

IEG Guidelines for Global and Regional Program Reviews (GRPRs)

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AIDS	Acquired immunodeficiency syndrome
CAE	Country Assistance Evaluation (IEG)
CAS	Country Assistance Strategy (World Bank)
CFP	Concessional Finance and Global Partnerships Vice Presidency (World Bank)
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
DAC	Development Assistance Committee (OECD)
DGF	Development Grant Facility (World Bank)
ECG	Evaluation Cooperation Group (MDB)
GRPR	Global or Regional Program Review (IEG)
GRPP	Global and regional partnership program
GPP	Global Programs and Partnerships (World Bank)
HIV	Human immunodeficiency virus
ICR	Implementation Completion Report (World Bank)
IEG	Independent Evaluation Group, formerly OED (World Bank)
Logframe	Logical framework
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MDB	Multilateral Development Bank
NGO	Nongovernmental organization
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OED	Operations Evaluation Department, now IEG (World Bank)
PPAR	Project Performance Assessment Report (IEG)
PRN	Partnership Review Note
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
TDR	Special Programme on Research and Training in Tropical Diseases
TL	Team leader (World Bank)
TOR	Terms of reference
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
VPU	Vice Presidential Unit

Contents

Introduction	1
Objectives of Global and Regional Program Reviews	1
Review Framework	3
Assessing the Independence and Quality of the Evaluation.....	4
Providing an Independent Opinion on the Effectiveness of the Program	4
<i>Relevance</i>	5
<i>Efficacy</i>	6
<i>Efficiency or Cost-Effectiveness</i>	8
<i>Governance and Management</i>	8
<i>Resource Mobilization and Financial Management</i>	10
<i>Sustainability, Risk, and Strategies for Devolution or Exit</i>	10
<i>Special Considerations for Regional Partnership Programs</i>	11
Assessing the Bank's Performance as a Partner	12
Process and Procedures	13
Collecting Documents to Review.....	13
Consultations	13
Suggested Outline.....	13
Review of Draft GRPR	14
Publication, Disclosure, and Dissemination.....	14

Boxes

Box 1. Program Maturity Influences Evaluation Purpose, Scope and Methodology.....	5
Box 2. What Are Global and Regional Public Goods?	7

Tables

Annex Table 1. Assessing the Independence and Quality of the Evaluation.....	15
Annex Table 2. Providing an Independent Opinion on the Effectiveness of the Program	16
Annex Table 3. Assessing the Bank's Performance as a Partner in the Program.....	21
Annex Table 4. Standard IEG/OPCS Evaluation Criteria for Investment Projects /1	22
Annex Table 5. World Bank Selectivity and Oversight of GRPPs.....	23
Annex Table 6. Eligibility Criteria for Grant Support from the Development Grant Facility.....	24
Annex Table 7. Common GRPP Activities	25

Introduction

1. These guidelines for reviewing global and regional partnership programs (GRPPs)¹ have been developed in response to the recommendation in IEG's Phase 2 Report on global programs that IEG should incorporate global programs into its standard evaluation and reporting processes to the Bank's Executive Board. In particular:

- IEG should review selected program-level evaluations conducted by Bank-supported global programs, like IEG reviews other evaluations of Bank support at the project and country levels.
- IEG should work with the Bank's global partners to develop consensus standards for the evaluation of global programs.²

IEG is implementing both parts of this recommendation concurrently since they are complementary. Progress in each area is contributing to progress in the other area.

2. In response to the second part of the recommendation, IEG has recently prepared a *Sourcebook of Indicative Principles and Standards for Evaluating GRPPs* under the auspices of the OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation. This Sourcebook draws extensively on work that has previously been done by the DAC Evaluation Network, the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), the Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG) of the Multilateral Development Banks, evaluation associations, and others to develop principles, norms, and standards for evaluating development assistance programs, projects, and activities. It also draws on IEG's experience in reviewing GRPPs over the last few years as well as the feedback that was received at a stakeholder consultative workshop held for this purpose in Paris in September 2006.

Objectives of Global and Regional Program Reviews

3. GRPRs are parallel to existing review processes for investment projects and country programs and therefore build upon precedents — in terms of both objectives and processes — that have been established for ICR Reviews/PPARs for investment projects and CAS Completion Report Reviews/CAEs for country programs.³ GRPRs are based upon a prior

1. These guidelines are applicable to both global and regional partnership programs. This does not, however, include regional (multi-country) investment projects supported by the World Bank and other donors, which have a substantially different character from partnership programs, and which have proven more straightforward for the Bank and other donors to evaluate through their regular M&E processes. However, regional partnerships have some distinguishing features from global partnerships which are addressed in a separate section of these guidelines. Throughout this document, the acronym "GRPP" is used when referring to both global and regional partnerships, and the adjectives "global" and "regional" are used when referring to only one.

2. Operations Evaluation Department, *Addressing the Challenges of Globalization : An Independent Evaluation of the World Bank's Approach to Global Programs*, Phase 2 Report, 2004, p. xxx. OED formally changed its name to the Independent Evaluation Group in December 2005.

3. The Bank's Regional VPUs are responsible for preparing Implementation Completion Reports (ICRs) at the end of each completed project, and Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) Completion Reports at the end of each CAS. IEG is responsible for preparing ICR Reviews, Project Performance Assessment Reports (PPARs), CAS Completion Report Reviews, and Country Assistance Evaluations (CAEs).

external evaluation of the global or regional program, generally commissioned by the governing body of the program.

4. A principal difference between GRPRs on the one hand and those for investment projects and country programs on the other is that GRPPs are partnership programs, in which the Bank is only one partner. Instead of being the responsibility of a Bank operational region or network, GRPPs are the responsibility of the governing body of the program, of which the Bank is only one member. While ICRs and CAS Completion Reports are properties of the Bank, GRPP evaluations are the property of the GRPP. Another difference from investment projects is that most GRPPs are ongoing, rather than completed. They evolve over time based on the availability of funding and on changing international circumstances, and do not usually have a fixed end-point.

5. GRPRs are similar in scope to a PPAR. These involve an average of 4–6 staff weeks as well as mission travel to the secretariat of the program if this is located outside Washington, D.C. Like PPARs, GRPRs will be “below-the-line” products that will conclude with “lessons learned” as opposed to recommendations.⁴ Also like PPARs, each review will be peer-reviewed and panel-reviewed within IEG, before being circulated elsewhere in the Bank and to external partners, and before being finalized and disclosed.

6. IEG's purpose in conducting GRPRs is to contribute to improving both the performance of GRPPs themselves and the Bank's participation in the programs. In common with all of IEG's evaluation products, the two overarching objectives of GRPRs are accountability and learning lessons:

- **Accountability:** To provide accountability in the achievement of the program's objectives by providing an independent opinion of the program's effectiveness
- **Learning lessons:** To identify and disseminate lessons learned from experience — in this case, from the experience of individual GRPPs.

7. The first objective includes validating the findings of the GRPP evaluation with respect to the effectiveness of the program, and assessing the Bank's performance as a partner in the program. The GRPP evaluation will not likely have done the latter since most evaluations do not assess the performance of individual partners in the program.⁵

8. The second objective includes assessing the quality and independence of the GRPP evaluation itself as well as drawing implications for the Bank's continued involvement in the program — both of which represent additional value added of the GRPR relative to the GRPP evaluation itself. Assessing the quality of GRPP evaluations is a particularly important aspect of GRPRs, since promoting more consistent evaluation methodologies across Bank-supported GRPPs and raising the quality of GRPP evaluations are important reasons why IEG has embarked on this new product.

4. However, IEG always reserves the right to elevate any evaluation study to an “above-the-line” product with recommendations, if IEG judges that the circumstances warrant.

5. This aspect of a GRPR therefore provides much opportunity for IEG to add value to the GRPP evaluation. Every partner clearly has the legitimacy to assess its own role and review its continuing participation in each program.

9. IEG completed three pilot GRPRs in FY06, and plans to complete six regular GRPRs during each of the next three fiscal years. Then IEG will conduct a stocktaking of its experiences with this new product (tentatively scheduled for FY09), similar to the recently completed *CAE Retrospective* of country assistance evaluations.⁶

Review Framework

10. This is based upon the review framework that was developed for IEG's Phase 2 Report on global programs, incorporates lessons derived from the experience of the three pilot GRPRs, draws on the *GRPP Evaluation Sourcebook*, and reflects the Bank's new strategic framework for global and regional programs. Each GRPR will consist of three substantive parts:

- Assessing the independence and quality of the GRPP evaluation that has been conducted
- Providing an independent opinion on the effectiveness of the program
- Assessing the Bank's performance as a partner in the program.

Refer to Annex Tables 1, 2, and 3 for the key evaluation issues and questions to be addressed under each part, and the various chapters of the *Evaluation Sourcebook* for further amplification regarding the application of these evaluation concepts and criteria to GRPPs.

11. IEG is not formally rating these various attributes of the program for the time being. The three pilot GRPRs found that it was premature to do so, given the current state of evaluations of global programs,⁷ and that attempting to do so detracted from the more important lessons arising from these reviews — both for the programs themselves and for other GRPPs in which the Bank is involved.

12. IEG reviewers have the flexibility to apply this framework as appropriate for each program. To provide context, each GRPR should start with a brief description of the history of the program, the objectives, strategies and activities, the principal partners, and the governance and financing arrangements. Where the objectives and strategies of the program are implicit or not well articulated, IEG reviewers need to construct a clear and agreed-upon statement of the objectives in consultation with the program secretariat in order to facilitate the subsequent assessment of the relevance, efficacy, and efficiency of the program. This section should also include a factual description of the evaluation being reviewed (such as who conducted it and

6. Operations Evaluation Department, *Country Assistance Evaluation Retrospective: An OED Self-Evaluation*, 2005.

7. So far, there is no formally agreed-upon methodology for the evaluation of GRPPs among the major partners in GRPPs, and so far, most GRPP evaluations do not contain explicit ratings with regard to relevance, efficacy, or efficiency. The new *Evaluation Sourcebook* has not yet been endorsed by the World Bank or the OECD/DAC Evaluation Network. Its publication in January 2007 represents the beginning of a trial period of application, use, and review in order to inform and further improve the document for eventual formal endorsement.

when), a brief summary of its major findings and recommendations, and the response of the program to the recommendations, if available.⁸

ASSESSING THE INDEPENDENCE AND QUALITY OF THE EVALUATION

13. The independence and quality of the GRPP evaluation is assessed in terms of the evaluation process, approach, scope, instruments, and feedback (see Annex Table 1 and *Evaluation Sourcebook*, chapters 2–8). To what extent was the evaluation independent of the management of program as measured by three criteria: (a) organizational independence, (b) behavioral independence and protection from interference, and (c) avoidance of conflicts of interest.⁹ In the case of smaller programs in which the governing body had limited time or evaluation expertise to manage the evaluation process itself, what steps were taken to ensure the independence of the evaluators, such as establishing an oversight subcommittee or external panel to manage the evaluation.

14. What was the overall quality of the evaluation? Were the purpose, scope and methodology, as outlined in the terms of reference, consistent with each other and with the age of the program (Box 1)? Did the evaluation address the most important evaluation issues? Was the evaluation objectives-based? Did it use a results-based framework? Did it assess outcomes as well as outputs? What evaluation instruments were used? Was the evaluation process participatory and transparent? Were the findings and conclusions evidence-based?

15. This section of the GRPR could also include a box assessing the overall M&E framework of the program, including (a) the clarity and coherence of the program’s objectives and strategies, (b) the use of a results-based framework, and (c) the existence of systematic and regular processes for collecting and managing data. IEG’s Phase 2 Report found out that the ability to evaluate a global program depends, among other things, on the extent to which the program has put in place an effective results-based monitoring framework, including monitorable indicators.¹⁰

PROVIDING AN INDEPENDENT OPINION ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROGRAM

16. Each GRPR is expected to provide an independent opinion of (a) relevance, (b) efficacy, (c) efficiency or cost-effectiveness, and (d) governance and management of the program. It may also provide an independent opinion of (e) financial management and (f) sustainability of the program, if the latter are important issues for the program and if there is sufficient information available on which to base an independent opinion. The following subsections draw heavily upon Chapters 9 to 14 in the new *Evaluation Sourcebook*. IEG reviewers should refer to the Sourcebook for more guidance on each of these six criteria.

8. This factual description, summary of the evaluation, and program response could also appear at the beginning of the next section on assessing the independence and quality of the evaluation.

9. For more information on these criteria, see Evaluation Cooperation Group, 2004, *Template for Assessing the Independence of Evaluation Organizations*, which can be downloaded at <http://www.ecgnet/docs/ecg.doc>. The two criteria of “behavioral independence” and “protection from external influence” have been combined into one criterion for GRPPs.

10. The monitoring framework could also be discussed under the subject of efficacy below. GRPRs are not intended to substitute for the lack of monitoring system where this does not presently exist. Rather, they point out such deficiencies as the case may be.

Box 1. Program Maturity Influences Evaluation Purpose, Scope and Methodology

The maturity of a program generally affects the purpose, scope and methodology of an evaluation. The following provides a general guideline.

- **Program in early stages (first 2–3 years):** An early — usually the initial — evaluation should assess the appropriateness of the program design and review the governance and management arrangements. The evaluation should also review the relevance and clarity of the objectives, identify constraints that make achievement of specific objectives difficult or impossible, and recommend adjustments if necessary.
- **Established program (over 5 years old):** The evaluation should address inputs, the progress of activities, and outputs. The recommendations should focus on ways to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the program.
- **Mature program:** At this advanced stage, the program should be operating smoothly and meeting the expectations expressed at its initiation. The evaluation should pay particular attention not only to outputs, but also to outcomes, as well as to sustainability and other strategic issues such as growth, devolution, or exit.

Source: *Evaluation Sourcebook*, 2007, pp. 10, and 34–35.

Relevance

17. Relevance is the extent to which the objectives and design of the program are consistent with (a) current global/regional challenges and concerns in a particular development sector and (b) the needs and priorities of beneficiary countries and groups. Shortcomings in relevance occur when the supply or the demand for the program is not well founded; when the program's activities are competing with or substituting for activities that individual donors, beneficiary countries, or other GRPPs could do more efficiently; or when the program's design and implementation are inappropriate for achieving its objectives. This also includes whether the objectives and the design of the program are still appropriate at the time of the review, given that circumstances may have changed since the program was started or its objectives last revised.

18. The relevance of a GRPP typically arises from the interplay between global/regional challenges on the one hand and beneficiary needs and priorities on the other, since the interests of all partners and participants do not always coincide. Indeed, the divergence of benefits and costs between the global/regional and country levels, or the inability of existing institutional arrangements to reflect shared interests is often a reason for financing the provision of global/regional public goods.

19. The *relevance of the objectives* is assessed against the existence of an international consensus for the program (demand-side relevance); alignment with beneficiary needs, priorities and strategies (supply-side relevance); consistency with the subsidiarity principle (vertical relevance); and the absence of alternative sources of supply (horizontal relevance). (See Annex Table 2, questions 1 to 4.) An international consensus can be articulated in a variety of ways, such as formal international conventions, less formal international agreements reached at major international meetings and conferences, or formal and informal standards and protocols promoted by international organizations, NGOs, and others. To what extent is there a consensus not only on the need for action but also on the definition of the problem, on priorities, and on strategies for action? Where beneficiary countries are signatories to the international conventions or declarations that gave birth to the programs, this enhances demand-side relevance. But even supply-driven programs may acquire beneficiary ownership

over time by demonstrating positive outcomes and impacts.¹¹ The subsidiarity principle concerns the most appropriate level — global, regional, national, or local — at which particular activities should be carried out in terms of efficiency and responsiveness to the needs of beneficiaries. IEG reviewers should pay particular attention to those programs that, on the face of it, are primarily supporting the provision of national or local public goods, as opposed to global or regional public goods (Box 2). What is the comparative advantage, value added or core competency of the program relative to other alternative sources of supply? Are there alternative or more cost-effective ways in which the activities of the program could be delivered?

20. The *relevance of the design* concerns the appropriateness of the strategies and priority activities of the program for achieving the objectives of the program. Are the activities of the program appropriate in light of the program's resources, beneficiary needs and priorities, the subsidiarity principle, and alternative sources of supply? Is the geographic coverage of the program consistent with the objectives of the program, such as addressing extreme poverty or the particular needs of fragile states? Are the strategies of the program still appropriate for achieving the objectives, given recent developments in the sector, such as the development of new technologies?

21. Either this section or the efficacy section should include a classification of the major activities of the program in accordance with the classification system in Annex Table 7. Is the program (a) primarily a policy or knowledge network, (b) providing technical assistance to support national policy and institutional reforms and capacity strengthening, and/or (c) providing investment resources to support the provision of global, regional, or national public goods. Establishing a results chain, assessing the relevance of the design, and verifying the achievement of outcomes have so far proven easier for investment programs than for networking and technical assistance programs, since the outcomes of the latter (such as studies, policy or institutional reforms, and capacity strengthening) have been more difficult to track and more costly to monitor and attribute to program activities.

Efficacy

22. Efficacy is the extent to which the program has achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, taking into account their relative importance. Shortcomings in efficacy have to do either with the *number* of objectives that have not been achieved (or are not expected to be achieved) or with the *extent* to which one or more objectives have not been achieved (or are not expected to be achieved). Positive unintended results may also be regarded as additional achievements if convincingly documented.

23. The ability to provide an independent opinion on efficacy depends on the age of the program (Box 1), the existence of a good monitoring framework, and the quality of the evaluation that is being reviewed. When the program is young (less than four years old), it will be more difficult to make a summative assessment of efficacy. When neither the program nor the evaluation has established a good monitoring framework, the GRPR could provide some guidance to the secretariat in establishing one.

11. This is the case of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) and the Special Programme for Research and Training on Tropical Diseases (TDR).

Box 2. What Are Global and Regional Public Goods?

Public goods produce benefits that are non-rival (many people can consume, use, or enjoy the good at the same time) and non-excludable (it is difficult to prevent people who do not pay for the good from consuming it). If the benefits of a particular public good accrue across all or many countries, then this is deemed a global or international public good.

In their pure form, true global public goods are rare. Therefore, Bank Management adopted a more operational definition in 2000: “Global public goods are defined as commodities, resources, services — and also systems of rules or policy regimes — with substantial cross-border spillover effects that are important for development and poverty reduction, and that can be produced in sufficient supply only through cooperation and collective action by developed and developing countries.”

The International Task Force on Global Public Goods also adopted a similar approach: “International public goods, global and regional, address issues that: (a) are deemed to be important to the international community, to both developed and developing countries; (b) typically cannot, or will not, be adequately addressed by individual countries or entities acting alone, and, in such cases (c) are best addressed collectively on a multilateral basis.”

These two definitions imply that information and knowledge about development — an output of many global programs — is not necessarily a global public good. There is, for instance, no shortage of knowledge now being disseminated globally on the Internet. Useful knowledge also tends to be contextual, and its global public goods characteristics must be verified through empirical research.

24. The review should provide an independent opinion on the inputs, the progress of activities, outputs, and outcomes to the extent possible (or explain why this is not possible). Findings regarding inputs should be clearly distinguished from those regarding outputs and outcomes. Outcomes should include any multiplier or downstream effects attributable to the GRPP and any unintended effects, whether positive or negative — either of the program’s activities or of the partnership itself, such as any harmonization of procedures or effects on aid coordination outside of the partnership itself. Outcomes relating to the unique contribution of the partnership itself — such as the scale of or joint activities made possible by its organizational setup as a GRPP, or its institutional linkages to a host organization — should also be highlighted. What has been the value added of the GRPP relative to what could have been achieved by intervening only at the country or local level, taking into consideration the leadership of the partnership, the roles and responsibilities of the various partners, and the degree of trust developed among the partners?

25. The review should provide an independent opinion on the effectiveness of the program’s operational linkages with country or local-level activities, whether or not the latter are supported by donors. For most GRPPs, positive outcomes and impacts at the country or local level are a joint product of both global/regional and country/local level activities. Programs seeking outcomes and impacts on the ground in developing countries generally require the inclusion of their priorities in country development strategies (such as Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers and CASs), as well as complementary or follow-on investments. To what extent is the program actively fostering linkages in both directions, such as making it easier for beneficiaries to communicate their constraints, requirements, and priorities to GRPP management?

Efficiency or Cost-Effectiveness

26. **Efficiency** is the extent to which the program has converted or is expected to convert its resources/inputs (such as funds, expertise, time, etc.) economically into results in order to achieve the maximum possible outputs, outcomes, and impacts with the minimum possible inputs. **Cost-effectiveness** is the extent to which the program has achieved or is expected to achieve its results at a lower cost compared with alternatives. An assessment of efficiency attempts to compare the benefits associated with the activities of a program to their costs; an assessment of cost-effectiveness treats these benefits as a given and asks the more tractable question of whether the outputs of the program could have been produced at a lower cost than they were. For GRPPs that are providing development assistance to developing countries, the principal alternatives are the traditional means of delivering development assistance (bilateral or multilateral) or other GRPPs operating in the same sector.

27. IEG has so far found that evaluations of GRPPs pay less attention to assessing efficiency or cost-effectiveness compared with evaluations of development assistance projects, due to the inherent complexity in doing so and due to the continually changing scale and reach of individual GRPPs, which makes the use of benchmarks (or comparisons with other programs) difficult. Nonetheless, each GRPR should attempt, at a minimum, to analyze the program's costs in broad categories (such as overhead vs. activity costs) and categorize the program's activities and associated benefits, even if these cannot be valued in monetary terms. Each GRPR should address the following broad questions to the extent possible:

- Has the program cost more or less than planned? How did it measure up against its own costing schedule?
- Have there been any obvious cases of inefficiency or wasted resources?
- Have the program's outputs and outcomes been achieved in the most cost-effective way?
- How do actual costs compare with benchmarks from similar programs or activities?
- To what extent do the benefits of individual activities outweigh their costs?

28. Ideally, IEG reviewers should analyze the cost-effectiveness of the program, or make a quick cost comparison, from both the beneficiary and donor perspectives. If this is not possible, then the analysis should clearly state from which perspective the costs have been analyzed. For instance, from the beneficiary perspective, has receiving the development assistance through the GRPP increased the transactions costs compared with traditional development assistance programs? From the donor perspective, has delivering the development assistance through the GRPP reduced donor costs by harmonizing efforts among donors or by reducing overlapping work (such as through joint supervision, monitoring and evaluation)?

Governance and Management

29. **Governance** concerns the structures, functions, processes, and organizational traditions that have been put in place within the context of a program's authorizing environment to ensure that the program is run in such a way that it achieves its objectives in an effective and transparent manner. **Management** concerns the day-to-day operation of the program within the context of the strategies, policies, processes, and procedures that have been established by the

governing body. Whereas governance is concerned with “doing the right thing,” management is concerned with “doing things right.”

30. GRPRs should focus more on the governance than on the management of the program being reviewed, since the governance structures give practical substance to the partnership, which is the *raison d’être* of a GRPP — to achieve something collectively that the individual partners could not achieve at all, or as efficiently, by acting alone. Much of the day-to-day management of a program is properly outside the purview of the program’s governing body, and therefore also outside the purview of evaluation and review.

31. It is not practical to base the assessment of governance and management on a particular governance model, since GRPPs employ a diverse array of models associated with the history and culture of each program. Rather, the assessment should be based on compliance with generally accepted principles of good governance such as legitimacy, accountability, responsibility, fairness, transparency, efficiency, and probity. (See question 11 in Annex Table 2 and the *Evaluation Sourcebook*, pp. 76–78, for definitions of these principles.)

32. The assessment of governance and management should also build upon and add to the previous assessments of relevance, efficacy, and efficiency. For instance, legitimacy is closely related to the relevance of the program, and efficient governance is related to the efficiency or cost-effectiveness of the program. The focus in this section, however, is on the structures and processes of governance and management. To what extent are these well articulated and working well to bring about legitimate and effective governance and management of the program?

33. A good place to start is the identification of the stakeholders of the program — while at the same time distinguishing the *partners* who are involved in the governance and financing of the program from the *participants* who are involved in its implementation (including the final beneficiaries). To what extent do the governance and management structures permit and facilitate the effective participation and voice of different categories of stakeholders — in particular those of developing countries and technical experts — in the major governance and management decisions, taking into account their respective roles and relative importance? To what extent do the different partners and participants, similarly situated, have equal opportunity to influence the program and receive benefits from the program?

34. Effective governance requires both legitimacy in exercise of power and efficiency in the allocation of resources. IEG reviewers should recognize the tensions between the two and ascertain if one principle is being sacrificed at the expense of the other. Theory suggests that traditional shareholder models of governance (in which membership on the governing body is limited to financial and other contributors) may be more efficient but at some cost to legitimacy, while stakeholder models (in which membership also includes non-contributors) may be more legitimate but sometimes at the expense of efficiency, if the number of participants becomes large and the costs of organizing diverse interests to pursue a common goal becomes high relative to the expected benefits. In reality, a certain degree of convergence of practice appears to be taking place between programs that had previously followed shareholder and stakeholder models, respectively.

35. For programs that are located in host organizations (whether the Bank or another partner organization), IEG reviewers should ascertain to what extent, if any, this arrangement is adversely affecting the governance, management, or any other aspect of the program – including relevance, efficacy, efficiency, or sustainability. Is it clear for which functions the program manager is accountable to the host organization and to the governing body of the program, respectively, and how conflicts between the two are to be resolved? Does the host organization play such a dominant role in the program that this has reduced incentives for the other partners to participate effectively, or reduced the ability of the host organization to look at the weaknesses of the program objectively?

Resource Mobilization and Financial Management

36. ***Resource mobilization*** is the process by which resources are solicited by the program and provided by donors and partners. ***Financial management*** refers to all the processes that govern the recording and use of funds, including allocation processes, crediting and debiting of accounts, controls that restrict use, and accounting and periodic financial reporting systems. In cases where funds received accumulate over time, this would also include the management of the cash and investment portfolio.

37. These issues are important because most GRPPs are externally financed with little or no capacity to earn income from their own resources. Most are public sector programs which provide goods and services (including financial resources) to beneficiaries on a grant or in-kind basis. And their ability to continue to raise funds from donors depends upon adherence to high fiduciary standards.

38. A GRPR is not required to address resource mobilization and financial management issues. But IEG reviewers could consider identifying and addressing any of the following issues that emerge during the course of the review:

- The link between governance and financing
- The role of the governing body in mobilizing resources
- The prospects for beneficiary or local partners to make financial contributions to the program now or in the future
- The quality of financial management and accounting
- The methods, criteria, and processes for allocating funds
- Resource mobilization and financial management during the early stages of a program
- Donor restrictions on the use of resources. (See the *Evaluation Sourcebook*, pp. 85–86, for a discussion of these issues.)

Sustainability, Risk, and Strategies for Devolution or Exit

39. ***Sustainability*** can refer either to the benefits arising from the activities of the program, or to the program itself. ***Risk to development outcome*** refers to the risk, at the time of the review, that the expected outcomes will not be realized or maintained. ***A strategy for devolution or exit*** refers to a proactive strategy to change the design of the program, to devolve some of its implementation responsibilities, to reduce dependency on external funding, or to phase out the program on the grounds that it has achieved its objectives or that its current

design is no longer the best way to sustain the results which the program has achieved. Other possible strategies include transforming the program into an informal network of country or local implementers or spinning off the program and establishing a new legal entity that is no longer hosted by one of the partner organizations.

40. A GRPR is not required to address these issues. It would be more appropriate for GRPRs to address the sustainability of the benefits of mature programs compared with young programs that have not yet had the opportunity to complete many activities or achieve many outcomes. It would also be more appropriate for GRPRs to assess the sustainability of mature partnerships that are still relevant and legitimate, and generating benefits that are worth sustaining.

41. Strategies for devolution or exit pose questions similar to those for sustainability, but from a different perspective: Does the program need to be sustained? Is the continuation of the program the best way of sustaining the results achieved? Should the design of the program be modified as a result of changed circumstances (either positive or negative)? What other alternatives should be considered to sustain the program's results more cost-effectively? A strategy for devolution or exit may or may not figure in a program's strategic documents, depending on its maturity or the requirements of its donors. The GRPR could address the appropriateness of such a strategy if one presently exists, or address the relative merits of a range of alternative strategies if one does not presently exist. If so, the merits of alternative strategies should be addressed in the light of the previous findings with respect to relevance, efficacy, efficiency, and sustainability. (See the *Evaluation Sourcebook*, pp. 93–94.)

Special Considerations for Regional Partnership Programs¹²

42. Regional partnership programs are often sub-regional in scope, with a contiguous geographic dimension to them such as a body of water (like the Aral Sea or Lake Victoria), a river system (like the Nile), or a transport or power system. More than for most global programs, these programs exist for the specific purpose of resolving collective action dilemmas among the participating countries regarding the use of the common resource. Sovereign countries are usually the principal partners represented on the governing body, since the success of regional programs hinges on beneficiary country ownership, capacity for collective decision making, and cooperative implementation of program activities.

43. Therefore, it is important for reviews of regional programs to assess individual country ownership of the program, the appropriateness of the incentives for cooperation that have been built into the design of the program, and the distribution of the benefits and costs of the program among the beneficiary partners, since an inequitable distribution of net benefits can adversely affect both the effectiveness and the sustainability of the program. Has there been sufficient analysis of the political context and the inter-partner relationships as well as efforts to develop trust, build confidence, and resolve conflicts? Has there been an adequate assessment of the costs and benefits to the countries individually, particularly in cases where countries have to make difficult trade-offs, such as water sharing or usage agreements. Has the program clearly delineated the roles and responsibilities for program

12. This subsection draws heavily on IEG's forthcoming review, *Regional Development Programs: An Independent Evaluation of World Bank Support*.

implementation between the regional and national levels, and then followed through? Do the countries have sufficient capacity to implement their parts of the program?

44. It is also important for reviews of regional programs to address the issues of sustainability, devolution, and exit. The programs need to plan for the sustainability of both national-level activities and regional coordination arrangements when external donor support ceases. Is there such a plan for sustainability? Does the design of the program indicate how the program expects beneficiary countries to take over more responsibility for financing and implementation of program activities at both the national and regional levels? Has an explicit timeline been established? Member countries have generally been more willing to assume responsibility for financing the continuation of the national-level activities than the regional coordination arrangements, except where the latter costs can be covered by self-generating resources (such as an electric power grid). So the financing of regional coordination arrangements has continued to be borne largely by external donor sources. To what extent can this be sustained, or should alternative financing mechanisms be more vigorously explored?

ASSESSING THE BANK'S PERFORMANCE AS A PARTNER

45. Like PPARs for investment projects, each GRPP is expected to assess the Bank's performance as a partner from the initial inception and design of the program, through oversight of program implementation, and to ultimate disengagement (Annex Table 3.) Although most GRPP evaluations do not specifically address the performance of the program's partners, IEG reviewers must do so by means such as consultations with other partners and interviews with Bank staff.

46. The assessment should start by listing the various roles which the Bank plays in the program — such as convener, trustee, donor, and host organization — since the breadth and depth of the Bank's role differs from program to program, and since the Bank's performance should be assessed in relation to the roles which the Bank is actually playing and in the context of the entire governance structure of the program. IEG reviewers also need to be cognizant of who is responsible for the different aspects of the Bank's engagement with the program. For instance, oversight of each program of behalf of the Bank is generally conducted by the GRPP team leader¹³ in the sponsoring Network or Region with the administrative support of the GPP Group, the DGF Secretariat, and TFO.

47. As the only global financial institution with a multi-sectoral capacity, the Bank typically brings comparative advantages at both the global and country levels to a global program. To what extent is the Bank playing up to or contributing these comparative advantages to the program (questions 1 and 2 in Annex Table 3). To what extent have the Bank's country operations established linkages to the GRPP, where appropriate, to enhance the

13. The GRPP "team leader" is the Bank staff member who has been assigned overall responsibility for oversight of the program from the Bank's point of view, and who is typically the Bank's representative on the governing body of the program. This is distinguished from "program manager" who is typically the head of the program management unit (or secretariat) that is managing the program, whether this is located inside or outside the Bank.

effectiveness of both.¹⁴ IEG's Phase 2 Report found that oversight (question 3) was often weak because of poorly defined expectations with respect to the roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities of Bank staff who are overseeing individual programs; that under-managed partnerships were posing some reputational risks to the Bank (question 4); and that the Bank's disengagement from some programs (question 5) was not well managed, which threatened the future viability of these programs. Bank Management has now acknowledged that enhancing its oversight of individual GRPPs is a vital aspect of the Bank's strategic and programmatic management of its entire portfolio of GRPPs.

Process and Procedures

COLLECTING DOCUMENTS TO REVIEW

48. Among other things, these would include:

- The GRPP evaluation being reviewed, and other evaluative material (if any)
- Documents associated with the establishment of the program or the Bank's participation in the program — program charter, incorporation documents (if any), initiating concept note, Partnership Review Note (PRN), DGF applications and progress reports, trust fund agreements, and Board documents (if any)
- Annual reports, including financial reports and audits
- Reports of scientific and technical advisory committees
- Minutes of governing and executive bodies
- Relevant academic literature on the program (if any).

Many of these can now be downloaded from program Web sites or the Bank's operations portal. Others have to be obtained from the Bank's representative on the governing body of the program, or from the program secretariats.

CONSULTATIONS

49. This varies, depending on whether the program is housed in the Bank or externally managed. At a minimum, the IEG reviewer consults with the Bank's representative on the Board of the program, the program chair, and the head of the secretariat. If the secretariat is not located in the Bank, then this normally involves a mission to the secretariat. In addition, it is important to consult with other key partners — either by phone, e-mail, or in person — and with other Bank operational staff involved with the program. As a general rule, it would also be appropriate to consult with the person(s) who conducted the evaluation of the GRPP.

SUGGESTED OUTLINE

50. Each review would include a preface, a summary, three substantive sections (corresponding to the quality of the GRPP evaluation, the performance of the program, and

14. There is admittedly some overlap between question 8 in Annex Table 2 on "linkages to country-level activities" with question 2 in Annex Table 3 on "comparative advantage at the country level." In the prior question 5, the onus was on the GRPP to establish effective linkages to country-level activities, whether associated with Bank operations or not. In the current question 2, the onus is on the Bank's country operations to establish such linkages to GRPPs for the benefit of both.

Bank performance as a partner in the program), a concluding section on lessons learned, and annexes. The main body of the report, not including the annexes, should be about 20–30 pages. The lessons should be stated in a generic way that can be applied more broadly to other programs, and illustrated with specific findings from the GRPR.

51. The preface should indicate the basic information about the establishment, objectives, and age of the program, the reasons for selecting the program for review, the basic facts about the review process (including any mission travel), and any limitations of the review process.

52. The annexes should include:

- Basic information about the program, including start date, location, chair, program manager, Bank oversight, and financing
- Current goals, objectives, strategies, and activities (organized, if appropriate, as a logframe)
- Genesis and evolution of the program
- Stated exit strategies (if any)
- Members of the governing and executive bodies
- Financial data, including sources and uses of funds
- Persons consulted

REVIEW OF DRAFT GRPR

53. Like each PPAR, each GRPR is peer-reviewed by one person at the request of the task team leader¹⁵ and then sent to the panel chair, who assigns a member of the IEG panel to review it formally.

54. Next, the GRPR is sent for comments to the Bank’s representative on the governing body of the program (and the person formally responsible for oversight of the program from the Bank’s point of view). If the program is housed inside the Bank, then the GRPR is also sent to the program manager at the same time.

55. Then the GRPR is distributed to other partners for their comments, and in the case of externally managed programs, to the program manager. The way in which and the extent to which this is done depends on the program and on the consultations that were conducted during the process of preparing the GRPR. Like the case with PPARs, comments received from the program being reviewed are appended as an annex to the final report (maximum 3 pages).

PUBLICATION, DISCLOSURE, AND DISSEMINATION

56. Like the case with PPARs, GRPRs are published and disclosed to the public on IEG’s external Web site after they have been distributed to the Bank’s Executive Board.

15. As is currently the case with PPARs, IEG’s task team leaders could peer review reports that are written by consultants.

Annex: Review Framework for GRPRs

Annex Table 1. Assessing the Independence and Quality of the Evaluation

Evaluation Questions								
<p>1. Evaluation process</p> <p>To what extent was the GRPP evaluation independent of the management of the program, according to the following criteria: /1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizational independence? • Behavioral independence and protection from interference? • Avoidance of conflicts of interest? <p>Factors to take into account in answering these questions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who commissioned and managed the evaluation? • Who approved the terms of reference and selected the evaluation team? • To whom the evaluation team reported, and how the evaluation was reviewed? • Any other factors that hindered the independence of the evaluation such as an inadequate budget, or restrictions on access to information, travel, sampling, etc.? 								
<p>2. Monitoring and evaluation framework of the program</p> <p>To what extent was the evaluation based on an effective M&E framework of the program with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and coherent objectives and strategies that give focus and direction to the program? • An expected results chain or logical framework? • Measurable indicators that meet the monitoring and reporting needs of the governing body and management of the program? • Systematic and regular processes for collecting and managing data? 								
<p>3. Evaluation approach and scope</p> <p>To what extent was the evaluation objectives-based and evidence-based?</p> <p>To what extent did the evaluation use a results-based framework — constructed either by the program or by the evaluators?</p> <p>To what extent did the evaluation address:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>• Relevance</td> <td>• Governance and management</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Efficacy</td> <td>• Resource mobilization and financial management</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Efficiency or cost-effectiveness</td> <td>• Sustainability, risk, and strategy for devolution or exit</td> </tr> </table>	• Relevance	• Governance and management	• Efficacy	• Resource mobilization and financial management	• Efficiency or cost-effectiveness	• Sustainability, risk, and strategy for devolution or exit		
• Relevance	• Governance and management							
• Efficacy	• Resource mobilization and financial management							
• Efficiency or cost-effectiveness	• Sustainability, risk, and strategy for devolution or exit							
<p>4. Evaluation instruments</p> <p>To what extent did the evaluation utilize the following instruments:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>• Desk and document review</td> <td>• Consultations/interviews and with whom</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Literature review</td> <td>• Structured surveys and of whom</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Site visits and for what purpose: for interviewing implementers/beneficiaries, or for observing activities being implemented or completed</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Case studies</td> <td>• Other</td> </tr> </table>	• Desk and document review	• Consultations/interviews and with whom	• Literature review	• Structured surveys and of whom	• Site visits and for what purpose: for interviewing implementers/beneficiaries, or for observing activities being implemented or completed		• Case studies	• Other
• Desk and document review	• Consultations/interviews and with whom							
• Literature review	• Structured surveys and of whom							
• Site visits and for what purpose: for interviewing implementers/beneficiaries, or for observing activities being implemented or completed								
• Case studies	• Other							
<p>5. Evaluation feedback</p> <p>To what extent have the findings of the evaluation been reflected in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objectives, strategies, design, or scale of the program? • The governance, management, and financing of the program? • The monitoring and evaluation framework of the program? 								

/1 For more information on these criteria, see the *Template for Assessing the Independence of Evaluation Organizations*, produced by the Evaluation Cooperation Group of the Multilateral Development Banks.

Annex Table 2. Providing an Independent Opinion on the Effectiveness of the Program

Note: The following framework for assessing the overall effectiveness of a GRPP has been designed to cover the wide range of such programs in which the World Bank is involved, encompassing policy and knowledge networks, technical assistance programs, and investment programs. It is not expected that every GRPR will cover every question in this table in detail. At a minimum, every GRPR is expected to cover the first four criteria in the following table: (a) relevance, (b) efficacy, (c) efficiency, and (d) governance and management. A GRPR may also cover (e) resource mobilization and financial management and (f) sustainability, risk, and strategies for devolution or exit if the latter are important issues for the program at the time of GRPR, and if there is sufficient information available on which to base an independent opinion.

Evaluation Criteria and Questions
<p>Relevance: The extent to which the objectives and design of the program are consistent with (a) current global/regional challenges and concerns in a particular development sector and (b) the needs and priorities of beneficiary countries and groups.</p>
<p>1. Supply-side relevance — the existence of an international consensus that global/regional collective action is required.</p> <p>To what extent does the program reflect an international consensus on the need for action, on the definition of the problem being addressed, on priorities, and on strategies for action?</p> <p>Is the original consensus that led to the creation of the program still present? Is the program still needed to address specific global/regional public concerns?</p> <p>Take into account the origin of the program in answering these questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the program formally responsible for implementing an international convention? • Did the program arise out of an international conference? • Is the program facilitating the implementation of formal standards and approaches? • Is the program primarily donor-driven? Did donors establish the program with little consultation with developing countries? • Is the program primarily Bank-driven? Did the World Bank found the program and then seek other partners?
<p>2. Demand-side relevance — alignment with beneficiary needs, priorities, and strategies.</p> <p>To what extent are the objectives consistent with the needs, priorities, and strategies of beneficiary countries as articulated in the countries' own PRSPs, and in donors' strategies such as the World Bank CASs, and the UN Development Assistance Frameworks?</p> <p>To what extent has the voice of developing and transition countries been expressed in the international consensus underlying the program?</p>
<p>3. Vertical relevance — consistency with the subsidiarity principle.</p> <p>To what extent are the activities of the program being carried out at the most appropriate level — global, regional, national, or local — in terms of efficiency and responsiveness to the needs of beneficiaries?</p> <p>To what extent are the activities of the program competing with or substituting for activities that individual donors or countries could do more efficiently by themselves?</p> <p>Pay particular attention to those programs that, on the face of it, are primarily supporting the provision of national or local public goods.</p>
<p>4. Horizontal relevance — the absence of alternative sources of supply.</p> <p>What is the comparative advantage, value added, or core competency of the program relative to other GRPPs with similar or complementary objectives? To what extent is the program providing additional funding, advocacy, or technical capacity that is otherwise unavailable to meet the program's objectives?</p> <p>To what extent are the good and services being provided by the program in the nature of public goods? Are there alternative ways of providing these goods and services, such as by the private sector under regular market conditions?</p>

Evaluation Criteria and Questions
<p>5. Relevance of the design of the program</p> <p>To what extent are the strategies and priority activities of the program appropriate for achieving its objectives?</p> <p>What are the major activities of the program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy and knowledge networking? • Financing country and local-level technical assistance? • Financing investments to deliver national, regional, or global public goods? (See Annex Table 7.) <p>Has the program articulated an expected results chain or logical framework, along with assumptions that relate the progress of activities with the achievement of the objectives? Does the results chain identify the extent to which the achievement of the objectives depends on the effective functioning of bureaucracies, markets, or collectivities? If so, to what extent are these assumptions valid?</p> <p>For programs providing global or regional public goods, is the design of the program consistent with the way in which the individual efforts of the partners contribute to the collective outcome for the program as a whole — whether “best shot”, “summation”, or “weakest link?”</p>
<p>Efficacy: The extent to which the program has achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, taking into account their relative importance.</p>
<p>6. Achievement of objectives</p> <p>To what extent have the stated objectives of the program been achieved, or has satisfactory progress been made towards achieving these objectives?</p> <p>To what extent are there implicit objectives that are well understood and agreed upon by the partners and to which the program should also be held accountable?</p> <p>To what extent are there any positive, unintended outcomes of the program that have been convincingly documented?</p> <p>To what extent have these assessments by the program or the evaluation been evidence-based?</p>
<p>7. Progress of activities, outputs, and outcomes.</p> <p>To what extent has the program or the evaluation measured the progress of activities, outputs, and outcomes?</p> <p>How did the program or the evaluation aggregate its outputs and outcomes at all levels — global, regional, national, and local — to provide an overall summary of its results?</p> <p>To what extent have factors such as changes in the location of the program, its legal structure, or governance processes affected the outputs and outcomes of the program?</p> <p>To what extent have there been outcomes that can be uniquely attributed to the partnership itself — such as the scale of or joint activities made possible by its organizational setup as a GRPP, or its institutional linkages to a host organization?</p>
<p>8. Linkages to country or local-level activities.</p> <p>To what extent has the program established effective operational linkages with country-level activities, taking into account that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The desired nature of these linkages will vary according to the objectives, design, and implementation of each program? • Positive outcomes at the country or local level are generally a joint product of both global/regional and county-level activities?

Evaluation Criteria and Questions

Efficiency or cost-effectiveness:

Efficiency — the extent to which the program has converted or is expected to convert its resources/inputs (such as funds, expertise, time, etc.) economically into results.

Cost-effectiveness — the extent to which the program has achieved or is expected to achieve its results at a lower cost compared with alternatives.

9. Efficiency

To what extent is it possible to place a monetary value on the benefits arising from the activities of the program?

To what extent has the program or the evaluation conducted impact evaluations of representative program activities?

To what extent has the program or the evaluation analyzed the program's costs in broad categories (such as overhead vs. activity costs), and categorized the program's activities and associated benefits, even if these cannot be valued in monetary terms?

10. Cost-effectiveness

To what extent is the program measuring up against its own business plans:

- Has the program cost more or less than planned? How did it measure up against its own costing schedule?
- Have there been any obvious cases of inefficiency or wasted resources?

To what extent is the program delivering its activities cost-effectively in comparison with alternatives:

- How do actual costs compare with benchmarks from similar programs or activities?
- Are the overhead costs of governing and managing the program reasonable and appropriate in relation to the objectives and activities of the program?

How does the program compare with traditional development assistance programs:

- For beneficiary countries, has receiving the development assistance through the GRPP increased the transactions costs compared with traditional development assistance programs?
- For donors, has delivering the development assistance through the GRPP reduced donor costs by harmonizing efforts among donors or by reducing overlapping work (such as through joint supervision, monitoring and evaluation)?

Governance and management:

Governance — the structures, functions, processes, and organizational traditions that have been put in place within the context of a program's authorizing environment to ensure that the program is run in such a way that it achieves its objectives in an effective and transparent manner.

Management — the day-to-day operation of the program within the context of the strategies, policies, processes, and procedures that have been established by the governing body. Whereas governance is concerned with "doing the right thing," management is concerned with "doing things right."

11. Compliance with generally accepted principles of good governance.

To what extent are the governance and management structures and processes well articulated and working well to bring about legitimate and effective governance and management?

To what extent do governance and management practices comply with the following seven principles:

- **Legitimacy** — the way in which governmental and managerial authority is exercised in relation to those with a legitimate interest in the program — including shareholders, other stakeholders, implementers, beneficiaries, and the community at large?
- **Accountability** — the extent to which accountability is defined, accepted, and exercised along the chain of command and control within a program, starting with the annual general meeting of the members or parties at the top and going down to the executive board, the chief executive officer, task team leaders, implementers, and in some cases, to the beneficiaries of the program?
- **Responsibility** — the extent to which the program accepts and exercises responsibility to stakeholders who are not directly involved in the governance of the program and who are not part of the direct chain of accountability in the implementation of the program?
- **Fairness** — the extent to which partners and participants, similarly situated, have equal opportunity to influence the program and to receive benefits from the program?

Evaluation Criteria and Questions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transparency — the extent to which a program’s decision making, reporting, and evaluation processes are open and freely available to the general public? • Efficiency — the extent to which the governance and management structures enhance efficiency or cost-effectiveness in the allocation and use of the program’s resources? • Probity — the adherence by all persons in leadership positions to high standards of ethics and professional conduct over and above compliance with the rules and regulations governing the operation of the program?
<p>12. Partnerships and participation</p> <p>To what extent has the program identified a complete list of stakeholders, or “stakeholder map”, including the agreed-upon or perceived roles and responsibilities of the categories of stakeholders identified? To what extent is this a routine programmatic function, updated regularly, and transparently available?</p> <p>Has the program adopted primarily a shareholder model of governance (in which membership on the governing body is limited to financial and other contributors), or a stakeholder model (in which membership also includes non-contributors)?</p> <p>To what extent, if any, is the program’s legitimacy being sacrificed in order to achieve greater efficiency, or vice-versa?</p>
<p>13. Programs located in host organizations</p> <p>To what extent is the location of the program in the Bank or other partner organization adversely affecting the governance, management, or other aspects of the program, such as compliance with the principles of transparency and fairness?</p> <p>For which functions is the program manager accountable to the host organization and the governing body of the program, respectively? Are conflicts of interest being managed appropriately?</p> <p>To what extent does the host organization play such a dominant role in the program, thereby reducing the incentives of other partners to participate effectively, or reducing the ability of the host organization to look at the weaknesses of the program objectively?</p>
<p>Resource mobilization and financial management:</p> <p>Resource mobilization — the processes by which resources are solicited by a program and provided by donors and partners.</p> <p>Financial management — the processes that govern the recording and use of funds, including allocation processes, crediting and debiting of accounts, controls that restrict use, accounting, and periodic financial reporting systems. In cases where funds accumulate over time, this would also include the management of the cash and investment portfolio.</p>
<p>14. Resource mobilization</p> <p>To what extent has the program succeeded in raising financial resources commensurate with its objectives? And from what sources — the Bank, bilateral donors, foundations, etc.?</p> <p>To what extent has the program succeeded in diversifying its funding beyond a small number of donors?</p> <p>To what extent are the sources of funding for the program (including donor restrictions on the use of resources) affecting, positively or negatively:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategic focus of the program? • The outputs and outcomes of the program? • The governance and management of the program? • The sustainability of the program?
<p>15. Financial management</p> <p>Are there any issues that have emerged during the course of the review in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The quality of financial management and accounting? • The methods, criteria, and processes for allocating funds among different activities of the program? • Financial management during the early stages of the program?

Evaluation Criteria and Questions

Sustainability, risk, and strategy for devolution or exit:

Sustainability — When applied to the **activities of a program**, the extent to which the benefits arising from these activities are likely to continue after the activities have been completed. When applied to a **program** itself, the extent to which the organization or program is likely to continue its operational activities over time.

Devolution or exit strategy — a proactive strategy to change the design of a program, to devolve some of its implementation responsibilities, to reduce dependency on external funding, or to phase out the program on the grounds that it has achieved its objectives or that its current design is no longer the best way to sustain the results which the program has achieved.

16. Sustainability of the benefits of the program's activities

What is the risk, at the time of evaluation, that the development outcomes (or expected outcomes) of the program will not be maintained (or realized)? This depends on (a) the likelihood that some changes may occur that are detrimental to maintaining or realizing the expected outcomes, and (b) the affect on the expected outcomes if some or all of these changes actually materialize?

17. Sustainability of the program

This will depend on a number of factors, such as the continued legitimacy of the program, its financial stability, its continuity of effective management, and its ability to withstand changing market or other conditions.

To what extent is there still a sufficient convergence or accommodation of interests among the major partners to sustain the program financially? To what extent has the program developed institutional capacity such as performance-based management, personnel policies, learning programs, and knowledge management that help to sustain a program?

In what areas could the program improve in order to enhance its sustainability, such as better marketing of the program's achievements in order to sustain its reputation?

18. Prospects for continuation and strategies for devolution or exit

To what extent should the program be sustained?

Is the continuation of the program the best way of sustaining the results achieved?

Should the design of the program be modified as a result of changed circumstances, either positive or negative?

What other alternatives should be considered to sustain the program's results more cost-effectively, in the light of the previous evaluation findings with respect to relevance, efficacy, efficiency, and sustainability:

- Reinventing the program with the same governance?
- Phasing out the program?
- Continuing country or local-level activities with or without devolution of implementation?
- Seeking alternative financing arrangements, such as revenue-generation, or self-financing to reduce dependency on external sources?
- "Spinning off" from the host organization?

Annex Table 3. Assessing the Bank's Performance as a Partner in the Program

Evaluation Questions
<p>1. Comparative advantage at the global/regional level. To what extent is the Bank playing up to its comparative advantages at the global/regional level — its global mandate and reach and convening power? To what extent is the Bank's presence as a partner in the program catalyzing other resources and partners for the program?</p>
<p>2. Comparative advantage at the country level. To what extent is the Bank contributing multi-sector capacity, analytical expertise, and country-level knowledge to the program? To what extent has the Bank's country operations established linkages to the GRPP, where appropriate, to enhance the effectiveness of both?</p>
<p>3. Oversight. To what extent is the Bank exercising effective and independent oversight of its involvement in the program, as appropriate, whether the program is housed in the Bank or externally managed? To what extent is the Bank's oversight independent of the management of the program? To what extent does the Bank's representative on the governing body have a clear terms of reference?</p>
<p>4. Risks and risk management. To what extent have the risks associated with the program been identified and are being effectively managed? For example, IEG identified the following risks in its global review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bank bears a disproportionate share of responsibility for governing and managing in-house programs? • Confusion at the country level between global program activities, Bank activities, and Borrower activities? • Representation of NGOs and the commercial private sector on program governing bodies? • Unclear role and application of Bank's safeguards? • Trust-funded consultants and seconded staff representing the Bank on some program governing bodies?
<p>5. Disengagement strategy. To what extent is the Bank engaged at the appropriate level in relation to the Bank's new strategic framework:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Watching brief? • Research and knowledge exchange? • Policy or advocacy network? • Operational platform? <p>To what extent is the Bank facilitating an effective, flexible, and transparent disengagement strategy for the program, in relation to the Bank's objectives for its involvement in the program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program declares "mission accomplished" and closes? • The program continues and the Bank withdraws from all aspects of its participation? • The program continues and the Bank remains engaged, but the degree of the Bank's engagement in some or all aspects (such as financing) declines over time?

Annex Table 4. Standard IEG/OPCS Evaluation Criteria for Investment Projects /1

Criterion	Standard Definitions for Lending Operations
<i>Relevance</i>	The extent to which the project's objectives are consistent (a) with the country's current development priorities and (b) with current Bank country and sectoral assistance strategies and corporate goals (expressed in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers, Country Assistance Strategies, Sector Strategy Papers, Operational Policies).
<i>Efficacy</i>	The extent to which the project's objectives were achieved, or expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.
<i>Efficiency</i>	The extent to which the project achieved, or is expected to achieve, a return higher than the opportunity cost of capital and benefits at least cost compared to alternatives.
<i>Outcome</i>	The extent to which the project's major relevant objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, efficiently.
<i>Risk to Development Outcome</i>	The risk, at the time of the evaluation, that development outcomes (or expected outcomes) will not be maintained (or realized).
<i>Bank Performance</i>	The extent to which services provided by the Bank ensured quality at entry of the operation and supported implementation through appropriate supervision (including ensuring adequate transition arrangements for regular operation of the supported activities after loan/credit closing) towards the achievement of development outcomes.
<i>Borrower Performance</i>	The extent to which the borrower (including the government and implementing agency or agencies) ensured quality of preparation and implementation, and complied with covenants and agreements, towards the achievement of development objectives and sustainability.

/1 These are the most recent harmonized evaluation criteria for ICR and IEG evaluations which became effective on July 1, 2006. These apply to both investment and development policy lending.

Annex Table 5. World Bank Selectivity and Oversight of GRPPs

Selectivity Criteria for Bank Engagement in Global Programs and Partnerships (May 2005) /1

1. International consensus that global action is required
2. Consistency with the Bank's development objectives
3. Need for Bank action to catalyze other resources and partners
4. Disproportionate benefits for client countries, and likelihood of results at the country level
5. Quality of partnerships

Approval Criteria for Bank Involvement in Partnership Initiatives Beyond the Country Level: Established by Bank Management (November 2000) /2

1. A clear linkage to the Bank's core institutional objectives and, above all, to the Bank's country operational work
2. A strong case for Bank participation based on comparative advantage
3. A clear assessment of the financial and reputational risks to the Bank and how these will be managed
4. A thorough analysis of the expected level of Bank resources required, both money and time, as well as the contribution of other partners
5. A clear delineation of how the new commitment will be implemented, managed, and assessed
6. A clear plan for communicating with and involving key stakeholders, and for informing and consulting the Executive Directors.

Levels of Bank Engagement (May 2005) /3	Priority Global Public Goods Issues for Bank Engagement (May 2005) /4	Strategic Focus for Oversight of Global Programs (March 2003) /5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Watching brief — keeping abreast of significant global and regional issues • Research and knowledge exchange — deepening global understanding of issues that are perceived to be important to Bank members • Policy or advocacy networks — helping to create policies, advocate for initiatives, promote good practices, or improve governance • Operational platform — advocating for global or regional collective action to help establish partnership programs, offer to take leadership, help mobilize and manage resources 	<p>Control of communicable diseases</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria and childhood communicable diseases, including the relevant link to education • Vaccines and drug development for major communicable diseases in developing countries <p>Preservation of environmental commons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change • Water • Forests • Biodiversity, ozone depletion and land degradation • Promoting agricultural research <p>Development knowledge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding development and poverty reduction <p>Labor mobility, migration, and remittances</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Migration flows and their determinants, remittances, brain drain, temporary movement of persons, trade, and foreign direct investment <p>Peace and security</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In particular, links between peace and development 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide global public goods 2. Support international advocacy for reform agendas which in a significant way address policy framework conditions for developing countries 3. Are multi-country programs which crucially depend on highly coordinated approaches 4. Mobilize substantial incremental resources that can be effectively used for development

/1 From the Development Committee Communiqué issued on September 25, 2000. Revised in "A Strategic Framework for the World Bank's Global Programs and Partnerships" (SecM2005-0250), May 3, 2005.

/2 From the Board paper, "Partnership Oversight and Selectivity," April 28, 2000, and an internal memorandum from Sven Sandstrom to all vice presidents, dated November 6, 2000. Global programs are expected to meet all six approval criteria.

/3 From "A Strategic Framework for the World Bank's Global Programs and Partnerships" (SecM2005-0250), May 3, 2005.

/4 From the *Strategic Directions Paper for FY02-04*, March 28, 2001. Revised in "A Strategic Framework for the World Bank's Global Programs and Partnerships" (SecM2005-0250), May 3, 2005.

/5 From the "Update on Management of Global Programs and Partnerships," memorandum to the Executive Directors, March 5, 2003. This Board update on the management of global programs and partnerships in the Bank also stated that "the principle of subsidiarity would be more rigorously applied when deciding whether a global program should be established and whether an activity should be carried out by the global program rather than, as the preferred option, implemented through country operations."

Annex Table 6. Eligibility Criteria for Grant Support from the Development Grant Facility

1. Subsidiarity	The program contributes to furthering the Bank's development and resource mobilization objectives in fields basic to its operations, but it does not compete with or substitute for regular Bank instruments. Grants should address new or critical development problems, and should be clearly distinguishable from the Bank's regular programs.
2. Comparative advantage	The Bank has a distinct comparative advantage in being associated with the program; it does not replicate the role of other donors. The relevant operational strengths of the Bank are in economic, policy, sector and project analysis, and management of development activities. In administering grants, the Bank has expertise in donor coordination, fund raising, and fund management.
3. Multi-country benefits	The program encompasses multi-country benefits or activities which it would not be efficient, practical or appropriate to undertake at the country level. For example, informational economies of scale are important for research and technology work, and operations to control diseases or address environmental concerns (such as protect fragile ecosystems) might require a regional or global scope to be effective. In the case of grants directed to a single country, the program will encompass capacity-building activities where this is a significant part of the Country Assistance Strategy and cannot be supported by other Bank instruments or by other donors. This will include, in particular, programs funded under the Institutional Development Fund, and programs related to initial post-conflict reconstruction efforts (e.g., in countries or territories emerging from internal strife or instability).
4. Leverage	The Bank's presence provides significant leverage for generating financial support from other donors. Bank involvement should provide assurance to other donors of program effectiveness, as well as sound financial management and administration. Grants should generally not exceed 15 percent of expected funding over the life of Bank funding to a given program, or over the rolling 3-year plan period, whichever is shorter. Where grant programs belong to new areas of activities (involving, e.g., innovations, pilot projects, or seed-capital) some flexibility is allowed for the Bank's financial leverage to build over time, and the target for the Bank grant not to exceed 15 percent of total expected funding will be pursued after allowing for an initial start-up phase (maximum 3 years).
5. Managerial competence	The grant is normally given to an institution with a record of achievement in the program area and financial probity. A new institution may have to be created where no suitable institution exists. The quality of the activities implemented by the recipient institution (existing or new) and the competence of its management are important considerations.
6. Arm's length relationship	The management of the recipient institution is independent of the Bank Group. While quality an arm's length relationship with the Bank's regular programs is essential, the Bank may have a role in the governance of the institution through membership in its governing board or oversight committee. In cases of highly innovative or experimental programs, Bank involvement in supporting the recipient to execute the program will be allowed. This will provide the Bank with an opportunity to benefit from the learning experience, and to build operational links to increase its capacity to deliver more efficient services to client countries.
7. Disengagement strategy	Programs are expected to have an explicit disengagement strategy. In the proposal, monitorable action steps should be outlined indicating milestones and targets for disengagement. The Bank's withdrawal should cause minimal disruption to an ongoing program or activity.
8. Promoting partnerships	Programs and activities should promote and reinforce partnerships with key players in the development arena, e.g., multilateral development banks, UN agencies, foundations, bilateral donors, professional associations, research institutions, private sector corporations, NGOs, and civil society organizations.

Source: World Bank, The Development Grant Facility: FY98 Annual Review and Proposed FY99 DGF Budgets, Oct. 28, 1998.

Annex Table 7. Common GRPP Activities

Policy and knowledge networking	
1. Facilitating communication among practitioners in the sector	This includes providing a central point of contact and communication among practitioners who are working the sector or area of development to facilitate the sharing of analytical results. It might also include the financing of studies.
2. Generating and disseminating information and knowledge	This comprises two related activities. The first is gathering, analyzing and disseminating information, for example, on the evolving HIV/AIDS epidemic and responses to it, including epidemiological data collection and analysis, needs assessment, resource flows, and country readiness. The second is the systematic assembling and dissemination of knowledge (not merely information) with respect to best practices in a sector on a global/ regional basis.
3. Improving donor coordination	This should be an active process, not just the side effect of other program activities. This may involve resolving thorny interagency issues that need addressing.
4. Advocacy	This comprises proactive interaction with policymakers and decision makers concerning approaches to development in a sector, commonly in the context of global, regional, or country-level forums. This is intended to create reform conditions in developing countries, as distinct from physical and institutional investments in public goods, and is more proactive than generating and disseminating information and knowledge.
5. Implementing conventions, rules, or formal and informal standards and norms	Rules are generally formal. Standards can be formal or informal, and binding or nonbinding, but implementing standards involves more than simply advocating an approach to development in a sector. In general, there should be some costs associated with noncompliance. Costs can come in many forms, including exposure to financial contagion, bad financial ratings by the IMF and other rating agencies, with consequent impacts on access to private finance; lack of access to OECD markets for failing to meet food safety standards, or even the consequences of failing to be seen as progressive in international circles.
Financing technical assistance	
6. Supporting national-level policy, institutional, and technical reforms	This is more directed to specific tasks than advocacy. This represents concrete involvement in specific and ongoing policy, institutional, and technical reform processes in a sector, from deciding on a reform strategy to implementation of new policies and regulations in a sector. It is more than just conducting studies.
7. Capacity strengthening and training	This refers to strengthening the capacity of human resources through proactive training (in courses or on-the-job), as well as collaborative work with the active involvement of developing country partners.
8. Catalyzing public or private investments in the sector	This includes improving regulatory frameworks for private investment and implementing pilot investments projects.
Financing investments	
9. Financing country-level investments to deliver national public goods	This refers primarily to physical and institutional investments of the type found in Bank loans and credits (not the financing of studies), the benefits of which accrue primarily at the national level.
10. Financing country-level investments to deliver global/regional public goods	This refers primarily to physical and institutional investments of the type found in Bank loans and credits (not the financing of studies) to deliver public goods such as conserving biodiversity of global value and reducing emissions of ozone-depleting substances and carbon dioxide, the benefits of which accrue globally.
11. Financing global/regional investments to deliver global/regional public goods	This refers to financing research and development for new products and technologies. New products and technologies are generally physical products or processes — the hardware as opposed to the software of development.