
APPENDIX M: CHAIRMAN'S SUMMARY: COMMITTEE ON DEVELOPMENT EFFECTIVENESS (CODE)

On July 20, 2005 the Committee on Development Effectiveness (CODE) discussed the report *Committing to Results: Improving the Effectiveness of HIV/AIDS Assistance - An OED Evaluation of the World Bank's Assistance for HIV/AIDS Control*, the draft Management Response, and the *Statement of the External Advisory Panel*.

Background. The report was the first comprehensive OED evaluation of the Bank's country-level HIV/AIDS assistance. The objective of the evaluation was to assess the development effectiveness of the Bank's country-level assistance for HIV/AIDS, and to identify lessons to improve ongoing and future initiatives. The evaluation covered the overall HIV/AIDS assistance to a country, including policy dialogue, analytical work, and lending. As of June 2004, the Bank had committed approximately US\$2.5 billion in credits, grants and loans to 62 countries for 106 projects. The report also included an assessment of the assumptions, design, and risks of the ongoing Africa Multi-Country AIDS Program (MAP). MAP projects account for two-thirds of active projects and half of ongoing HIV/AIDS commitments; represent a departure from traditional investment projects that make up the completed HIV/AIDS project portfolio and active portfolio in other regions; focus on the most affected continent and signal the Bank's longer-term commitment. The evaluation drew on other evaluation reports and was complemented by the recent OED evaluation on Global Programs.

OED Comments and Recommendations. OED highlighted two points: (i) the Bank deserved credit for helping to strengthen commitment to fighting HIV/AIDS, to induce governments to act earlier or in a more focused

and cost-effective way, to raise political commitment, and to encourage governments to enlist the NGOs support in public HIV/AIDS programs, and needed to continue its support to countries; and (ii) the Bank needed to go one step further to "commit to results" by helping countries use resources more effectively and efficiently to improve outcomes of HIV/AIDS assistance, with enhanced monitoring and evaluation (M&E). It clarified several aspects of the report including: (i) OED assessed the MAP design based on evidence of completed projects and other sources, but did not evaluate the effectiveness of any MAP projects, none of which had yet closed; (ii) the report supported a prioritized multisectoral response, and did not advocate that Ministries of Health should control national investment in HIV/AIDS assistance in all countries; (iii) the report cited community involvement as a major achievement, but also pointed out the need to strengthen M&E of its effectiveness in producing outcomes and to better articulate the objectives of the engagement of different segments of civil society; and (iv) OED recommendations concerning HIV prevention among individuals with highest risk behavior were intended as an addition to, rather than replacement for, assistance to the broader population in a generalized epidemic. OED also emphasized that the report pertained to all Bank HIV/AIDS assistance, and not just to Africa. Recommendations for all Bank assistance included: (i) help governments to be more strategic and selective, to prioritize and implement activities that will have the greatest impact, including ensuring that public goods and prevention among those most likely to spread HIV are supported; (ii) strengthen national institutions for managing and implementing the long-run response,

particularly in the health sector; and (iii) improve the local evidence base for decision making by creating incentives for evaluation of program activities and rigorous analytic work.

Management Response. Management welcomed the report, and agreed with many points raised, as well as with the thrust of the recommendations. It commented that many issues raised were being addressed including the specific ones for the MAP, which had been internally reviewed. It supported the OED emphasis on the need to further enhance efficiency and effectiveness of Bank support to improve outcomes, while stressing that the Bank was not the only institution providing assistance in this area. Management acknowledged the limitations identified by OED, which also emerged in its internal review such as need to help improve national strategic planning and prioritization of assistance, and to enhance M&E. It also noted that improvements in M&E required the concerted action of national and international partners, and not just of the Bank. Two areas where views differed were: role of communities and civil society, where Management considered that they had an integral and complementary role to government; and focus on health sector versus a multi-sector approach where Management emphasized need to strengthen the sector and simultaneously work with other sectors.

Overall Conclusions and Next Steps. The Committee welcomed the evaluation report and there was a rich discussion on the challenges of addressing HIV/AIDS. Members reaffirmed the Bank's role, together with other development partners, in responding to the complex and pressing issue of HIV/AIDS that threatens to undermine progress in development. Given the challenging nature of HIV/AIDS, members stressed the need for bold, innovative, and flexible responses, and also reconfirmed the need for a multisectoral approach. Some members found the OED evaluation useful for a fundamental and substantial debate in clarifying the Bank's role. There was broad agreement with many recommendations, except for those related to community-based responses and high-

risk groups, as elaborated below. Several members had questions about the evaluation methodology and concerns about its tone, and commented on aspects that OED could have expanded upon or incorporated more. Members supported the thrust of the draft Management Response (MR) and recognized the recent efforts to strengthen Bank assistance, particularly of Africa Multi-Country AIDS Program (MAP) through several self-critical internal reviews including the 2004 MAP Interim Review.

Speakers' comments focused on the following areas: country ownership and commitment; multisectoral approach and role of the Ministry of Health; targeting of assistance; community development approach and involvement of civil society; M&E; and alignment with global initiatives and partnerships. The Committee generally supported the External Advisory Panel's proposal for a strategy to guide overall Bank assistance to address HIV/AIDS.

The following main issues were raised during the meeting:

Importance of Country Ownership and Commitment. The importance of broad national commitment including of governments and local communities, and country specific strategies for effective HIV/AIDS intervention, including for MAP, were emphasized. There was agreement with the OED recommendation that the Bank should help governments to develop strong and sufficiently prioritized nationally owned strategies, which should serve as basis of coordinated donor support. Questions were raised about how the Bank supports integration of HIV/AIDS issues into development planning, poverty reduction strategies, and budget allocation processes and also mainstreams these into the country assistance strategy. Others stressed the need to prioritize capacity building of governments, local communities, and NGOs to tackle the disease.

Support for Multisectoral Approach. Members and speakers stressed that HIV/AIDS required an integrated and multisectoral response. Several members commented on the complexity of a multisectoral approach that necessitated

the highest level of political commitment, strong leadership, and clarity of roles of various stakeholders on the ground, including that of the Ministries of Health (MoHs). While some speakers agreed with the OED report that MoHs had a central role and the health sector needed to be generally strengthened, others shared Management's views and objected to the report's implicit suggestion that MoHs should control national investment in HIV/AIDS or that assistance to HIV/AIDS has been made at the expense of broader health sector development. Other speakers also emphasized the importance of broad partnerships at the country level, and implementation roles defined by country specific context. A member felt the report had been misinterpreted and understood that in some instances MOHs could play a more important role to coordinate the implementation of multisectoral activities by various stakeholders. Some speakers also commented on the potential benefits of regional approaches and gave examples, including the Lagos-Abidjan project. Supporting the multisectoral approach, OED found that such an approach based in the MoHs had been successful in enlisting key ministries when there was strong political commitment. It also stated that implementation arrangements should be country specific and reiterated the report recommendation for the Bank to focus on implementation of activities in sectors that have a greatest potential impact on the epidemic and with some comparative advantage. Management stated the global development community considered HIV/AIDS a broad development issue that cannot be tackled by focusing on one sector, while strengthening health sector remains important.

Targeting Assistance. Some speakers expressed concerns about the OED recommendation suggesting high risk groups and high risk behaviors be targeted. They shared Management's views about the complexity of transmission and risk, while others noted the disagreement between OED and Management on the main cause of infections. One member said that focus of assistance should be on women and youth. Members stressed the need for more careful and nuanced

assessment, including the cultural and social dynamics, for better understanding and to support nationally owned strategy. OED said it was not proposing that Bank assistance only target high risk groups and behaviors at the expense of other types of support in generalized epidemics. It stated that evidence collected suggested that prevention information and services were not reaching high risk groups, which should be addressed.

Role of Communities. Several speakers disagreed with the recommendations concerning community-based responses and supported Management's response; many speakers viewed that community-based responses and involvement of civil society were important. A member reserved judgment about whether the findings of the evaluation on community development (CD) were applicable to HIV/AIDS or whether a special case could be made for role of local communities in effectively addressing HIV/AIDS. OED explained that the HIV/AIDS report supported involvement of communities and civil society, and recognized Bank efforts to encourage governments to work with NGOs and communities to implement national HIV/AIDS responses. At the same time, OED reiterated that M&E of community level activities had been weak and little was known so far about their effectiveness. Thus, it recommended that objectives of engagement with different segments of civil society be articulated and results of HIV/AIDS assistance following a CD approach be more rigorously evaluated to understand their contribution to outcomes.

Stepping up Research and M&E. The Committee supported the recommendations concerning M&E and view that the Bank should support local capacity building in this area, working with other partners. Specific comments concerning the research base and M&E included: importance of balancing efforts with the emergency nature of HIV/AIDS and need for quick action and immediate results; assessment of underlying factors should consider gender dimensions; challenge of developing clear criteria and outcome indicators, and need to improve data; need for broad partnerships; and impor-

tance of M&E and communication of research work and Bank experience for learning. Questions were raised about the experience of intensified M&E for MAP projects and the role of the Global AIDS Monitoring and Evaluation Team (GAMET) in addressing the weaknesses in M&E. Management elaborated on the extraordinary steps taken by the Bank to strengthen M&E and through GAMET, working with partners to develop manuals and systems to assess countries' progress, and mobilizing global experts to provide country level support. OED acknowledged these efforts but noted that it was too early to know their effectiveness and they will be evaluated in the future in the context of individual country operations.

Need to Link with Other Global Initiatives.

Many speakers commented that the Bank was not operating alone, and the OED report and MR should be linked to the broader global initiatives and partnerships, and harmonization and alignment efforts. They said that Bank assistance needed to be consistent with the Bank's commitments to agreed and prioritized recommendations of the UNAIDS led Global Task Force Team (GTT); and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (GFATM) and "Three Ones" principle.¹ Management emphasized that the Bank's HIV/AIDS assistance represented only a portion of global assistance for HIV/AIDS and commented on its coordinated and complementary support with respect to the recommendations of the GTT, GFATM, and the "Three-Ones." It stressed the centrality of the

GTT and coordinated global efforts to translate the "Three-Ones" vision into concrete action. OED clarified that this evaluation focused on the Bank's country-level assistance and was complemented by the recent OED evaluation on Bank support for global programs, (including in health), which addressed coordination issues with global partners. It noted that this report's findings and recommendations were consistent with those made for global programs.

Welcome a Strategy to Guide Bank's HIV/AIDS Assistance. Some speakers supported the External Advisory Panel's proposal for a Bank strategy to guide its HIV/AIDS assistance.

Comments Related to the OED Evaluation.

Some speakers commented on the evaluation methodology and also commented that the OED evaluation could have given more recognition to the recent actions to improve Bank assistance, in particular of MAP; considered collaboration with other stakeholders including role of private sector, and gender dynamics; and provided more concrete operational recommendation. Responding to some members' questions on how the Bank's self-critical internal evaluations, including the 2004 MAP Interim Review had been considered, OED responded that it had incorporated their findings into its evaluation. On the issue of how OED formulated the recommendations, the Acting Director-General of Operations Evaluation commented that they were prepared in a way to allow Management flexibility in responding to the issues raised.

Chander Moban Vasudev, Chairman