRSLDP will be used as a case study.
9. The training will also be an occasion to boost south-to-south dialogue and knowledge exchange on ex-post evaluation. Representatives from central Government and executing agencies of both ADB and IFAD projects in Lao PDR and Government officials in charge of M&E in other countries in the region will be invited to the training in order to share their experiences and lessons learned on evaluation.

B. Project Overview

10. **Project area.** The project sought to improve the livelihoods of upland smallholders in five northern provinces of Bokeo, Hauaphanh, Louang Namtha, Louang Phrabang, and Xieng Khouang of Lao *Theung* (midland Lao) and Lao *Sung* (upland Lao). It focused on the poor and women in the 18 poorest districts of the selected provinces. The selection of provinces and districts followed a two-stage method, focusing first on provinces and then on districts within them, as per the incidence of poverty.
11. **Project objectives.** The overall goal of the project was to contribute to the improved sustainability of livelihoods of upland smallholders in five selected provinces of northern Lao PDR based on the recognition of poverty incidence among the target groups, especially women. The project objective was to "enhance village livestock systems" leading to improved livestock productivity and profitability under integrated upland farming systems.³ This was to be done through: (i) the stabilization of shifting cultivation in the upland areas to ensure sustainable livelihoods for the local population and for people resettled from these areas; and (ii) the gradual decentralization to the provincial, district and village levels of authority, functions, resources and accountability for the planning and implementing development initiatives.
12. **Target group and targeting approach.** The total population of the project area was estimated at about 146,880, with considerable diversity in size of provincial populations and poverty across districts. Target population comprised 24,480 households. Of these, 17,000 ethnic households and women were expected to be assisted directly under the project and 50 per cent of the households were expected to be poor. Positive impacts on income were also anticipated for another 1,500 beneficiaries in 250 villages. These households were generally characterized by: (i) falling productivity from upland shifting agriculture; (ii) inadequate land and forests for food production and gathering; and (iii) lack of access to appropriate

³ ADB. 2006. *Report and Recommendation of the President to the Board of Directors. Proposed Loan and Asian Development Fund Grant to the Lao People's Democratic Republic for the Northern Region Sustainable Livelihoods through Livestock Development Project*. Manila. September, p. 8, para. 22.

technologies and marketing opportunities for improved livestock production and trade. The project approach followed geographical targeting of poor and the poorest districts as identified in the Lao's National Growth and Poverty Eradication Strategy (NGPES) and pursued a self-targeting mechanism to benefit the poor and women. The project design envisaged a main focus on the rural poor and women, largely belonging to Lao *Theung* and Lao *Sung*, who would benefit from the project.

13. **Project components.** The project comprised three main components: (i) enhanced village livestock systems with subcomponents of productivity initiatives, market linkages and enterprise development, and participatory extension network; (ii) capacity-building for community-driven development; and (iii) management of project implementation.
14. **Project financing.** The total baseline project costs were estimated at US\$18.40 million (in 2006 prices). IFAD funding came in the form of a SDR2.0 million (approx. US\$3.0 million) loan. ADB pledged US\$9.3 million as a loan and US\$0.7 million as a grant. SDC pledged US\$3.5 million as a grant. Furthermore, the Government of Lao PDR assured a contribution of US\$1.1 million, while beneficiaries would contribute US\$0.8 million. The summary of the project budget and actual costs is shown in table 1.

Table 1

Summary Project Costs and Financing Plans

	Approval (US\$ million) in 2006 prices		Actual (US\$ million) in 2014 prices	
	Total project costs	18.4		18.31
IFAD loan and % of total	3.0	16.3%	2.2	12.0%
ADB loan	9.3	50.5%	9.43	51.5%
ADB/ADF grant	0.7	3.8%	0.56	3.1%
JFPR grant			0.46	2.5%
SDC	3.5	19.1%	3.37	18.4%
Borrower	1.1	6.0%	1.76	9.6%
Beneficiaries	0.8	4.3%	0.53	2.9%

ADB = Asian Development Bank, ADF = Asian Development Fund, IFAD = International Fund for Agricultural Development, JFPR = Japan Fund for Poverty Reduction, SDC = Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation. Source: IFAD. 2014. *Project Completion Report, Northern Region Sustainable Livelihoods through Livestock Development Project (NRLDLP), Lao People's Democratic Republic*. March; and ADB. 2015. *Completion Report: Northern Region Sustainable Livelihoods through Livestock Development Project in Lao People's Democratic Republic*. Manila. June.

15. **Timeframe.** The project was approved in 2006 (ADB in September and IFAD in December). The loans became effective in 2007 (ADB in April and IFAD in October). The project was completed and closed in 2014 (IFAD on 31 May, and ADB on 12 August). At the time of project closing, the total disbursement was US\$18.3 million (about 94.7 per cent of the approved total amount). IFAD's disbursement was \$2.2 million (72 per cent). ADB disbursed 97.9 per cent of the approved loan amount and 79.6 per cent of the ADB ADF grant.⁴ The SDC grant of US\$3.5 million was utilized in the amount of US\$3.4 million (96.2 per cent).
16. **Implementation arrangements.** The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry was designated as the Executing Agency and the Department of Land and Forestry (DLF)⁵ as the overall implementing agency. DLF also coordinated project activities of the National Agricultural and Forestry Extension Service, and the National Agriculture and Forestry Research Institute. The program established a project

⁴ There seems to be minor differences in data as per IFAD and ADB documents. While the above table shows data as per IFAD's document, ADB data is given in the Annex 1. These differences will be examined in detail and reconciled during preparation of the PPE report.

⁵ This Department has been renamed the Department of Livestock and Fishery

steering committee to guide the implementation, including its annual work plans and progress reports.

17. In addition, Lao PDR's provincial and district level institutions and offices were involved in implementation. The regional office was established in Luang Prabang. It was headed by the National Programme Director who provided day-to-day management and coordinated with the provinces to ensure that project work plans were in line with District Agriculture and Forestry Extension Office (DAFEO) and provincial agriculture and forestry office (PAFO) work plans, budgets, financial, and progress reports.
18. Further, at the provincial level, provincial coordination committees – convened by the provincial governors and drawing membership from relevant provincial departments and mass organizations – were set up to review and approve annual work plans and budgets of the provincial implementation units.
19. Finally, the implementation of microfinance activities was to be carried out by the Lao Women's Union teams in each of the 18 districts. Working with district extension offices, this component was to support farmers in accessing financial resources for livestock production.
20. **Midterm review and adjustments.** Despite a 15-month extension of the project closing date, the effective field implementation period was reduced from 72 months to 57 months. This resulted in a reduction of villages targeted for NRSLLDP activities from 408 to 300 and in a reduction of targeted households from 17,000 to 12,000, as agreed at the mid-term review. Furthermore, changes were made to the Village Livelihood Fund (VLF) microfinance programme to ensure that more beneficiaries would qualify for the VLF loan. Finally, the livestock marketing and trade activities were postponed after the initial consultative input, as it was deemed premature prior to the improvement of livestock production systems and the increase of outputs.

C. Scope and Methodology

21. **Scope.** The PPE will take account of the preliminary findings from a desk review of PCRs,⁶ other key project documents, and interviews at the IFAD and/or ADB headquarters. During the PPE mission, additional evidence and data will be collected to verify available information and reach an independent assessment of performance and results. In view of the limited time and resources available, it may not be possible for the PPE to undertake extensive quantitative surveys or to examine the full spectrum of project activities, achievements and drawbacks. Rather, the PPE will pursue a stratified approach with selected site visits and, if possible, complemented with a limited survey.
22. **Methodology.** The PPE exercise will be jointly undertaken in accordance with the IFAD Evaluation Policy⁷ and the second edition of the IFAD Evaluation Manual (2015), as well as ADB's Guidelines for the Evaluation of Public Sector Operations (April 2016).⁸ Analysis in the PPE will be assisted by a review of the theory of change in the context of the project objectives, outputs, and expected results (appendix 1). Since IOE evaluation methodology is more specific and tailored towards assessing integrated rural development projects, it will be used to provide the basic evaluation approach and structure of the report. Where IED guidelines add value for assessing specific criteria (e.g. efficiency), they will be integrated within the general IOE approach.

⁶ International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). 2014. *Project Completion Report, Northern Region Sustainable Livelihoods through Livestock Development Project (NRSLLDP)*. Lao People's Democratic Republic. March; and Asian Development Bank (ADB). 2015. *Completion Report: Northern Region Sustainable Livelihoods through Livestock Development Project in Lao People's Democratic Republic*. Manila. June.

⁷ International Fund for Agricultural Development: <http://www.ifad.org/pub/policy/oe.pdf>

⁸ Independent Evaluation Department. 2016. *Guidelines for the Evaluation of Public Sector Operations*. ADB. Manila.

23. **Evaluation criteria.** The joint evaluation will apply the following key evaluation criteria:

- (i) **Rural poverty impact**, which is defined in the IFAD Evaluation Manual (2015) as the changes that have occurred or are expected to occur in the lives of the rural poor (whether positive or negative, direct or indirect, intended or unintended) as a result of development interventions. Four impact domains will be assessed to generate a composite indication of rural poverty impact: (i) household income and assets; (ii) human and social capital and empowerment; (iii) food security and agricultural productivity; and (iv) institutions and policies. A composite rating will be provided for the criterion of "rural poverty impact", but not for each of the impact domains.
- (ii) **Development impact assessment** will be considered in line with ADB's guidelines. The evaluation will provide a broader assessment of the long-term, far-reaching changes to which the project contributed in the targeted rural areas.
- (iii) **Relevance** of project objectives and design, and the targeting strategy adopted will be assessed. Emphasis will also be laid on the continued relevance of the project during the project cycle. In order to comply with ADB's guidelines, the relevance of design will also look at the innovative features of the project.
- (iv) **Effectiveness** measures the extent to which the project's immediate objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved. The assessment will be based on the analysis of the output and outcome levels of the project theory of change.
- (v) **Efficiency** indicates how economically resources/inputs (e.g. funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results. The evaluation will examine the project's economic internal rate of return (EIRR) ex post, along with process efficiency.⁹ For loan-financed projects, it is all the more important to ensure that projects yield steady benefits over their economic life. In ADB, a cut-off of 12 per cent is used for EIRRs to describe a project as efficient, especially when it is a revenue-generating project.
- (vi) **Sustainability of benefits** indicates the likely continuation of net benefits from a development intervention beyond the phase of external funding support. It involves an assessment of the likelihood that actual and anticipated results will be resilient to risks after project completion. Sustainability of net benefits generated by the project will be assessed from a technical, financial,¹⁰ institutional, social and environmental perspective.
- (vii) **Gender equality and women's empowerment** indicates the extent to which the intervention contributed to better gender equality and women's empowerment according to the objectives of relevant ADB and IFAD strategies.¹¹ The effects of the project on gender will be examined along the theory of change and specifically in the final evaluation report under relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. The report will include a short section on gender equality and women's empowerment which summarizes the main findings under the various evaluation criteria and

⁹ In the absence of EIRR, cost-effectiveness or standard unit costs can be used to estimate project efficiency.

¹⁰ In ADB, this is examined and analyzed with the help financial internal rate of return (FIRR) of the project, especially for revenue generating projects. The underlying idea is to ensure availability of financial resources to maintain project assets (O&M) in working condition so as to keep generating benefits.

¹¹ The reference strategy for IFAD will be the 2003 Gender Plan of Action

provides the overall rating for gender equality and women's empowerment.

- (viii) **Innovation** in terms of design and approaches is assessed under relevance of design. Under innovation, the evaluation will assess the extent to which these innovative approaches were successfully introduced for deeper impact on rural poverty reduction.
 - (ix) **Scaling up.** Assessing the extent to which the project has been (or is likely to be) scaled up by Government authorities, donor organizations, the private sector and others agencies.
 - (x) **Environment and natural resource management.** Assessing the extent to which the project contributes to changes in the protection, rehabilitation or depletion of natural resources and the environment. The project's medium- to long-term effects on natural resource management, pollution, biodiversity, and greenhouse gas emissions will form part of the analysis. These effects will be examined along the theory of change and specifically in the final evaluation report under relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. The report will include a short section on this criteria which summarizes the main findings and provides the overall rating for environment and natural resource management.
 - (xi) **Adaptation to climate change.** Assessing the contribution of the project to increased climate resilience and increased beneficiaries' capacity to manage short- and long-term climate risks.
 - (xii) **Overall project achievement** provides an overarching assessment of the intervention, drawing upon the analysis and ratings for all above-mentioned criteria. In sum, this assessment validates the results chain of the project and its legitimacy, in light of the theory of change.
 - (xiii) **Performance of partners**, including the performance of IFAD, ADB, SDC and the Government, will be assessed on an individual basis, in accordance with the partners' expected role and responsibility in the project life cycle. Methods, procedures and protocols engendering better synergies among development partners will be identified, as they emerged from this particular joint project.
24. **Rating system.** In line with the practice adopted in many other international financial institutions and UN organizations, IOE uses a six-point rating system, where 6 is the highest score (highly satisfactory) and 1 is the lowest score (highly unsatisfactory).¹² ADB, however, uses a four-point scale, where 3 is the highest score and 0 is the lowest. In addition to a combined substantive assessment, the PPE will generate two separate ratings tables so that assessments can be integrated in the respective evaluation databases of both organizations.
25. Table 2 provides an overview of the criteria adopted and rated by IOE and IED.

¹² ADB uses four point scale in relation to sub-criterion of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and likely sustainability, and non-quantitative assessment of other developmental aspects.

Table 2
Evaluation criteria rated by IOE and IED

Evaluation criteria	Rating	
	IOE	IED
Relevance	Yes	Yes
Effectiveness	Yes	Yes
Efficiency	Yes	Yes
Sustainability of benefits	Yes	Yes
Overall Project Performance	Yes	Yes
Rural Poverty Impact	Yes	No
Development impact ¹³	No	Yes
Gender equality and women's empowerment	Yes	No
Innovation	Yes	No
Scaling up	Yes	No
Environment and Natural Resource Management	Yes	No
Adaptation to Climate Change	Yes	No
Overall Project Achievements	Yes	No
Partners' Performance		
IFAD/ADB	Yes	Yes
Government	Yes	Yes
Project completion Report Quality Ratings		Yes
Scope	Yes	
Quality	Yes	
Lessons Learned	Yes	
Candour	Yes	

26. **Data collection.** The PPE will be built on the initial findings from a review of the Project Completion Report, Project Completion Report Validation and other documents. The project conducted two RIMs surveys in 2010 and 2013. However, supervision reports and PCRs highlighted the weaknesses in the M&E system of the project, the lack of baseline and key impact data at completion (e.g. on the impacts of technology adoption on animal health, selling prices, and on the use of loans provided by the Village Livelihood Fund, etc.) and the unreliability of the few data collected.
27. The PPE team will make an attempt to ascertain the contribution of the project to the sustainable livelihoods of the targeted population by collecting primary data during the field mission through focus group discussions, interviews with key informants, direct observations and site visits in order to reach an independent assessment of performance and results. The PPE will make use of available quantitative data (e.g., project M&E and other secondary sources) where appropriate. Triangulation will be applied to verify findings emerging from different information sources.
28. **Stakeholders' participation.** In compliance with the IOE Evaluation Policy and

¹³ This is an ADB specific criteria

following good practice of IED, the main project stakeholders will be involved throughout the PPE. This will ensure that the stakeholders' views are taken into account, the evaluators fully understand the context in which the project was implemented, and the identification of opportunities and constraints faced by the implementing institutions. Regular interaction and communication will be established with the Asia and the Pacific Division (APR) of IFAD, ADB, and with the Government.

29. A core-learning partnership (CLP) will be established to enhance the quality of the evaluation as well as to build ownership among key partners in the evaluation process and its outcomes. The CLP will comprise the following members:

Representatives of IFAD management:

- Country Programme Manager for Laos
- Programme Management Department, Front Office

Representatives of ADB management:

- South-east Asian Regional Department
- Lao PDR Resident Mission of ADB

Government authorities at national level:

- Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
- Department of Land and Forestry

Government authorities at provincial level:

- District Agriculture and Forestry Extension Office (DAFEO)
- Provincial Agriculture and Forestry Office (PAFO)
- women's union

D. Evaluation Process

30. Following a desk review of the PCR and other project key project documents, the PPE will involve the following steps:

- (i) **Country work.** As mentioned in the introduction, the joint PPE will be linked to ECD activities in the country. The PPE field mission will take place following the ECD training for Government officials. The IOE and IED mission members will serve as technical resources during the training, which will include the Ministry of Planning and Investment staff who will participate in the PPE mission. The PPE mission will interact with representatives from the Government and other institutions, beneficiaries, and key informants, in Manila, Philippines, and in Lao PDR. At the end of the mission, a wrap-up meeting will be held in Vientiane to share a summary of the preliminary findings and to discuss key strategic and operational issues. In addition to ADB officials, the IFAD country programme manager and/or country programme officer for Lao PDR is also expected to participate in the wrap-up meeting.
- (ii) **ECD, report drafting and peer review.** After the field visit, the lead evaluators from IOE and IED will prepare the joint draft PPE report. As part of the ECD activities, the representatives of the evaluation office of the Ministry of Planning and Investment of Lao PDR will be trained by IOE and IED to prepare their own evaluation report. The draft PPE report, prepared by IOE and IED, will be submitted to IOE internal peer review for quality assurance. The draft report will also be independently peer reviewed in ADB.
- (iii) **Comments by IFAD and ADB Management and the Government.** The draft PPE report will be shared simultaneously with IFAD APR and the Government for review and comments. ADB will share the report with its Regional Department

responsible for ADB operations, as well as the resident mission in Lao PDR. Following the receipt of comments, IOE and IED will finalize the report and prepare an audit trail.

- (iv) **Management response.** A written management response on the final PPE report will be prepared by IFAD Management. This will be included in the PPE report, when published. ADB will likewise follow its internal procedures for processing the report before publishing it on its web page, in accordance with ADB’s disclosure policy.
- (v) The **tentative timetable** for the PPE process is as follows:

Date	Activities
January - February 2017	Desk review
27 February - 10 March 2017	Mission to Lao PDR
March - April 2017	Preparation of draft report
Mid-May 2017	IOE internal peer review
June 2017	Comments from IFAD, ADB and Government of Lao PDR
July 2017	Finalization of the report
September 2017	Publication and dissemination

E. Specific Issues for this Project Performance Evaluation

- 31. **Key issues for PPE investigation.** A PPE is a project evaluation with limited scope and resources. As such, PPEs are not expected to investigate all activities financed under the project or to undertake an in-depth impact assessment. Selected issues to be closely reviewed were identified based on the initial desk review and are illustrated below. These issues may be fine-tuned and revised based on further considerations or information availability, consultation with IFAD, ADB, and the Government.
- 32. **Targeting, coverage and focus on vulnerable groups.** The PPE will assess whether: (i) the project area selection was realistic, also considering the reduction in the number of villages covered and beneficiaries reached at completion; and (ii) the project was successful or not in reaching the target groups (including women and indigenous people) and the appropriateness of the strategy adopted.
- 33. **Programme contribution to livestock development.** The project identified, in the lack of access to adequate productive resources and marketing opportunities, a constraint to the sustainable livelihoods for the poor upland ethnic groups in northern Lao PDR. Given the dependency of upland communities on unstable agriculture, its falling productivity and land availability constraints, the project aimed at supporting the creation of enhanced livestock systems and the transition from low-input livestock to commercially-oriented production. This was done through the introduction of technologies and rural financial services, the promotion of markets and enterprise development and community level capacity building. The PPE will seek to verify whether the technologies introduced were tailored to the local context and contributed to higher value livestock production, greater food security and cash incomes for poor upland communities, towards deeper impact in rural poverty reduction.
- 34. The PPE will also seek to assess the extent of project contribution in terms of facilitating access to credit by smallholders and microenterprises that otherwise might not have had access to finance for investment and working capital.
- 35. **Programme impact.** The measurable evidence on rural poverty impact is very limited. As mentioned in previous paragraphs, the project supervision reports and PCR have repeatedly pointed to the weaknesses in the monitoring and evaluation system of the project and the limited quantitative data or analysis on the four

impact domains. The PPE team will conduct focus group discussions to better understand the project's impact on various domains and also use secondary household survey data to support the analysis if available.

36. **Sustainability of programme benefits.** The PPE will pay attention to:
- Community institutions such as Livestock Production Groups (LPGs) and women associations and implementation structures set up during the project;
 - The maintenance of community and village level infrastructure created during the project.
 - Continuity of technical (farmer extension services, livestock health support to farmers etc.) and financial services and their benefits to the target population introduced by NRSLLDP in the target districts. In particular, the PPE will review the extent to which those services continue to be provided to poor people, and in particular women, after the project has closed.
37. **Partnership between IFAD and ADB.** In light of the growing partnership between IFAD and ADB and the respective comparative advantages that IFAD and ADB have in addressing rural poverty reduction in Asia-Pacific, the PPE will seek to assess the value added of the IFAD-ADB partnership and the contribution of the project due to this partnership.

F. Evaluation Team

38. Simona Somma, Evaluation Officer of IOE, and Mr. Andrew Brubaker of Senior Evaluation Specialist IED have been designated as Joint Lead Evaluators for this PPE and will be responsible for delivering the final report. They will be assisted by Mr Brahm Prakash, IOE consultant economist and evaluation specialist, Ms Renate Roels, IOE evaluation research analyst, Ms Patricia Lim, national consultant evaluation officer, and Ms Myrna Fortu, associate evaluation analyst, will support the evaluation team in preparing the draft and finalizing the evaluation report.

G. Communication and dissemination

39. The final report will be jointly published by IOE and IED and disseminated among key stakeholders both online and in print. Presentations on the findings and methodological issues will be made at IFAD and ADB, and for national stakeholders in Lao PDR. IOE and IED may also present the evaluation findings and their experience in conducting the joint evaluation at international forums such as the Evaluation Cooperation Group of the MDBs and the United Nations Evaluation Group.

H. Background Documents

- **NRSLLDP project-specific documents**
 - (i) Appraisal reports of IFAD and ADB
 - (ii) IFAD President's Report and RRP of ADB
 - (iii) Mid-term review reports
 - (iv) Project Financing Agreement and amendments
 - (v) Supervision mission aide memoires and reports
 - (vi) Project status reports
 - (vii) Project completion reports of IFAD and ADB, including related validation reports
- **General and others**
 - (i) IFAD (2015). Evaluation Manual – Second Edition
 - (ii) IOE (2012). Guidelines for Project Completion Report Validations and Project Performance Evaluations

- (iii) IFAD (2011). IFAD Evaluation Policy.
- (iv) IFAD policies and strategies, in particular, the Strategic Framework (2002- 2006), Rural Finance, Rural Enterprise, Targeting, Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Annex 1

Table 1
Project cost and financing plan (US\$ 000s)

	Particulars	ADB loan	IFAD loan	ADB ADF grant	SDC grant	Government	Beneficiaries	Total \$ (000s)
I.	Investment costs	9,052		686	3,506	1,035	641	17,760
	A. Civil works	1,835				253	440	2,528
	B. Vehicles and equipment	769				311		1,081
	C. Extension material	525						525
	D. Specialist services	0		656	2,145			2,801
	E. Contract services	111			945			1,056
	F. Revolving fund	1,807	1,014				201	3,022
	G. Surveys and studies	67		30				97
	H. Farmer training	696						696
	I. Agency training	112			416			528
	J. Supervision and implementation	2,637				416		3,054
	K. Vehicles and equipment	491				55		545
	L. Marketing and poultry	0	1,827					1,827
II.	Recurrent costs	0				30	173	203
III.	Total project costs	9,052	2,841	686	3,506	1,065	814	17,963
	Total Disbursement	9,281	2,994	686	3,506	1,065	814	18,346

ADB = Asian Development Bank, ADF = Asian Development Fund, IFAD = International Fund for Agricultural Development, SDC = Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation.

Source: ADB. 2015. *Completion Report: Northern Region Sustainable Livelihoods through Livestock Development Project in Lao People's Democratic Republic*. Manila. June.

