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1 INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

Tracking the progress of implementation of evaluation recommendations is a good practice recognized among development institutions. As part of its mandate, the Independent Development Evaluation function (IDEV) is expected to report to CODE annually on the status of adoption (and implementation) of agreed evaluation recommendations. This 2021 MARS report will be the third presented by IDEV and will consider the recommendations with all their actions due by June 30, 2021.

The overall objective of the assessment is to improve accountability and compliance, promote a results oriented culture, enhance evaluative learning, and assist the Board in its oversight role by providing the status of implementation of the agreed action plans.

Once an independent evaluation is done and its recommendations and Management’s Response have been considered by the Board’s Committee on Operations and Development Effectiveness (CODE), Management begins implementing the actions it has committed to with a clear timeline, updates the evidence of implementation in the MARS on a quarterly basis, and reports to CODE twice a year on the status of implementation of the actions. IDEV, in turn, assesses the progress of implementation at the recommendation level in terms of level of alignment, degree of implementation and level of adoption, based on information in the MARS and other channels. It reports to CODE on an annual basis.

This note provides an overview of the proposed assessment and aims to inform consultations with the relevant stakeholders within the Bank.

2 ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

The purpose of this report is to provide CODE with IDEV’s assessment of the status of adoption of agreed recommendations. It does not purport to assess the MARS system itself (implementation, process and results), which would require a full evaluation that also looks at the quality of recommendations (detailed, actionable, evidence-based) and the outcomes of the action plans (e.g., whether the issue highlighted by the recommendation has been addressed).

Specifically, the objective is to examine the extent to which Management has adopted the agreed recommendations of IDEV evaluations by assessing the alignment of the actions to the respective recommendations and the degree of implementation of the actions.

3 METHODOLOGY

The unit of analysis is the recommendation, which is issued and should be considered in the context of each evaluation. For this 2021 report, the assessment considered the evaluation recommendations with all their actions due by June 30, 2021, which represents 149 recommendations from 52 evaluations and 403 actions (Figure 1).

Compared to the 2020 Report, in 2021 the number of recommendations to be assessed has increased from 124 to 149 and the number of evaluations from 41 to 52, but the number of

---

2 An action plan is defined as all the actions committed by Management in response to a given recommendation in a IDEV evaluation. The number of action plans thus equals the number of agreed and partially agreed recommendations.
actions remained almost constant (394 to 403). Between June 2020 and June 2021, 68 new recommendations reached their target completion date.

**Figure 1. Distribution of evaluations, recommendations, and actions in the overall and assessment samples**
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Source: MARS data.

Based on the evidence provided by Management in the MARS IT platform, a four-point scale (High, Substantial, Moderate and Low)\(^3\) will be used to assess Management’s action plans in terms of alignment, implementation and level of adoption of recommendations (Figure 2). The *level of alignment* examines the extent to which the action plans in the Management Response are aligned with the agreed recommendations of IDEV, while the *degree of implementation* explores the extent to which the action plans have been implemented as planned. Therefore, for actions implemented or ongoing with delay, the assessment will go beyond the simple implementation status (“completed with delay,” “ongoing with delay,” or “no progress with delay”) to consider the extent of the delay. The longer the delay is, the lower the score will be. For example, the score on “degree of implementation” will be higher for an action implemented with three months’ delay than for an action implemented with two years’ delay.

**Figure 2: Formula for rating the level of adoption of a recommendation**

![Figure 2: Formula for rating the level of adoption of a recommendation]


The rating on the level of adoption of the recommendations combines the ratings on the level of alignment and the degree of implementation (Table 1). For a recommendation to be considered adopted, it must be both aligned and implemented, and the overall rating is the lower of the two ratings on alignment and implementation (also rated on a four-point scale). The assessment template is provided in Annex A.

---

\(^3\) Table 1: Rating Scale Criteria.
Table 1. Rating scale and criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Substantial</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level of Alignment**

- **Very weak or nonexistent alignment of most of the committed actions with the recommendation.**
- **Limited alignment of most of the committed actions with the recommendation.**
- **Strong alignment of most of the committed actions with minor shortcomings.**
- **Very solid alignment of all committed actions with the recommendation.**

**Level of Implementation**

- If most of the actions have been completed with a delay greater than or equal to two (02) years or are ongoing with a delay greater than or equal to one (01) year or Management did not provide enough evidence on the implementation of the actions.
- If most of the actions have been completed with a delay greater than one (01) year but less than two (02) years or are ongoing with a delay of less than one (01) year.
- If most of the actions have been completed no later than one (01) year after the target completion date.
- If all actions have been completed as planned.

**Level of Adoption= Level of Alignment + Level of Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Adoption (Overall rating)</th>
<th>If Alignment OR Implementation is rated “Low.”</th>
<th>If Alignment AND Implementation are rated at least “Moderate.”</th>
<th>If Alignment AND Implementation are rated at least “Substantial.”</th>
<th>If Alignment AND Implementation are both rated “High.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4 QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS

Quality assurance of IDEV’s assessment will take place through strong engagement with Management and extensive review of IDEV’s assessment tools and analysis by Management, evaluators and peer reviewers through six steps:

i. Two IDEV evaluators will review and assess the entire set of action plans according to the assessment templates;

ii. The task manager or a team member from the original evaluation or a IDEV expert on the topic of the evaluation (when both task manager and team members are no longer available) will review the action plan assessment template for each recommendation from that evaluation in order to bring his/her expertise on the topic of the evaluation;

iii. IDEV management will review the action plan assessment templates;

iv. The Management and MARS focal points in the LIDs will review the assessment templates (during this step, they will have the opportunity to provide additional evidence or new developments as needed);

v. Two internal peer reviewers will ensure the quality of all steps of the production of the report; and

vi. The assessment team will finalize the assessment templates considering the comments and draft the technical report.
5 DELIVERABLES AND DISSEMINATION

The main deliverable of the assessment is this 2021 report, which will include an in-depth descriptive analysis of the MARS database, the sampling of recommendations that will be analyzed in this report and the methodology.

6 WORK PLAN, MANAGEMENT AND ARRANGEMENTS

The report is expected to be ready in December 2021.

Table 2: Tentative Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Tasks / Key Deliverables</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Report Team</td>
<td>October 15, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review by focal point and IDEV task Managers</td>
<td>MARS focal points and IDEV Evaluation Task Managers</td>
<td>November 15, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Peer Review</td>
<td>Peer Reviewers</td>
<td>November 24, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARS 2021 Report</td>
<td>Report Team</td>
<td>December 15, 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Task Manager for this report is Eric KERE, Senior Evaluation Officer (Team Leader), and Jeannot NGOULMA, Consultant, will provide research and analytical support. Parfait YAO, Team Assistant will provide administrative support. Andrew ANGUKO, Chief Quality and Methods Advisor, Oswald AGBADOME, Principal Evaluation Officer and May MWAKA, Principal Evaluation Officer, will be the internal peer reviewers.

Under the overall guidance of Madhu MAMPUZHASSERIL, Division Manager, IDEV.2 and Karen ROT-MUNSTERMANN, Acting Evaluator General of IDEV, the Task Manager will provide inputs and lead the work of the consultant, and will produce the final report to submit to CODE.

The Task Manager will be responsible for organizing communication processes with stakeholders within and outside the Bank, with the support of the Knowledge Management Division. Raky Gassama, Senior Knowledge Management Officer, Aminata KOUMA, Evaluation Knowledge Assistant and Foteh YOUSSOUF, Consultant, will be in charge of leading the evaluation knowledge management, communication and dissemination strategy.
## Annex A. Action Plans Assessment Template

### General Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation Code</th>
<th>Key indicators that capture the essence of the recommendation</th>
<th>Actions (Management Response)</th>
<th>Key indicators that capture the essence of the action</th>
<th>Target Completion Date</th>
<th>Completion Date or last update (in not completed)</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Guide for Completing Template

Please use the evaluation document and the management response to fill these boxes. Ensure that the key indicators expected from the implementation of the recommendation are well identified.

### Level of Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low / Moderate / Substantial / High / NA</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent the committed actions in the Management Response are aligned with the agreed recommendations of IDEV?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High (4):** Very solid alignment of all committed actions with the recommendation.

**Substantial (3):** Strong alignment of most of the committed actions with minor shortcomings.

**Moderate (2):** Limited alignment of most of the committed actions with the recommendation.

**Low (1):** Very weak or nonexistent alignment of most of the committed actions with the recommendation.

### Level of Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low / Moderate / Substantial / High / NA</th>
<th>Evidence provide by the Management</th>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent the committed actions have been implemented as planned?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High (4):** If all actions have been completed as planned (on time).

**Substantial (3):** If most of the actions have been completed no later than one (01) year after the target completion date.

**Moderate (2):** If most of the actions have been completed with a delay greater than one (01) year but less than two (02) years or are ongoing with a delay less than one (01) years.

**Low (1):** If most of the action have been completed with a delay greater than or equal to two (02) years or are ongoing with a delay greater than or equal to one (01) years or the management did not provide enough evidence on the implementation of the actions.

### Level of Adoption

**Level of Adoption** = Level of Alignment + Level of Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low / Moderate / Substantial / High / NA</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent the recommendation has been adopted?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High (4):** If level of alignment AND level of implementation are rated High

**Substantial (3):** If level of alignment AND level of implementation are rated at least Substantial

**Moderate (2):** If level of alignment AND level of implementation are rated at least Moderate

**Low (1):** If level of alignment OR level of implementation are rated is Low
The level of adoption relies on both the level of alignment and the level of implementation. For a recommendation to be adopted the two conditions must be simultaneously met. For example, a recommendation is considered weakly adopted when the action is highly aligned with the recommendation but has not been implemented because the problem raised by the recommendation remains unresolved and no progress can be expected. Similarly, a recommendation will be considered weakly adopted if the action is weakly aligned with the recommendation, even if it is fully implemented, because the action is unsuitable, and the problem will remain. Therefore, the level of adoption is not just an average of the ratings of the level of alignment and the level of implementation.