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Introduction

The evaluation of the African Development Bank’s (AfDB) Self-evaluation Systems and Processes (SESP) comes at a critical time, as the Bank has been going through profound changes, and revisiting its strategic directions and operational processes. Such an effort comes from the realization that, ultimately, it is the quality of operations that determines the capacity of the Bank to achieve development results. As a consequence, the Bank has initiated over the past couple of years an in-depth diagnostic of its Quality Assurance (QA) processes. This diagnostic was complemented by a series of Independent Development Evaluation (IDEV) evaluations that aims to examine the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the Bank’s QA processes across the project cycle as a way of enhancing their contribution towards performance management, accountability and learning.

This evaluation is conceived with this logic in mind and builds on previous IDEV evaluative work dealing with: (i) quality at entry (QaE); and (ii) quality of supervision and at exit (QoS), as well as a “chapeau” paper coalescing the different findings including the compliance with the Bank’s Environmental and Social (E&S) safeguards. Based on existing evidence, Management prepared a QA Implementation Action Plan (“The Plan”), covering five areas of reform2 and setting the basis for the improvement of the SESP, building on this evaluation and Management’s own diagnosis. This will complete the assessment of the QA framework and will potentially set the stage for institutionalizing “best practices” in a consistent way and positioning the AfDB on a par with comparator agencies.

The SESP are commonly defined as the assessment made of a project, country/regional program, and policy/thematic review by the entity engaged in the activity. As illustrated in the theory of change (Figure 1), the main SESP tools being used are the implementation progress reports, the mid-term reviews, and the completion reports. The SESP are meant to pursue three main outcomes: (i) performance; (ii) accountability; and (iii) learning. The functioning of the SESP is assessed along three main dimensions: relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. The performance of the main SESP tools is summarized in Table 1 below. While not being SESP instruments as such, corporate reporting through dashboards and the Results Measurement Framework (RMF) are partly fed by the SESP.

While the SESP are carried out by staff/Management, IDEV complements the process through the validation of certain products, such as the completion reports or through independent evaluations of projects, Country Strategy Papers (CSPs) and Regional Integration Strategy Papers (RISPs).

While project performance relies to a large extent on the performance of country governments, partners and local stakeholders, as well as external factors, the SESP are entirely under the Bank’s control, as well as in its capacity to adopt and implement recommendations. Ultimately, the evaluation tries to answer the following question: “Do the SESP support performance management, accountability, and learning at the Bank?”; and two underlying sub-questions: (i) how well are the SESP performing?; and (ii) to what extent are the SESP impacting the quality of development results?

The evaluation covers the period 2013 - 2018, and the implementation of the SESP over the time span that goes from project approval to closing (exit). It covers both public sector and Non-sovereign Operations (NSOs). While specific references are made with respect to NSOs in each chapter, the report is mostly focused on public sector operations. In addition to the project- or operation-level analysis, case studies for a sample of CSPs and RISPs have also been carried out.
Main Findings

The Bank’s SESP have many positive features. They lay out strong standards and procedures underpinning their functioning, as well as a cogent articulation with the independent evaluation function carried out by IDEV. Annex 5 presents a detailed description of the SESP of comparator institutions that shows a good level of alignment, which was to be expected from members of the Evaluation Coordination Group (ECG). Many of the tools and processes in place are consistent with, and as good as, those of comparator institutions. The articulation between self-evaluation, validation and independent evaluations is similar, and the system produces corporate results data that are used to report to the Board. However, this evaluation finds that progress towards a culture of development effectiveness has been mixed, and the potential of the SESP to make an impact on the three fronts of performance management, accountability and learning, remains unmet.

The main weaknesses of the SESP are in the application of the established procedures, standards and norms. While the issues identified as part of this evaluation mirror similar constraints faced by comparator organizations, three factors seem to be affecting the proper functioning of the SESP to a higher degree in the AfDB: (i) low compliance with established procedures; (ii) limited resources for M&E during supervision; and (iii) a deficient in candor and a positive bias in assessing performance. This has affected the credibility of the SESP and contributes to a perception that the system is adding little value.

The AfDB has an independent evaluation policy that was approved in 2016 and amended in 2019. However, the Bank does not have an integrated evaluation policy that covers both the independent function and self-evaluation of the Bank itself (such as in the case of the World Bank Group [WBG] or IFAD). IDEV promotes the use of evaluation findings on specific topics in line with the demand coming from the Board and Management, which are also the primary users. Evaluation adds value only when its findings are used. The AfDB’s independent evaluation policy necessarily focuses on the supply side of evaluation and not the use side. In the absence of a harmonized framework, alignment of strategic approaches, methodologies and processes will remain at risk. Furthermore, IDEV is not the only generator of evaluation findings. All completed operations and country/regional strategy papers (CSPs/RISPs) are self-evaluated by staff.

Effectiveness of the SESP is constrained by its ratings methodology and structure, and the way it is applied to Project Completion Reports (PCRs). Several elements can be highlighted:

- The Bank uses a 4-point rating system, but several discussions have taken place recently on the merits of adopting a 6-point system similar to other comparator organizations (IDB, IFAD, and the WBG). A 6-point system allows for more flexibility and realism in assessing the performance of the large pool of projects falling somewhat in between Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory, as the distance between the two is often perceived to be too wide and too stark, according to staff interviews. However, it was also noted that the 6-point scale does not permit making a clear judgment regarding project performance, and that such a scale would tend to classify performance of most interventions in the two middle categories anyway, which ultimately will be aggregated together with the Satisfactory or the Unsatisfactory categories as being “above or below the bar”. Other suggestions made by the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) or by the 2016 PCR Synthesis Report are in favor of an odd-number points system (3 or 5), as this will allow to better account for the middle space of the distribution (assuming a symmetrical profile). However, an odd number rating scale would be against the agreed Good Practice Standards of the ECG.
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The main risk associated with any rating scale is whether it might lead to more positive ratings without supporting evidence and subsequently to an increased “disconnect” with IDEV ratings. This happens to be the case in the Bank. Any rating system will have pitfalls and, whether a 3, 4, 5 or a 6-point rating is adopted, it may not lead to significant improvements unless other measures are put in place to improve the reliability of the system and the implementation of more rigorous procedures for the generation of the required evidence.

The use of simple averages of sub-ratings and dimensions (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability) can somewhat distort overall ratings. Some institutions (e.g., IDB) put a higher weight on effectiveness, or do not allow a positive rating with lacking relevance or effectiveness. Defining the cut-offs for a high rating is also important. The AfDB defines “satisfactory” (or better) overall performance as a rating above 2.5, meaning that half of the dimensions being above the line and the other below the line is sufficient. Other institutions use a higher bar (e.g., AsDB requires an average of 2.75, i.e., 3 of 4 dimensions have to be above the line), or they do not use averaging, hence they avoid having to deal with decimal numbers (WB, IFC, IFAD, IDB).

There is a significant difference on project performance depending on how “satisfactory” is defined. At 2.5 and above, 97 percent of the 137 PCRs analyzed are considered to be satisfactory, while at 3 and above it is 80 percent. Similarly, the “disconnect” between the overall rating assigned by staff in the PCRs, and the lower rating provided by IDEV validation in the respective Project Completion Report Evaluation Note (PCREN) is 15 percent at 2.5 and above and 39 percent at 3 and above. This raises questions regarding the credibility of the PCR ratings.

In recent years, the AfDB has reported in its Annual Development Effectiveness Review (ADER) the PCR/Extended Supervision Report (XSR) ratings instead of the PCREN/Extended Supervision Report Note (XSREN) ratings provided by IDEV. This is mainly because of the untimely availability of the PCREN/XSREN ratings. The use of the PCR/XSR ratings especially for RMF indicators on portfolio performance departs from the practice of comparator institutions.

Bank and Borrower performance ratings in the PCR are very different from IDEV ratings in the PCREN. It has proven difficult for staff to rate the Bank’s performance negatively. This is seen as closely associated with their own performance and that of their clients, with whom staff try to maintain a good relationship and naturally they do not want to be seen as finger-pointing. The large perceived step between a Satisfactory and an Unsatisfactory rating has likely also contributed to this gap.

The downgrading of ratings by IDEV is a source of tension and is often not accepted by staff, who argue that validation is a desk-based exercise that does not account for field realities. Ratings will remain a controversial subject as long as they are viewed as a tool to pass judgment on staff performance. Consultations between staff and the IDEV team around the PCR validation process are limited to the provision of feedback on draft PCR validation. In the opinion of almost all the staff interviewed, the rating methodology needs revision. Whether the system is too heavy on ratings or not remains to be seen, but at a minimum there should be an attempt to mitigate the perception that ratings are easy to “game”, that IDEV’s validation is out of context and mostly biased in nature, that the disconnect with IDEV can be largely ignored, and that the rating methodology is too rigid and bureaucratic.
As illustrated in the theory of change (Section III), the underlying logic of the SESP is that it can play an important role in improving performance management, accountability and learning. The rest of the findings are organized along these three following main outcomes.

Performance Management

The lack of candor in self-evaluation, particularly in Implementation Progress Reports (IPRs)/Annual Supervision Reports (ASRs) and PCRs/XSRs, can be explained among other things by the lack of a proper incentive structure. This is corroborated by various sources, including the Operations Committee Secretariat and Quality Assurance Department (SNOQ) Quality Retrospective Report, the QoS evaluation, the 2016 and 2017 PCR Synthesis Reports, staff interviews and the case studies. The perception that project performance is equated to staff performance undermines the motivation to rate poorly-performing projects candidly. The effectiveness of the SESP is undermined by their being viewed as a compliance mechanism that is driven by box-ticking, protecting one’s reputation, and relying on weak generation of evidence (M&E and results frameworks). Candor is also undermined by weak accountability mechanisms. Finally, there is little recognition that being identified as a “problem fixer” could motivate staff towards greater proactivity in raising issues and corrective action.

A number of issues constrain the contribution of the SESP to improving portfolio performance.

- The Bank’s culture, incentives and institutional Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are skewed in favor of lending approvals, similar to other comparator institutions, with limited emphasis on quality and development results. This issue has been recognized by Management and is being addressed through the QA Action Plan;

- There is insufficient attention to incentives that support a culture of quality and results. Opportunities for recognizing, celebrating, internalizing and learning from good quality M&E, results frameworks, proactivity in addressing issues or project restructuring, and successful implementation remain limited (this is also being addressed by the QA Action Plan);

- There are weaknesses in M&E systems and how they are articulated with baselines and results frameworks. Many PCR ratings were downgraded by IDEV validations for lack of evidence that would support a particular assessment;

- Excessive focus on accelerating project approvals leads to critical design activities being rushed or carried over into implementation (procurement plans, feasibility studies, validation of E&S assessment studies, the setting-up of the Project Implementation Unit [PIU] baselines). This results in early implementation delays, which require a stronger SESP to fix issues from the start;

- There is a strong tendency to avoid addressing issues through formal project restructuring because the transaction costs are considered to be too high. This results in a failure to introduce corrective measures and leads to the retention of appraisal targets that are no longer in line with the project reality;

- Increased decentralization and the move towards continuous implementation support, together with the establishment of a new position of Implementation Support Manager for public sector projects, are positive developments. However, new roles and the division of responsibilities between staff at HQ and at the country/regional level need clarification;

- The IPR ratings of the current portfolio feed into the Country Portfolio Performance Reports (CPPRs), which in turn also affect the assessment of the CSPs, since they are presented in tandem. The Development Objectives (DO) and Implementation Progress (IP) ratings of the last IPR also migrate to the PCRs. Therefore, the compliance and candor issues affecting the IPRs
permeate through other SESP outputs and all the way to the Results Measurement Framework (RMF). In addition, issues of consistency between CSPs and CPPRs’ assessment methodologies have emerged recently that require revision (currently under way);

In the case of NSOs, the lack of clear measuring tools of the progress towards development objectives and the absence of a rigorous and institutionalized M&E system lead to poor tracking and reporting of achieved results, and reduce the likelihood of effective risk mitigation during implementation. This makes it difficult to assess, analyze and report adequately on portfolio performance. These issues are now being contemplated under the NSO QA Action Plan (September 2019) adopted by Management.

Project teams and task managers (TMs) are fundamentally motivated to help clients deliver results and, by and large, are committed to the supervision task. However, most TMs and investment officers are overstretched, and the additional support required to address issues and help in the proper implementation of the SESP has been wanting. The Bank seems to be short of staffing and skills required to implement the SESP efficiently and effectively. This is particularly the case for M&E and E&S safeguards during supervision, as also documented in the recent evaluation report on the integrated safeguards system (ISS)³.

Accountability

Low compliance stems from insufficient accountability mechanisms and deficient visibility. In the absence of reliable information, the SESP lose their credibility. The current enforcement and incentive systems fail to prevent staff from ignoring the rules that suit them least and getting away with not generating the required outputs. Moreover, the Bank has been lagging behind in the development of an IT-supported online portal that can provide access to portfolio and SESP data and raise the visibility and the efficiency of the system.

Providing real-time information and compliance data to line managers will enhance accountability for supervision, and completion of IPRs/ASRs and Mid-term Reviews (MTRs), while easing the burden on TMs by simplifying and streamlining reporting requirements. It will also facilitate more effective portfolio reviews and planning exercises. The roll-out of the Results Reporting System (RRS), as part of the Integrated QA Action Plan for both the public sector projects and the NSOs, is meant to address this issue. Once completed, it is expected to facilitate automatizing the reporting of results, the timely escalation of issues to senior management, accountability, reliability of information, efficiency of reporting at the corporate level, and transparency at implementation.

Reporting tools such as Dashboards and the RMF have proven to be powerful accountability mechanisms and should be enhanced to cover indicators of compliance. The fact that the disconnect between Management’s ratings and IDEV’s ratings is not reported takes away an important element of accountability. In addition, very little information is conveyed to the Board in the RMF with respect to the performance of NSOs. While there is a need to take into account issues of confidentiality, this could be addressed through aggregate reporting.

Accountability processes have placed insufficient focus on the quality of monitoring and closure. The IPR/ASR and the PCR/XSR are not fully considered a decision-making or a learning tool, but rather an administrative requirement with inadequate accountability. Since IDEV does not validate IPRs/ASRs, there are few opportunities for contestability of ratings, as evidenced by the fact that IPRs are not much discussed nor systematically reviewed by Management. Line managers are not systematically held accountable for quality checks at supervision. The role played by the Portfolio Management Division of the NSO and Private Sector Support Department (PINS) is akin to a dual accountability approach and provides some degree of arms-length review and contestability.
For public sector projects, the recent addition of the Implementation Support Manager position in each region could help engage on portfolio issues, liaise with the sector divisions, and provide the regional and country perspective, including country program officer (CPO) involvement for better convergence with country portfolio management.

A consistent and harmonized framework that allows for the assessment of performance throughout the project life from origination to independent evaluation is lacking. This would allow linking the SESP and its tools with the front-end portion of the QA process (quality at entry) and ensure that the same approach and indicators are being used throughout the process, in progress reports and in PCRs and XSRs. This will also make clearer where the lack of candor comes in and allow for “no surprises” by providing predictability on the assessment metrics being used. This also means keeping results frameworks up-to-date in case of changes to the project environment and, on the NSOs side, including monitoring indicators in line with those adopted by the Additionality and Development Outcomes Assessment (ADOA) framework.

Templates and formats for a number of SESP tools are not sufficiently differentiated and adapted to specific circumstances. There is room to make the templates more efficient and user-friendly and avoid redundancies especially between IPRs/ASRs and Back-to-Office Reports (BTORs), as also noted by the QoS evaluation. IPRs are not adapted to special investment vehicles such as Program-based Operations (PBOs) and technical assistance (TA) projects, nor to fragility situations. The PCR and PCREN templates are overly repetitious, too long and some sections duplicative, as also evidenced by the Final Synthesis Reports of the 2016 and 2017 PCR validation (2019). Templates are not designed for optimum management attention and do not focus on priority issues or priority actions needed.

The capacity of the SESP products to report and address specific issues is weak in the areas of safeguards, gender, climate and fragility. In particular, as reported by the recent ISS evaluation, the Bank’s supervision reports and BTORs do not capture the key E&S information to allow compliance checks. E&S information found in the available supervision reports is scanty except when a potential high corporate risk materializes. Other studies conducted by SNSC corroborate the point that, once a project is approved, the Bank’s internal reporting system offers very little information regarding the E&S follow-up. The gender dimension of M&E systems is particularly weak, with average ratings in the PCREns below 2. Project teams do not have adequate support in these areas or coaching on SESP requirements to mitigate the effect of the high staff turnover that the Bank has experienced in the past couple of years. The newly launched Operations Academy should help address this issue once all modules are developed.

Completion reports of CSPs/CPPRs and for RISPs are usually not validated by IDEV before being submitted to the Board, unlike comparator institutions or similarly to PCRs and XSRs, which are validated and submitted to the Board in the form of a synthesis paper. IDEV has carried out validation of one CSPs and one RISP on a pilot basis and is assessing whether there is scope for expanding the process. Management is also in the process of reviewing the CPPR methodology and guidelines that should address this point, including the differentiation between CPPRs and CSPs.

Learning

Despite the fact that performance management and accountability aspects of the SESP are weak, they have overshadowed or even undermined learning objectives. This finding resonates with the situation in comparator institutions. There is a fine line between the search for accountability and learning. Strategy papers (country or thematic) are more conducive to learning, possibly because no ratings are involved. Disagreement over ratings between staff and IDEV further undermines the incentive to promote learning. If the PCR/XSR is seen as a tool to judge the TM, it will undermine candor
in ratings and learning opportunities. The rating itself could become an obstacle to learning because it potentially makes the discussion unnecessarily contentious and personalized.

**There is no single place where SESP products and information can be accessed.** The SESP has not benefited from the availability of a solid repository of knowledge that is mined and shared regularly by staff. This is in the making with the advent of the RRS, which will include data from all SESP products. Incentives, combined with new forms of learning and templates, may be needed, providing solutions and lessons irrespective of how it may be self- or independently assessed in a single project context.

The quality of PCRs, as measured by IDEV’s validation process, is variable, but average ratings are low (around 2.8), which hinders learning opportunities. While over three-quarters (77 percent) of PCRs are good when measured against the current 2.5 rating threshold (2016 and 2017 validations), only about half (52 percent) are good when measured against a 3-rating threshold, i.e., “fully” satisfactory. The majority of PCRs are prepared by consultants. Most of the TMs interviewed think that they should not do their own PCR for reasons of conflict of interest. However, while using consultants under the supervision of TMs may provide some level of arms-length review, candor remains an issue and consultants do not follow the same standards, raising issues of comparability and quality. PCRs are typically given lower priority by staff and there is little vetting on the choice of consultants.

**Recommendations**

From the findings above, and considering the Bank’s Integrated QA Plan, Management should:

**Recommendation 1:** Review the AfDB’s results measurement framework and evaluation frameworks across the project cycle to ensure (i) internal consistency throughout the AfDB’s results measurement and reporting system from operation to corporate level, and (ii) that there is harmonization between sovereign (SO) and non-sovereign operations (NSO).

**Recommendation 2:** Review and revise, in close collaboration with IDEV, the PCR/XSR ratings methodology in use including the ratings scale and guidelines in order to improve the reliability of the ratings system for all operations, and to better align SO and NSO.

**Recommendation 3:** Enhance the accountability for SESP products by developing appropriate indicators and explicitly incorporating these indicators in the AfDB’s top-level corporate KPIs, in VPS and Directors performance agreements, and in staff performance discussions. The focus should be on delivery, timeliness, quality, usefulness and proactiveness; encouraging candor in flagging and addressing emerging issues.
Recommendation 4: In the context of the AfDB’s rightsizing, review the SO and NSO staffing levels for M&E, and quality assurance activities in order to ensure that the self-evaluation function is appropriately staffed and resourced.

Recommendation 5: Enhance compliance with corporate self-evaluation reporting requirements by clarifying the roles, procedures, frequency and reporting requirements for supervision, implementation support, and completion. In addition, work with IDEV on an appropriate and realistic timeline for timely PCR/XSR validation in order to feed the formal annual development effectiveness report on the AfDB-funded interventions.

Recommendation 6: Enhance learning through SESPs by improving (i) quality of and accessibility of SESP products, and (ii) task managers’ understanding and acceptance of SESP as learning tools rather than just as accountability tools.

Table 1: SESP Reporting tools and performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting tools</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Main issues</th>
<th>How well does it support the related outcome?</th>
<th>Proposed actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPR</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Low Compliance, filing delays and candor issues. Redundancy with BTORs and no differentiation for special situations (PBOs, fragility).</td>
<td>Weak tool for raising issues, corrective action and performance management. IPR weaknesses permeate through PCRs, CSPs, CPPRs and RISPs. Insufficient accountability tool.</td>
<td>The IPR format should be updated, simplified to reduce redundancy with BTORs, and differentiated for diverse typologies of operations and country circumstances (e.g., fragility). Make Management vetting of IPRs a requirement for compliance monitoring through the dashboard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPR</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Managers are not sufficiently accountable for IPR quality and reliability: little validation and discussions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTR</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Compliance is low and MTRs are only occasionally used for project restructuring, which is perceived as having high transaction costs.</td>
<td>The tool is considered adequate but its implementation weak.</td>
<td>Include MTR compliance as a dashboard indicator. Requires higher degree of Mgt. accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTR</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Weak incentive structure for candor. The rating system is not conducive to effective and reliable assessment, leading to disconnects with IDEV’s validation. Occasionally used as learning tool esp. for follow up projects in the same country. Excessive focus on ratings hampers learning opportunities. Trade-off between accountability and learning.</td>
<td>Equating project performance with staff performance leads to candor issues and reduces accountability. Learning potential is unmet as there are too few opportunities for more structured lessons-sharing events.</td>
<td>Reform the rating system to allow to better capture the reality and improve the guidelines for generating more solid evidence. Develop a distinct approach towards learning with the SESP as one of its inputs but relying on more adapted venues and products, a repository of information and a safe space environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: SESP Reporting tools and performance
# Executive Summary

An IDEV Corporate Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting tools</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Main issues</th>
<th>How well does it support the related outcome?</th>
<th>Proposed actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NSOs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
<td>Low compliance and redundancy with ASRs &amp; BTORs. Little discussion or validation by Mgt.</td>
<td>Weak tool for performance management. Low compliance reflects low accountability.</td>
<td>Rationalize its use, format and content relative to the other reporting tools (ASRs, BTORs). Make reporting on compliance more visible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASR</strong></td>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
<td>Low compliance and redundant with BTORs. Lack of consistency in using common assessment criteria and rating systems between the various documents. DO ratings are not systematically validated.</td>
<td>Weak assessment of risks to development outcomes. Low compliance reflects low accountability.</td>
<td>Develop a more precise and actionable assessment of risks to development outcomes. Improve accountability through better and harmonized results reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>XSR</strong></td>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
<td>Lenient ratings in the XSR with considerable validation backlog. Compliance issue. Projects assessed against indicators not included in the PAR or the ADOA. Few learning opportunities.</td>
<td>Low compliance and candor affect accountability and efficiency of reporting. Financial performance dominates over development outcomes.</td>
<td>Better alignment of criteria and harmonization of rating systems among the various reporting tools. Make lessons more relevant and useful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSPs/ CPPRs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
<td>The quality of CSPs/CPPRs is impacted by the quality of IPRs. CSPs/CPPRs completion reports are not validated by IDEV. The weight of CPPRs in assessing the quality of CSPs is questionable. CSPs/CPPRs are reviewed by the Board and are more likely to be subject to discussion and learning.</td>
<td>Lines of accountability between the CSPs and the CPPRs are blurred. IDEV carries out independent evaluations which facilitates accountability and learning. The current focus on the narrative, rather than on ratings, facilitates learning.</td>
<td>CPPR methodology and articulation with CSPs need revision. Consider validations of more CSPs/CPPRs by IDEV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RISPs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
<td>The quality of RISPs is impacted by the quality of IPRs. RISP Completion Reports are not validated by IDEV. CSPs are reviewed by the Board and are more likely to be subject to discussion and learning.</td>
<td>IDEV carries out independent evaluations of RISPs which facilitates accountability and learning even if methodologies are not harmonized with CRs.</td>
<td>Consider more validations of RISP completion reports by IDEV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About this Evaluation

This report summarizes the findings of an independent evaluation of the African Development Bank’s Self-Evaluation Systems and Processes (SESP). The evaluation is timely as the Bank revisits its strategic directions and operational processes. Over the past couple of years, the Bank has initiated an in-depth diagnostic of its quality assurance processes. This diagnostic was complemented by a series of Independent Development Evaluation (IDEV) evaluations that aims to examine the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the Bank’s quality assurance processes across the project cycle as a way of enhancing their contribution towards performance management, accountability and learning.

The SESP are commonly defined as the assessments made of projects, country/regional programs, and policy/thematic review by the entity engaged in the activity. While the SESP are carried out by staff/Management, IDEV complements the process through the validation of certain products such as completion reports and through independent evaluations of projects, Country Strategy Papers and Regional Integration Strategy Papers.

The evaluation covers the period 2013 - 2018, and the implementation of the SESP over the time span that goes from project approval to closing (exit). It covers both public sector and non-sovereign operations. In addition to the project- or operation-level analysis, case studies for a sample of Country Strategy Papers and Regional Integration Strategy Papers have also been carried out.

The evaluation found that the Bank’s SESP have many positive features. They lay out strong standards and procedures underpinning their functioning, as well as a cogent articulation with the independent evaluation function carried out by IDEV. However, the main weaknesses of the SESP are in the application of the established procedures, standards and norms.