AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK GROUP

MAKING A DIFFERENCE IN AFRICA
A COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION OF THE BANK’S DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

APPROACH PAPER

OPEV DEPARTMENT

MARCH 2014
Cover note

An approach paper for a comprehensive evaluation of the Bank’s development results

Background

In October 2013, CODE discussed options for conducting a comprehensive evaluation of the African Development Bank (the Bank). The committee selected an option including two separate products. The first would be a review of the implementation of commitments, to be delivered in mid-2015. The second product would be a comprehensive evaluation of development results, to be delivered in 2016. CODE asked to see approach papers for these evaluations. The following is the approach paper for the second of these components, evaluating the Bank’s development results (CEDR).

A strategic approach to increase value for money

CODE members stressed that the evaluation should be embedded in OPEV’s work program to ensure additional costs could be kept down. For these reasons, the approach proposed is based on “building blocks”, i.e. evaluations embedded within the wider OPEV evaluation work program. In order to ensure representative coverage, the CEDR would need to draw on a significant number of these building blocks. A set of about 15 Country Strategy Evaluations (CSE) would take center-stage in the CEDR as country goals and beneficiaries in the Bank’s 2013 RMCs form the apex of the Bank’s impact indicators. But the evaluation would need to incorporate other critical evaluation building blocks that contribute to country results. These include regional evaluations; sector, cluster and thematic evaluations and reviews; project validations and outcome measurements for key sector projects; and additional studies, for instance on Bank-wide activities and products. OPEV will also undertake a meta-analysis of OPEV evaluations and syntheses since 2008 and carry out literature reviews in key results areas to inform the country evaluations and the CDER synthesis. With some exceptions all building blocks would be regular evaluations in OPEV’s work program 2014-2016, most of them with independent, free-standing products.

Key questions on which guidance is requested:

- Are lead questions proposed well reflecting the issues CODE wishes to see addressed and those for which an information gap exists?

- Are volume, regional balance, and balance between the various type of countries (MIC, LIC, FS) relevant dimensions for selecting the countries? Are any other criteria missing?

- What role should CODE play going forward and how to ensure buy-in throughout the implementation period?
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Background and context

Why we are doing this evaluation

1. Key stakeholders of the African Development Bank have identified a gap in the assessment and reporting of development results at the Bank. While there are some studies (both evaluations and others) that already addressed the Bank’s organizational effectiveness and efficiency, there is a dearth of credible and evidence-based information on development results achieved by the Bank on the ground, particularly in terms of final development outcomes such as real improvements in people’s lives. There is also a sense, particularly among Regional Members, that too little is known on how the Bank’s development results relate and contribute to higher-level RMC goals, in infrastructure, private sector or social development. And how their impact could be enhanced in the future, given the mandate and resources of the Bank and a rapidly changing environment for development aid. Some stakeholders are concerned that the Bank’s priority setting for results in the past may not have been sufficiently supportive of and aligned with country priorities, affecting demand for the Bank’s products and services and raising questions of future ownership and commitment.

2. For these reasons CODE requested OPEV to carry out a Comprehensive Evaluation of Development Results (CEDR) in November 2013¹ and to proffer a consolidated approach paper for such an evaluation. Initial consultation with CODE and Bank Management underscored that to add value, such an evaluation should focus on the Bank as a whole, not just a single instrument; and to provide lessons for the Bank going forward, rather than to simply record backwards.

How and where the Bank means to achieve results

3. The African Development Bank provides about 7 percent of ODA in Africa. To leverage and scale-up this relatively modest share the Bank is determined to take advantage of its special role as a trusted regional institution and adviser by and for African governments and non-Regional Members. The three successive Bank-wide strategies of 2003, 2008 and 2013 have all emphasized the importance of partnerships for development² and of linking the Bank’s loans and grants to high-quality technical knowledge and advisory services for African governments. As noted in the most recent strategy: “Delivering knowledge, innovation and advice will be as important as lending…. The Bank will systematically leverage its own resources and become a catalyst for significantly scaling up development finance for Africa” Ten-year Strategy, p.19. In other words, the goal for the Bank is, and has been in the past, to enhance its leverage, additionality and overall relevance to work for broader country development goals.

4. Inclusive and green growth are now explicit goals in the new 2013-22 ten-year strategy. Earlier on the Bank had emphasized its support for gender and poverty alleviation when signing-up to the Millennium Development Goals in 2003. And the 2004 Environmental Policy put the Bank firmly on the road towards environmental and social safeguards and mainstreaming. Over the past decade the Bank has also been frequently and prominently called upon for short-term financial support and

---

¹ as part of Option 5 of the OPEV Concept Note to address the ADF Delegates’ call in June 2013 for a comprehensive evaluation

² Boosted through the 2005 Paris Declaration
longer-term rehabilitation in emergencies, particularly in the wake of national and regional conflicts, the financial crisis and the food price crisis of 2008. All these aspects of the Bank results strategy deserve attention in conceptualizing this evaluation of development results at the Bank.

How the evaluation relates to the Bank’s ten-year strategy and the new RMF

5. This evaluation comes at a time when the Bank is embarking on a new ten-year strategy (2013-2022) and a corresponding results measurement framework (RMF). The implementation of the strategy and related RMF in practice will require quite a bit of fine-tuning and experimentation on the ground, as experience from the past shows. This is a good time for a forward looking evaluation: to help operationalize the TYS and the RMF in the medium-term, by finding out what works and where, by identifying bottlenecks and by assessing alternative solutions (including through benchmarking). In terms of results measurement, this evaluation would provide a critical mass of resources and expertise to carry out a broadly representative, analytically rigorous and sufficiently independent assessment of the Bank’s development outcomes; complementary to the work ORQR and others in Operations are doing to enhance regular results reporting through the Annual Development Effectiveness Reviews and elsewhere, and more broadly to support results-based management. In the long-run the evaluation may be highly opportune to support and inform the dialogue of the Bank’s governors and others on The Next 50 years: “The Africa We Want” – which aims to set the trajectory for a prosperous, better integrated, self-determined and peaceful Africa in the year 2063.

Purpose, objectives and audience

What the evaluation is about

6. The CEDR is meant to be a comprehensive, integrated and evidence-based assessment of the Bank’s development results across sectors, countries and regions; public and private operations; lending and non-lending activities. The main questions the CEDR seeks to examine and better understand is whether the Bank is achieving desired results; why these results are achieved or why not; and whether the Bank is optimally using and leveraging its resources to generate inclusive and sustainable growth that makes a measurable difference in the daily lives of ordinary Africans.

7. The evaluation serves accountability and learning in equal parts. It would summarize and analyze results that have materialized from completed operations and activities and assess real-time and prospective results of the ongoing portfolio. It would provide evidence to the Bank’s shareholders and final beneficiaries on achievement of results compared to what was intended and programmed, thus serving the accountability function. At the same time the evaluation is designed as a forward-looking exercise and learning tool: for the Bank’s management and staff, for regional and non-regional decision-makers and other important stakeholders; to enhance the Bank’s and RMCs’ roles and capacities in maximizing development results in Africa. For this reason establishing and maintaining regular lines of communication throughout the evaluation and beyond its completion will be a high OPEV priority.

8. Private sector operations through non-sovereign lending will be an integral part of the assessment of development results of this evaluation. Even when these operations are not explicitly planned for or integrated in country and other overarching strategies. Private sector operations accounted for a bit more than 22 percent of total approved net loans of the Bank from 2009-2013, and
17 percent of all projects. Their link with the Bank’s public sector operations and results goals, in PPPs and beyond, will be a major focus for the CEDR.

What we hope to achieve with the evaluation

9. To support accountability and learning, the Comprehensive Evaluation of Development Results (CEDR) has four principle objectives:

(1) Assess the Bank’s overall results and result trends for public and private sector operations; in particular in view of the Bank’s contributions to RMC national and to regional goals; with special reference to the Bank’s results in response to emergencies, fragility and adaptation to changing external circumstances;

(2) Highlight the main drivers and risks for results at various levels; with emphasis on the critical role of vertical linkages (micro-meso-macro operations and activities) and horizontal linkages (such as between various programs and development partners);

(3) Provide evidence and forward-looking analysis to support the implementation of the Bank’s ten-year strategy 2013-2022 and to optimally leverage the Bank’s deployed resources at country and other levels; and

(4) Enhance the management for results, by the Bank and by RMCs and inform the implementation and fine-tuning of the current Bank’s RMF.

10. The evaluation is summative by focusing on results, causative by examining key determinants for results, and formative by looking forward and identifying solutions and best practices in key areas of Bank and RMC strategic and programmatic choices and management.

How we are planning to carry it out

11. In order to ensure representative coverage, the CEDR would need to draw on a significant number of evaluations embedded within the wider OPEV evaluation work program (building blocks). A set of about 15 Country Strategy Evaluations (CSE) would take center-stage in the CEDR as country goals and beneficiaries in the Bank’s 2013 RMCs form the apex of the Bank’s impact indicators. But the evaluation would need to incorporate other critical evaluation building blocks that contribute to country results, as set out in Figure 1. They include regional evaluations; sector, cluster and thematic evaluations and reviews; project validations and outcome measurements for key sector projects; and additional studies, for instance on Bank-wide activities and products. In particular, the CEDR will draw on two major sector evaluations that OPEV is about to embark on in 2014, those of energy and water and sanitation. The evaluation would also undertake a meta-analysis of OPEV evaluations and syntheses since 2008 and carry out literature reviews in key results areas to inform the country evaluations. With some exceptions these building blocks would be regular evaluations in OPEV’s work program 2014-2016, most of them with independent, free-standing products. For the purposes of the CEDR key findings from these evaluations would be brought together in a final synthesis report on development results.

3 Exact period still to be decided by meta-analysis working group
12. **The study period would cover ten years (2004-2013).** It starts in 2004, the year after the 2003 Strategic Plan of the Bank came into effect and just ahead of the time when results-based Country Strategy Papers (CSP) were introduced in the Bank in 2005. The CSPs and projects considered are those approved in the study period; and all projects completed since 2009, even if their approval may have taken place earlier. Development results at the outcomes level typically take a long period of time to be realized. Therefore, a longer study period would allow for these results to be captured. A 10-year study period would also allow discerning changes over two 5-year periods, 2004-2008 and 2009 – 2013.

13. **Given the likely number of building block evaluations required, the initial start-up time in developing and agreeing a common framework for them, and the period required to analyze and synthesize findings the whole process would take more than two years.** A final evaluation report on the development effectiveness of the Bank would therefore be available in mid-2016. A progress report, or a report focusing on a substantial subset of countries and/or sectors, would be presented in late-2015, early 2016. But it would not necessarily include all conclusive findings for the Bank as a whole as sufficient analysis and coverage might not have been achieved at that point.

*Who will be interested in and/or affected by the evaluation*

14. **The main stakeholders and primary audience for evaluation products are**

   1. The Bank
      1. CODE/Boards
      2. Incumbent and new president and senior management
      3. Strategic planners at various levels
   2. RMCs
      1. Governments
      2. Others
   3. Co-financiers and direct partners in the Bank’s operations
4. African evaluation community (including capacity building)
5. Important others
   1. Africa network – civil society
   2. International press – Economist, TAZ Berlin etc.
   3. African civil society; OXFAM; stakeholders of emerging donor countries
       Brasil/China etc.
   4. The Bill Gates type of foundations
   5. Private investors

These different stakeholders may have different priorities for information. Some may be more interested in accountability (CODE/Boards, Incumbent Management), others in forward looking planning (New Management, RMCs), others in evaluative aspects. Considering and balancing these potentially competing interests of primary audiences will be a major task in this evaluation, to be dealt with at various evaluation stages in a participative manner.

**Evaluation questions and scope**

*Lead questions for the Comprehensive Evaluation of Development Results*

15. The CEDR has formulated a number of lead questions that define the evaluation’s core thematic priorities and would eventually add up to the story line of the evaluation\(^4\). They are indicative for the design and priorities of the evaluation building blocks at this stage and may be refined during the course of the evaluation. They closely link with the standard evaluation questions and criteria of the Country Strategy Evaluations and other evaluation building blocks for the CEDR.

1. **What were the Bank’s results of lending and non-lending operations (mainly of operations embarked on in the past 10 years) and what were the primary factors for achieving results?**

   - What has the Bank contributed to RMC country and regional results, through its project and sector work, public and private sectors? And where has the Bank been particularly successful?
   - How have the Bank’s priority sectors and development areas contributed to the long-term result goals of the Bank?
   - Specifically, how have private sector operations been working towards long-term and high-level results? This would include an ex-post analysis of ADOA.\(^5\)
   - What were the Bank’s results in fragile countries? And in response to other emergencies and risks, such as the 2008 financial and food price crises; North-Africa’s political transformation; climate change and adaptation?

---

\(^4\) These lead questions could be chapters (or sub-chapters) in the final CEDR synthesis report. They should reflect the most meaningful overarching questions for the institution (and for RMCs!). They would have to be backed up by clear methods and approaches for analysis; and be mapped with technical evaluation criteria (quantity and quality dimensions).

\(^5\) As part of its evaluation manual review process OPEV is currently designing a harmonized approach to public and private sector project evaluations. This is expected to help significantly to assess and compare the effectiveness of private sector operations in the CEDR.
• And to what extent do Bank’s results address the needs of specific target groups? Are they inclusive in terms of reductions in poverty and inequality, and wider access to economic opportunities for Africans across age, gender and geographic divides?6 Are they environmentally sustainable?

2. Specifically, how effective has the Bank been as a convener and knowledge institution; and what concrete results can be found at country, regional and other levels from these activities? How innovative and creative are Bank operations and what are the results for innovative products or components?

• How effective has the Bank been as a catalyst; a credible knowledge broker, trusted adviser; voice for development in Africa. How can this been demonstrated?
• What factors helped or prevented the Bank from being an effective convener and knowledge institution?
• Where can we find successful innovation and new business development with good results that could be replicated elsewhere?

3. How effectively does the Bank leverage its resources? And how well are Bank operations vertically and horizontally connected?

• What instruments and modalities were deployed to achieve results on the ground? And in what combination? What multiplier effects do Bank investments have?
• How well does the Bank work along sector results and value chains; and how well does it coordinate and work with other partners for development?

4. What is driving the Bank’s country and regional strategies, priorities and portfolios? And how does this affect results?

• Bank strategic priorities? Sector pipelines? RMC demands? Regional considerations, division of labor? Inertia, convenience? Has this been changing over time?
• Which parts of the Bank’s strategic priorities commonly receive most attention and which ones get less? And why? How does the Bank set and ensure priorities and coherence?
• To what extent are the Paris Declaration principles of ownership followed and what contributes to successful implementation of these principles: Regional Member Countries set their own strategies for development and poverty reduction, improve their institutions and address corruption?
• How well does the Bank resolve tensions among various goals and objectives? In particular among growth and inclusiveness, poverty reduction and the environment. And in terms of short- and long-term results? Potentially high-return investments and risk-aversion?

5. What is the Bank’s culture and capacity for results-based management (RBM), results measurement and feedback (in terms of skills, technology and institutional arrangements)?

• To what extent has the Bank implemented a performance management strategy that focuses on performance and the achievement of outputs, outcomes and impacts?
• Were results measurement frameworks articulated in a way to provide effective guidance for results-oriented evaluations?

6 Ten-year Strategy 2013-22 p. 7/8
- Why have things worked out - or not worked out - in terms of RBM?
- How does this implicate RMCs; and what support has been provided to RMCs to enhance their systems for results-based management?
- Are the monitoring and evaluation systems of the Bank and RMCs effective? Is evaluative information used to improve results and development effectiveness?

16. **Relevant dimensions in all of the above questions include:** What happened and what evidence demonstrates success or failure? Why did things happen and why not? What could be done better? What works, why and where? How do others do it? What are the consequences of the findings for the implementation of the Bank’s ten-year strategy and the Africa 50 Initiative.

17. **The standard evaluation questions and criteria of the Country Strategy Evaluations (CSE) and other building blocks on relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, efficiency, AFDB performance and RMC performance are the technical core for the CEDR.** While applying these criteria special emphasis will be on development results and how and why results were achieved or not. Standard evaluation questions and criteria for the CSEs are summarized in Annex 2.

**Evaluation design and methods**

*How the evaluation questions will be analyzed*

18. Most of the lead evaluation questions can and would be addressed by the planned building blocks of the CEDR, the country and regional strategy evaluations, the aggregated project validation and outcome measurements, and by sector and thematic evaluations and reviews. Standard methodologies for CSEs and other building block evaluations exist and are currently being updated by OPEV for good fit with the CEDR. The lead questions for the CEDR will be mapped in detail with the standard evaluation questions and criteria in the Country Strategy Evaluations and the other building blocks in the inception report of the CEDR. Lead questions 1, 3, 4 and 5 are closely related to the common effectiveness, sustainability, relevance, efficiency and AfDB and RMC performance criteria for country CSEs (compare with a summary of these criteria in Annex 2). The Inception Report will also determine detailed data needs and methods to be used, including the representative sampling of projects in sectors and themes to allow for generalizations at these levels for the Bank as a whole. Moreover, the inception report will define the strategic priority sector and thematic areas for which results will be analyzed and aggregated.

19. **Additional studies may have to be conducted to support the basic CSE analysis.** For instance, question 2 may require some additional thematic work on Bank wide non-lending activities, or innovative work in the private sector portfolio, although part of these themes play out and can be assessed in each sample country through the CSE. The question of inclusiveness will have to be worked out in more detail, as inclusiveness refers to several dimensions: gender, social, age and geography.
A simple conceptual model for development results at the Bank

20. The lead questions are built on a simple model of how the Bank means to achieve higher level and final results (Figure 2). The Bank has different instruments and modalities at its disposal that fall into three broad categories: Bank loans and grants, knowledge and other non-lending products, and various forms of partnerships. Covering public and private sector. Results are generated at three different intervention levels: sub-national projects and programs in various sectors; country level financial support (PBOs and multi-sector projects) and various country wide non-lending activities; and regional and Africa-wide operations and activities, such as multinational projects and regional or Africa-wide public goods. The vertical and horizontal integration of these different instruments, modalities and intervention levels is essentially the Bank’s contribution to development results in terms of country goals and final beneficiary outcomes. This is the focus of the CEDR country analysis. In the CEDR model performance of results-based management by the Bank and RMCs and the search for and application of innovation and new business models are important factors for results that deserve special attention.

Figure 2: Simple results model of the comprehensive evaluation

Development results: what we are talking about

21. The concept of development results in the CEDR. The evaluation will have a clear focus on development outcomes. For the purposes of this evaluation development results are therefore defined as all effects generated by the outputs of Bank operations and activities, in single-financed or joint ventures; in particular outcomes at national level and for final target group beneficiaries. They

\[ \text{Typically, results include project or CSP outputs.} \]
include intermediate and final, higher level and, to the extent measurable, longer term outcomes. Higher level outcomes refer to the Bank’s RMF goal level 1 “impacts” (Figure 3).^8

Figure 3: African Development Bank Results Measurement Framework (Dec. 2013)

22. **Quality dimensions and linkages.** In addition to their quantification, the evaluation will pay attention to quality aspects of outcomes, efficiency and to measuring linkages of results between Bank RMF level 2 and 1 goals, this means between Bank controlled outcomes (level 2) and higher level “impacts” (level 1, RMC national level goals).

23. **While the evaluation will have a strong focus on actual development outcomes of completed projects at country and field level it is recognized that the ongoing portfolio will have to be included in the results analysis.** Where final development outcomes have not yet materialized, the evaluation will carefully review all evidence and proxies on performance, outputs to date and quality of entry and implementation to draw conclusions on prospective results.

---

^8 The evaluation is cautious in using the term ‘impact’ to describe final or high level outcomes as it may be confusing. The reason is that in the African Development Bank and elsewhere the term impact is frequently used in three different ways: (1) for high level country-wide outcomes as RMF goal level 1; (2) for long-term outcomes in projects and programs (according to the OECD DAC definition); and (3) for rigorous impact evaluations that assess all kinds of results of specific interventions in controlled environments, usually with control groups.
24. **Contribution versus attribution.** It should be noted that the achievement of development results, particularly at higher or longer term level, is influenced by a multitude of factors. “It is very difficult to attribute overall development results to the work of a single institution: development is the combination of countless decisions made by governments, firms and households.(RMF 2013, para. 39)”. Rather than directly attributing development results to the Bank (particularly final outcomes), the evaluation will demonstrate how the Bank’s interventions have contributed to these results, which represents a certain form of attribution. Various kinds of contribution analysis may be explored and applied during the evaluation.

**Sampling strategy: How we choose the countries to work in**

25. The evaluation will examine a stratified sample of about 15 Regional Member Countries, which will be selected to ensure a minimum coverage of 50-60% of the Bank’s volume of assistance over the past 10 years. To ensure representativeness and representation of the Bank’s interventions and various settings, the countries will be selected based on a number of criteria including, level and type of support, country size, country type and region. Attention will be paid to countries with high spatial inequalities. The sample will include a number of fragile and middle-income countries. The planned Regional Integration Evaluations would also inform the country selection. There are some groups of countries that may eventually be underrepresented in the sample, but that may deserve special studies. This includes countries that do not borrow much from the Bank or small island states with special circumstances. While the Country Strategy Evaluations will be major building blocks for the Comprehensive Evaluation of Development Results they will be, at the same time, free standing products as mentioned above. For this reason another important selection criterion will be the CSP cycle of a given country with preference for those countries where the evaluation can inform in a timely manner the design and development of new CSPs.

**Strategic priorities and other areas of thematic focus.**

26. To provide disaggregate accountability, comparisons and useful lessons key results would be examined in each sample country and beyond for a set of country strategic priorities, sectors and themes. These strategic priorities, sectors and themes are aligned with the five strategic priorities of the Bank’s 2013 Results Measurement Framework (RMF), which in turn reflects the Bank’s new ten-year strategy for 2013-22 (Table 1). In addition to the strategic priorities, OPEV would pay attention to results in four other areas of thematic focus: gender, social and environment; fragility and emergencies; non-lending instruments; and new business models. The overarching TYS objectives of inclusive and green growth would be included under the first thematic focus. A number of disaggregated priority sectors and themes fall under each of the five strategic priorities. They could be reviewed jointly or separately, whatever may be most appropriate (Table 1). The four aggregate areas of thematic focus cover the TYS areas of special emphasis and top objectives and two sets of activities regarded as very important for the future of the Bank: the increasing demand for a variety of

---

9 The language criteria is implicit in the regional balance. Other criteria discussed in the working group were data availability, security, the inclusion of interesting countries in terms of key thematic priorities, and countries with a low demand for Bank services

10 Gender, fragile states, agriculture and food security, inclusiveness and green growth
non-lending activities by RMCs and of innovative Bank products\textsuperscript{11}. The inception report will elaborate in detail the focus and methods for assessing non-lending and innovative Bank products.

**Table 1 - Key result areas and themes for the Comprehensive Evaluation of Development Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key results areas</th>
<th>Priority sectors and themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic priorities (RMF 2013 and TYS 2013-2022)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Infrastructure</td>
<td>Transport, energy, water and sanitation, agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Regional integration</td>
<td>Multinational projects and regional public goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Private Sector</td>
<td>SMEs, private equity, PPP, micro-finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Skills, social and human development</td>
<td>Education, health etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Governance and accountability</td>
<td>PBOs and finance, governance capacity building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other areas of thematic focus (TYS 2013-2022 and AfDB 2014-2016 Rolling Plan and Budget)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gender, social and environment</td>
<td>Gender, inclusiveness, environment and natural resources management, climate change, and green growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fragility and emergencies</td>
<td>Fragile states, response to emergencies, agriculture and food security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Non-lending instruments</td>
<td>Policy dialogue, knowledge and convener role, capacity, trust funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. New business models; innovation and creativity</td>
<td>Innovative lending instruments; leveraging resource management; new sources of financing and partnerships; access to domestic resources and international capital markets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Common results measurement frameworks and causal models**

27. To facilitate comparison, cross-country and sector aggregation the country, regional, sector and other evaluations carried out in the context of the CEDR would adopt common or compatible approaches and frameworks for analysis. Two reference systems would be considered, for different purposes: for accountability, the assessment of results would mainly use the relevant results frameworks at the time of CSP or project design, such as project, sector or country logical

\textsuperscript{11} For instance, President Kaberuka recently called for aid to be more driven by the desire for leveraging assistance, new information technologies and smart/wise natural resource exploitations (Press conference in Paris December 17, 2013). The Bank also set up a strike force on business development for expansion and diversification of its business – which includes new aid and intervention models.
frameworks, indicators and targets (what was planned and what was done)? Such analysis would consider to what extent results-frameworks have changed over time. Assessing the availability of sufficient indicators, baselines and targets will be one of the priority tasks during inception. Secondly, the evaluation would construct its own causal models and frameworks, in particular to allow the analysis of the Bank’s contribution to final outcomes at country level, to facilitate learning and to assess the appropriateness of existing RMFs. Such causal models would be closely aligned with the priorities of the Bank’s 2013 Results Framework (Figure 3) to facilitate a forward looking analysis.

28. **Relevant results frameworks include those for CSPs, projects, sectors and themes and for the Bank as a whole**, the latter in the form of the 2003 Strategic Plan, the 2008 Medium-Term Strategy and the 2005, 2010 and 2013 RMFs. And related results indicators. Thus the evaluation will be providing an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Bank’s 2003 Strategic Plan and its 2008 Medium-Term Strategy in terms of results achieved. Causal models would be designed accordingly at each level and applied in each country or building block evaluation - with appropriate modifications to take account of country and other specifics. To establish these models a theory of change approach will be employed. A theory-based evaluation is the most suitable option as it will not only address what results were achieved, but also how and why the results were achieved or not. Quasi-experimental designs would in most cases not be suitable in the absence of baseline data and comparison groups.

**Process, outputs and communication**

*Timeline and milestones*

29. **The CEDR will include three evaluation phases** carried out over the coming three years, 2014-2016 (Figure 4): (1) a planning and preparation phase from January to May 2014; (2) an 18 month period during which most of the country, sector and thematic work that focuses on results and determinants would be implemented (the what and why questions) – May/June 2014 through December 2015; and (3) a solutions focused period of 6-8 months where country and desk work would concentrate on the questions: What works and where? And how are others doing it (benchmarking)? This phase would be concentrated on high-priority and attention thematic and business process priority areas. - November 2015 through June 2016. Each of these three phases will include a consultative priority setting exercise to set boundaries for the evaluation and keep it manageable.

30. **Phase 1: Planning the Evaluation (January – May 2014).** The planning phase will consist of (1) methodological planning of common results frameworks and basic data assessments, (2) a meta-analysis of OPEV evaluations and literature reviews, (3) final country selection and country pre-testing of methodologies and priorities, (4) the establishment of evaluation governance structure and

---

12 As we try to focus mainly on corporate outcomes, CSP or sector related KPIs are often not relevant, as they focus more on process and inputs.

13 See Annex 3 for a simple conceptual and analytical framework for CSE country analysis of the Bank’s contribution to final outcomes as currently being developed in the OPEV country evaluation manual.
teams and (5) the production of an inception report with an evaluation matrix and a detailed work plan for the field and desk work 2014-2015/16.

31. Phase 2: Conducting Country Strategy Evaluations and Sector/Thematic Studies (May/June 2014 – December 2015). At this stage, up to 15 Country Strategy Evaluations and several Sector Thematic Evaluations and reviews would be carried out. The two main questions covered are (1) What are the results; and what is the Bank contributing to RMC results? (the summative evaluation part) (2) What was driving the results? (the causative evaluation part). Following quality assurance of each study an interim report for the CEDR will be produced by Dec. 2015 reporting on available results up to this point. Separate Country Strategy Evaluation reports will be submitted in line with the preparation of new CSPs.

32. Phase 3: Carrying out in-depth and benchmarking field and desk work with a focus on solutions; and producing the synthesis report for the CEDR (Nov. 2015 – Sept. 2016). During this phase the CEDR would continue to work in the sample countries and through desk studies; this phase would be mainly forward-looking; with in-depth analysis of high priority issues that were identified in the interim report; and through assessing alternative options for the Bank and RMCs (the formative evaluation part). The final phase will complete with a Final Synthesis Report from the various building blocks of the CEDR in July or September 2016.

33. Throughout phases 2 and 3 and after completion of the CEDR the teams will engage with audiences within and outside the Bank to share intermediate and final evaluation findings and reports as they become available - after appropriate quality controls. Intermediate and final reports will be posted on the Bank’s website and findings will be added to the Evaluation Results Database. In addition, a number of learning events, both at headquarters and in the regions, will be organized to share key lessons. Finally, a series of videos and possibly podcasts will also be produced to communicate key findings.

**Deliverables and outputs**

34. Direct deliverables and outputs from the CEDR include: (1) an interim report in a form to be agreed on, possibly just as a power-point presentation or in another more informal format (around Dec. 2015), in time for briefing the new President Team; (2) a final CEDR synthesis report (June 2016); and (3) other products in the form of various working papers or other forms of more formal outputs.

**Communication and dissemination**

35. Establishing and maintaining regular lines of communication throughout the evaluation and beyond its completion will be a priority as earlier stated (para. 7). OPEV will prepare a special plan for communication and dissemination during and after this evaluation, within the Bank and outside. This would include regular briefings and seminars which will allow all stakeholders to stay abreast and comment on more detailed methodologies – such as those to be elaborated in the inception report - and on early findings.

36. Planning and testing of CEDR evaluation approaches and methodologies over the coming 3-4 months are very important. This requires consultations within and outside the Bank. The
evaluation will actively seek inputs and advice for the inception report from concerned Bank Departments, Senior Management and interested Board members as well as from qualified and experienced peer reviewers.

37. **Field consultations and country participation are considered indispensable for the CEDR to be relevant and influential.** Various forms of country consultations will be incorporated in the CSEs and other CEDR building blocks, from focus group discussions with different stakeholders, participative evaluation methods to emerging findings workshops.

**Figure 4 – Timeline and Reports**
Evaluation governance and quality assurance

**Evaluation governance**

38. **CODE.** The highest oversight body for the comprehensive evaluation is the Bank's Committee on Development Effectiveness (CODE). CODE will review the approach, will be informed of progress on a regular basis, and will be alerted if there is any risk of significant deviation against the agreed timelines and budget. All final reports will be presented to CODE, which may decide submission to the Board for endorsement on a case by case basis.

39. **OPEV internal oversight.** The day to day implementation of the comprehensive evaluation will be overseen by OPEV’s management, with one or two managers directly responsible for overseeing the work of the multiple teams carrying out the building blocks of the evaluation and for ensuring consistency across the teams keeping in mind the overarching framework for the evaluation. The main decision making body for the comprehensive evaluation will be the evaluation Steering Committee, chaired by OPEV's Director and including managers as well as a core group of 4-5 senior OPEV staff. The steering committee will meet at least on a quarterly basis to review progress and decide the appropriate course of action to resolve any pending issue, or mitigate any new risk.

40. **Bank-wide reference group.** A Reference Group composed of about 10-15 representatives at senior levels (Director) from across the Bank will be established to act as a sounding board throughout the evaluation process and to help engage with the Bank management. This reference group will play a crucial role in ensuring the relevance and usefulness of the evaluation. It will be established in order to allow input into finalizing the approach, the inception and in commenting on main draft reports, in particular synthesis reports. It will also meet to discuss proposed recommendations, helping to ensure they are as specific and as useful to the Bank as possible. Specific focused reference groups may also be established as needed for the various evaluations constituting building blocks for the comprehensive evaluation, in particular thematic, sector and corporate evaluations. For country evaluations, the country teams in place will be used as reference groups, in order to ensure the evaluation findings and recommendations are incorporated into the CSP preparation process.
Quality assurance

41. **Quality Core Group.** To ensure credibility and rigor, the quality of all of the component work will be regularly assessed to ensure that they meet pre-established quality standards. Within OPEV, a Quality Core Group of 4-5 senior staff will play a key role in ensuring the appropriate level of quality of all reports, background and final. This core group will be assisted as needed by sector / thematic specialists within OPEV or externally recruited who will intervene as peer reviewers for the various products. The role of the Quality Core Group will be to ensure that all relevant documents are peer reviewed according to OPEV guidelines and manuals, and to advise task managers as needed on the appropriate corrective plans before moving to next steps, to ensure quality issues are fixed as early as possible in the evaluation process, starting with background studies and reports.

42. **Senior Advisory Panel.** Complementing the internal quality assurance process, a Senior Advisory Panel (external to the Bank), composed of subject matter experts with significant expertise in the areas of program evaluation, performance measurement and management and international development (with a focus on Africa) will be organized to ensure that the planning documentation (i.e., overarching framework) and subsequent evaluation reports are sound in design and that its application will yield valid and reliable evidence suitable to support decision-making. It will be complemented by external expert reviewers who will also focus on methodology and on the quality and soundness of the conclusions and recommendations. The feedback provided by the expert reviewers will be used to refine the planning documentation and final draft of the evaluation, as required.
**Risk management**

43. **This evaluation is not without risks – on the contrary.** The evaluability of Bank results/outcomes and other questions concerning the design, implementation and utilization of the CEDR deserve highest attention. How much can we take on so that we can indeed deliver? Or in other words: how ambitious can we afford to be? Reducing and mitigating the risks that we know we face becomes a necessity. As well as managing expectations. A reality check is imperative.

44. **Some of the more technical problems of results measurement are well described in the 2013 RMF (p.4/5), in particular those of (i) multiple factors determining outcomes and resulting problems in attribution (including others’ contributions and exogenous factors); (ii) the timeline, which often can mean a long time-lag between outputs and outcomes, and (iii) paucity of data on outcomes (Annex 4). The latter will require to embark on a substantial effort of outcome measurements in the field and on the ground data collection.**

45. **A number of problems may arise** from the diversity of operations and activities that we may wish to cover, the large scale of the evaluation and the variety of countries and settings. The evaluation also has to consider common problems with meaningfully aggregating the results data at country, sector and AfDB level.

46. **An added problem may be that many new CSPs, and therefore CSEs, are due in 2015 or even earlier – this could put a lot of pressure on country results work and may cause difficulties in synchronizing it with CSE delivery schedules.**

47. **Demand for the evaluation.** How can we ensure that there be demand for the evaluation, in particular with the new Bank President and Senior Management Team after Sept. 2015? And how can we ensure interest and credibility among African policy and strategic decision-makers? Sometimes the results agenda is seen as a bureaucratic necessity and burden, mainly driven by non-regionals.

48. **Mitigation of these and other issues will need to be considered.** Some measures have already been discussed, more need to follow. Among others it was suggested:

- to get outside expertise and systematic quality control; and have specialized contractors do much of the systematic data collection and processing, particularly at the project level;
- to establish a senior advisory board for technical and thematic reviews at critical stages of the evaluation (eg. inception report; interim report, final draft synthesis report);
- pre-testing;
- to choose methods of data collection wisely - a combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches; and
- to be selective in general.

49. **With regard to the last point, selectivity:** We are aware that we need to prioritize and be selective in coverage. This raises the question: how and when do we determine priorities for the evaluation? For the evaluation as a whole (for instance at the inception report; the interim report); at country level (in country approach papers? or after scoping visits)? At the same time we need to
ensure generalization of findings, or a plausible representativeness. At a minimum we need to set out clear criteria and processes how to get there.

50. **Several success-factors for comprehensive evaluations** have already been summarized in the earlier Options paper for CODE. The table is again included in Annex 5 of this paper for consideration.

Table 2 summarizes the main risks and mitigation strategies for the evaluation.

**Table 2: Risks and mitigation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical difficulties to measure results: multiple factors and attribution, timelines, concepts and results frameworks to be applied etc.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Contribution analysis at country level, sector and project level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Application of different methodologies and careful pre-testing in a limited number of countries and settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment of external and local expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison and aggregation of results across countries and sectors</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Application of common results frameworks and measurement techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Using the same team for carrying out similar data collection and results analysis across different countries and settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Systematic peer review and quality control at all stages of the evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paucity of data</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Carrying out a separate exercise of validation and measurement of outcomes in a representative sample or Bank projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Using a diversity of results assessment methods, at country, sector and project level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of operations and activities</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Establish sector and situation specific results frameworks, data collection and analysis strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnect of CEDR and CSP schedules</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Although Bank staff will be busy with the move to Abidjan, OPEV will work to ensure buy-in and participation upfront, including at management level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic overload and lack of focus</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Establish a clear timeline, responsibilities and process for setting of priorities for overall evaluation and building blocks; Regular internal reviews; expert panels; consultations with planned audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand for and credibility of the evaluation</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Careful assessment of differences in demand by various groups of decision-makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keeping the channels of communication open throughout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Internal organization of work at OPEV** | Medium | Medium | Connecting multiple teams through good planning, transparency and clear ownership  
Establishing electronic sharing platform and other forms of regular communication  
Internal OPEV steering committee  
Clear and realistic setting of delivery timelines |
| **Move to Abidjan** | High | Low | Many country and sector specific activities will take place independently from the move  
Most consultations with Bank staff and others will take place in the regions and countries |
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Annex 1 – Preliminary List of Country Strategy Evaluations (Nov. 2013) - currently being reviewed and updated


(These questions are closely following the latest drafts of the CSE manual of Jan. 14 and Feb. 7, 2014; to some extent they are still work in progress)

1. **Relevance:** Were the CSP strategy and program of assistance relevant to /aligned with the RMCs development challenges and AfDB/RMC agreed development priorities and objectives, including those for important target groups? Relevance reflects whether the Bank – through its CSP - is doing the right things and making the right choices (i.e. in positioning the Bank) - in a consistent and focused manner. It also addresses internal coherence and quality of design of the CSP, particularly in terms of intervention logic, integration between instruments and results measurement.

2. **Effectiveness:** Did the interventions (lending and non-lending) successfully contribute to the RMCs progress in achieving the CSP development objectives, in particular at final beneficiary or final outcome level? And what are the (plausible) links? What evidence demonstrates achievement of planned key outputs and desired outcomes? Outcomes are assessed at different levels: across similar lending and non-lending instruments; within key project/ program and thematic areas, and at broader institutional and socio-economic levels. With special reference to targeted beneficiaries, gender, inclusiveness and environmental sustainability. The analysis includes non-intended and negative outcomes.

3. **Sustainability:** Have achievements continued and are they likely to be sustained after conclusion of (major) external financial assistance provided? Sustainability refers to the (likely) continuation of benefits of cumulative project/program interventions, after the completion of (major part) of the assistance provided. Different sustainability dimensions will be distinguished: technical, financial, institutional, economic, political, cultural and environmental, depending on the type of project, sector or theme and the context.

4. **Efficiency:** If the interventions contributed successfully, was this done efficiently? Have adequate measures been taken to minimize costs of resources and/or maximize outputs for a given input while ensuring quality standards (cost efficiency)? Are outputs producing adequate outcomes (cost effectiveness)? Have there been timely resource disbursements and utilization; and timely completion on budget and to schedule?

5. **AfDB performance:** How has the AfDB performed as development partner and in program management for results within each strategic priority and overall? Sub-criteria include building government/client ownership and policy dialogue, division of labor and partnering, and management for development results.
6. **RMC performance:** How has the RMC performed in discharging its responsibilities as the key client and development partner? Sub-criteria include the assumption of ownership of the CSP and maintenance of dialogue with AfDB; consultation with stakeholders, leadership in aid coordination and management for development results.

**Annex 3 - Causal Model for Country Strategy Evaluations (final Bank outcomes, country level impact)**
Annex 4 - Better assessing the Bank’s impact on development

[From: The One Bank Results Measurement Framework Dec. 2013 (p. 4/5)]

16. One of the most frequent critiques of results measurement frameworks is that they do not do enough to assess the development impact of projects or programs, and tend to focus too much on project outputs … which are easier to measure.

17. This is a problem that all development organizations struggle with, for a number of good reasons. The first is conceptual: development outcomes (e.g., literacy rates) are the result of multiple factors (economic, social, demographic) and multiple agents (state, private sector, development agencies). So it is exceedingly difficult to assign an outcome to a single project, program, or set of activities. The second reason has to do with the timeline: development activities typically take a number of years before they yield development outcomes. For instance, an effective education program might take two to three years after the project is completed before it generates positive outcomes; as a result, these outcomes will not be captured in the annual RMF. The third reason is paucity of data on outcomes. National or regional statistical departments, on which projects rely for data on outcomes, often do not have relevant or timely statistics.

18. … The Bank is taking initiatives at multiple levels to improve the way it measures its contribution to development—some of which go beyond the scope of the RMF.

- Measuring intermediate outcomes rather than outputs. The new RMF increases its focus on intermediate outcomes rather than outputs—for example, by including a greater number of indicators in Level 2 that measure the impact of Bank operations on people. In energy, for instance, the focus is less on the number of power stations constructed and more on people benefitting from improved access to electricity…
- Improving the Bank’s understanding of development impact. A quantitative framework of indicators can only go so far in articulating the linkages between the Bank’s activities and their impact on a country’s development. Thus the Bank is increasingly investing in qualitative analysis designed to deepen its understanding of the development results that its activities are likely to achieve …
- Strengthening client capacities and demand for evidence-based policies. To overcome the bottleneck of data availability, the Bank is investing in strengthening national statistical capacity. It is also working through the African Community of Practice (AfCoP) to foster demand for evidence-based policy-making.

C. Stronger focus on gender

20/21. In recognition of the importance of gender as a driver of development progress …the Bank is also strengthening its management information systems so that they better address the gender dimensions of Bank operations.
Annex 5 - Details on the CEDR planning phase

More specifically the planning phase will include:

1. **Methodological planning**: the development of an overarching framework, including common Results Measurement Frameworks and Terms of Reference for the Country Strategy Evaluations and complementary evaluations and reviews. An assessment of the availability and quality of Bank data (particularly results) will be carried out in order to identify any data gaps. This step is critical in informing the design of the evaluation and the data collection activities.

2. **Relevant desk and literature reviews, including a meta-analysis of OPEV evaluations and syntheses.**

3. **Final country selection.** Based on the ongoing portfolio review of CSPs and projects and the established country selection criteria the CEDR Team will select a final list of 12-15 countries for the country strategy evaluations, determine their phasing and sequencing and select countries for pre-testing.

4. **Country pre-testing.** Pretesting will be done in three to five countries and help to further develop methodologies, assess data availability, prepare and test data collection methods and tools and determine priorities and major hypotheses.

5. **Establishment of evaluation governance structure and teams.** Three main tasks are to be covered: (1) establish an evaluation team within OPEV that will be responsible for oversight of the overall CEDR and teams to carry out country evaluations and other building blocks; (2) determine contracting support needs and call for expressions of interest. For instance for a framework contract; or for companies to carry out some basic field data collection and analysis etc. and (3) identify and organize a support structure outside of OPEV, including a Reference Group at the Bank level, a Senior Advisory Panel, and a system of Quality Expert Reviews to guide and oversee the evaluation.

6. **Inception report.** Based on the approach paper, peer reviews and consultations, desk reviews and field testing, the CEDR team will fine-tune and prioritize the major evaluation hypotheses, thematic priorities and develop more details on the evaluation design. The team will come up with an evaluation matrix to establish major evaluation questions, relevant methods and indicators.

51. **Four preparatory working groups are being planned**: the first one to guide the process of country selection, prepare the inception report and provide input into the initial batch of country and sector evaluations; the second one to collect and analyze basic data for country choice and pre-testing (portfolio review); the third one on methodologies for results measurement, RMFs and aggregation, with sub-groups working on different sectors and themes (eg. infrastructure, PBOs, private sector etc.); and the fourth one on meta-analysis to mine OPEV’s evaluations from 2006-2013 for relevant findings, conclusions and recommendations, and to inform thematic priorities and hypotheses in the
inception report and beyond. TORs for each working group are being developed. The portfolio review group is already established and working.

52. In detail the **inception report working group** would

- finalize the CEDR approach paper and continue with developing the inception report;
- develop main hypotheses; narrow down priorities; formulate an evaluation matrix
- chose priority countries and pre-test in selected countries; and
- contribute to approach papers for the first batch of CSEs.

53. The **portfolio review working group** would

- collect key information from SAP and CSPs to establish a project data base (projects approved since 2005 and completed since 2008); CSP strategic and program priorities; and
- start collecting all relevant country and background information for pre-testing in 3-5 countries.

54. The **methodologies working group and sector/theme specific subgroups** would

- review current sector and country results-frameworks; as well as frameworks for other thematic areas (regional integration, private sector, cross-cutting issues etc.);
- review literature and sourcebooks on methods and indicators for results/impact measurements; and
- assess and determine the methods that could be used by the evaluation for measuring outcomes at project, sector/thematic and country levels (particularly in view of frequently missing baselines).

55. The **working group on meta-analysis** would

- develop a simple methodological framework to review and synthesize OPEV’s major evaluation findings, conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations to inform the CEDR and help set thematic priorities;
- carry out the work, also in view of the experience with setting up the lessons learnt data-base;
- if appropriate, outputs from this working group could be useful for and fed into the lessons learnt data base.
Annex 6 - Success factors based on past experiences with comprehensive evaluations

[From: OPEV Exploratory Note, Oct. 14, 2013]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Usefulness**           | **Relevance to information needs/demands**  
The information generated needs to be relevant to information demands from key stakeholders – most notably the Bank itself, including senior management and its Board, as well as to ADF deputies. Alignment and relevance for current and future strategic directions also affects take up. |
| **Timing**               | To have an impact, the delivery of comprehensive evaluations has to be well timed – to coincide with opportunities for major reforms (such as a change in leadership) or major decisions (such as funding processes). |
| **Feasibility**          | **Evaluability**  
There are limitations to the data available, particularly in the results area. To ensure an evaluation can be delivered to an agreed schedule and budget, an upfront evaluability assessment has often proved helpful. |
|                          | **Time-frame**  
All experience shows that these evaluations take time, most examples fall into the range of 18 months to 2 years. Given the size of the exercise and the importance of a solid consultation and governance process, squeezing the schedule would increase exposure to risk. |
|                          | **Scope**  
Despite seeking to be comprehensive, setting clear limits on the scope is crucial. This includes decisions on the time period under review, as well as the key questions that the evaluation should address. What is expected in evaluating issues like effectiveness needs to be clearly defined – as assessing organizational and development effectiveness require different approaches. |
|                          | **Resources**  
Comprehensive evaluations have proved resource intensive exercises. In addition to staff, comprehensive evaluations have varied in cost from USD 1 million to USD 2.2 million. None conducted in the last few years cost less than USD 1.5 million. This type of funding would necessarily be additional to core budget allocations. Experience indicates that, unless fully embedded in the wider evaluation work program, comprehensive evaluations can be taxing on the organization. |
| **Credibility**          | **Engagement and buy-in**  
Buy-in of key stakeholders is crucial both for conducting the evaluation well and for ensuring follow up. Both internal and external stakeholders should be engaged, though to different degrees. Engagement is needed right through the process, including in initial scoping stages. |
|                          | **Governance and independence**  
Steering committee arrangements have been crucial to the credibility of comprehensive evaluations. Many have included not only an internal steering committee, but an external and independent expert group, to provide guidance and oversight to the evaluation department. Their role is important in agreeing a final approach, terms of reference etc. Transparent processes and quality assurance mechanisms are also crucial. |
|                          | **Multi-disciplinary independent team**  
Whatever the focus, any comprehensive evaluation will necessarily cover a range of areas and require a team comprising different expertise. The team members should be independent of the Bank, and coordinated by the independent evaluation department. The involvement of high level experts also supports credibility. Understanding of the political and practical context for the institution has also proved helpful in other cases. |
|                          | **Follow up**  
The extent of genuine follow up is also linked to timing and buy-in. However, setting out as early on in the process as possible how recommendations will be used and their implementation followed up provides a helpful starting point. |
Annex 7: Bank results levels and flows; mapped with RMF goals