

Community Impact: Demonstrating Results to Clients

Many CDD goals, such as increasing social capital and participation, are difficult to measure. It can therefore be challenging for task teams to demonstrate the benefits of CDD projects to clients. The purpose of this note is to provide task team leaders with background information they need to develop effective results frameworks for CDD operations

Basic Principles and Goals for Impact Evaluation

Many of the same principles which apply to impact evaluation in general are relevant for demonstrating the impact of CDD operations:¹

1. Collect baseline data prior to project implementation whenever possible. A careful evaluation requires a well defined and executed baseline survey that gathers information before the project starts. Evaluation design should ideally take place alongside project design and development.
2. Establish a counterfactual. A careful sampling that includes intervention and comparison groups and is based on accurate baseline data is critical to a rigorous evaluation.
3. Use mixed methods. Combining quantitative and qualitative approaches provides a more comprehensive and

nuanced understanding of program impacts than either approach can generate alone.

4. Tailor study design and data collection to project and context.
5. Build close relationships between implementers, local partners and focal points and use existing knowledge to design surveys.

Did you know?

According to a recent OED (IEG) report, an insufficient focus on measuring the impact of CDD projects has prevented the Bank from drawing convincing comparisons between CDD and more traditional investments and policy and institutional reform programs.

Accordingly, and given the constraints discussed throughout this note, task teams should ensure that sufficient funds are allocated to M&E and supervision activities both on the government side and on the World Bank side. As a general rule, between 1 and 2 percent of the project loan should be assigned to routine M&E activities. This is a small price to pay to gain an understanding of whether the remaining 98% of the loan is being well spent.

Economic Results of CDD Programs: Evidence from Burkina Faso, Indonesia and the Philippines

These cases highlight how process evaluation can be used to demonstrate the effectiveness of CDD projects. All three studies found significant unit cost savings from the CDD approach. In comparing the average direct cost per unit (including community counterpart contributions) per square-meter constructed of a building or per kilometer of road with benchmarks from comparable non-CDD government projects, the cost savings were substantial in almost all cases. For example, classrooms in Burkina Faso built by the CDD operation are less than half the cost of those procured through competitive bidding to private contractors and adjudicated by the national procurement board on behalf of the Ministry of Education. Similarly, in Indonesia “numerous factors like isolated locations, double and triple handling of materials, and frequent on-site design modifications all conspire to make it virtually impossible for commercial contractors to compete with [the CDD operation] on a cost basis.” (Van Domelen 2007)

¹ The terms results and impact are used interchangeably throughout the note. This section is adapted from <http://go.worldbank.org/4SDOIMX440>

Using Impact Evaluation to Demonstrate the Effectiveness of CDD Operations to Clients²

Monitoring and evaluation are different yet complementary components of an integrated system, each of which addresses a distinct aspect of the project.

- Monitoring involves the continuous and systematic collection and analysis of data on inputs, outputs, processes and assumptions to determine whether a project is being implemented as designed and make appropriate adjustments. Generally speaking, good monitoring systems allow task teams to collect the data they need to demonstrate results to clients.
- Evaluation, broadly defined, is the objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project, including its design, implementation and results, to determine the relevance and achievement of objectives, project efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

Within evaluation,

- *Process evaluation* examines how the project operates and addresses problems in service delivery. This type of evaluation is useful for improving operational efficiency.
- *Cost analysis* assesses project costs compared to benefits and to alternative uses of the same resources. When the project has been effective, these evaluations can be used to convince clients to scale up or expand CDD operations to other areas of the country.
- *Impact evaluation* seeks to determine whether the project had the desired

effects on individuals, households and institutions and whether those effects are attributable to the project.

The evaluation process represents an opportunity both to show clients the benefits of CDD projects and to shape the formulation of public policy. However, a recent OED (IEG) report found that fewer than 10 percent of CDD operations established a baseline against which to assess the impact of Bank intervention, instead relying largely on with-without comparisons with weak counterfactuals.

Since these with-without comparisons are debatably inappropriate, it is very difficult to tell whether project goals have been achieved using this methodology. At the same time, it is important to note that while the quality of impact evaluation Bank-wide continues to lag, CDD operations have responded to the OED (IEG) report by improving the quality of impact evaluations through the collection of strong baseline data and the allocation of additional resources to M&E.

In order to demonstrate the impact of CDD to clients, task teams need to construct an effective results framework. Task teams should initiate a collaborative approach to this process in order to ensure ownership and build consensus among local counterparts. The following methodology can be used to guide the process:

- Think carefully about what the project should achieve: “What is the key problem we

Case Study: KALAH I in the Phillipines

A sound impact evaluation requires substantial resources and planning concurrent with project design. In the context of KALAH I-CIDSS, the challenge was to design a high quality impact evaluation within the given financial, logistical, and CDD-specific constraints. Ideally, evaluation design should take place alongside project design and development. However, given logistical and resource constraints, initial thinking about impact evaluation often occurs only after the project has begun—this was the case with KALAH I-CIDSS.

While this presented a challenge to the quality of the design, the phasing of project implementation allowed for the collection of quality baseline data in Phase III municipalities before the project was launched there. Several other CDD programs follow a phased approach similar to the one in KALAH I-CIDSS. Accordingly, project implementers should recognize the possibility of collecting quality baseline data despite lack of early planning. (Community-Driven Development and Social Capital, 2006)

² Parts of this section are adapted from Adam 2006

- are trying to solve at the community level?”
- Think about the results/outcomes indicators and the precise targets. It is important to note that successful CDD projects usually achieve one of the following:
 - Increase the use of (and satisfaction with) basic infrastructure and social services
 - Increase communities' capacity to plan, implement and maintain development projects
 - Improve local governance

Gathering Baseline Data

Collecting baseline data is a crucial part of demonstrating community impact. First, it ensures that the project's rationale is based on facts and not on anecdotes. Second, it ensures that task teams will be able to measure project's impacts rigorously.

- During preparation, team should try to find out what sort of data is available in the country that could be used as a baseline for the operation. If none of the information available is deemed sufficient to serve as a baseline, the team should plan for quality baseline data to be collected. Given the very specific objectives of CDD operations, it is likely that both quantitative and qualitative data will have to be collected.
- If no baseline has been collected before implementation and if no plans have been made to collect some, task teams can ask the facilitators to collect some baseline information during their first visit to the villages they are responsible for. Basic indicators (e.g. population profile, access

to services, etc.) should be developed and facilitators should be trained accordingly. In the course of implementing a baseline survey it is important to assemble a team which will collect accurate baseline data in the field. Task teams should keep the following suggestions in mind:

- Sub-contract surveyors from the area who speak the local language
- Include women surveyors to prevent gender bias
- Hire a supervisor who is well versed in statistics to scrutinize the data
- Pay surveyors reasonable wages in order to provide them with incentives to do a good and comprehensive job. Provide surveyors with adequate training before sending them out into the field
- Randomly verify questionnaires to decrease the likelihood of false responses

Constructing Indicators³

The indicators chosen to measure operational outcomes should be **SMART** (i.e. Specific, Measurable, Attributable, Realistic and, Timely).

- By **specific** we mean that the indicator is related to the results we want to achieve and only to those results.
- By **measurable** we mean that the indicator is very clearly defined and that there is an agreement about how to measure it.
- By **attributable** we mean that the changes in the indicator can be attributed to the project.
- By **realistic** we mean that the target for the indicator can be achieved in a practical

KALAHI: Gathering Baseline Data

The baseline survey instrument consisted of quantitative surveys of households and village officials. The survey instruments, designed in close cooperation with the World Bank to respond to the operational needs of KALAHI-CIDS project management, were field-tested three times before being finalized and translated into local languages. Reputable research institutions operating in each survey area collected the data. This proved to be an efficient arrangement given the diversity in language, local conditions, and political situation in the four survey provinces. The World Bank, local implementing agency and relevant ministry cooperatively designed the survey instruments based on lessons from previous questionnaires. (Community-Driven Development and Social Capital, 2006)

³ The following sections are adapted from Julien Labonne (2007)

manner.

- By **targeted** we mean that the indicator identifies the particular group we want the project to impact.

One simple test that task teams can use to check whether the Project Development Objective is good or not is: “Can you find outcome indicators that are SMART?” If the answer is no, the team should go back to the Project Development Objective and try to find a better one.

Examples of Indicators

Task teams will choose different indicators based on the specific impacts they are attempting to measure. As the examples below highlight, it is possible to develop indicators to measure a wide variety of CDD outcomes. It is important to note that this data can be augmented with information collected through processes such as participatory monitoring and evaluation and focus groups.

1. Selected Infrastructure Outcome Indicators

- % change in the % of households in the targeted communities using basic social and economic infrastructure (water system, rural road, school, health clinic, etc.).
- % change in the % of community members who feel confident in their ability to influence decision-making in the targeted communities.
- % change in the % of women (or other target group) in local decision-making bodies in the targeted communities.
- Change in household per capita expenditures/incomes in the beneficiary communities.

2. Community Grants Indicators

- Economic internal rate of return for major infrastructure types.
- % of users satisfied with the goods and services delivered through the project.
- % of subprojects where the necessary maintenance operations are taking place.

3. Capacity Enhancing Indicators

- Change in the % of local government unit funds allocated through

participatory process in the targeted communities.

- % change in the number of household in the targeted communities requiring services (business permit, tax certificate, etc.) from the local government.
- % change in the % of users of local government services (in the targeted communities) satisfied with the services they receive.

4. Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators

- % of financial and procurement audits that are unqualified
- Number of meetings during which the findings from M&E system are presented to project management.
- % of recommendations from mid-term review implemented.

Monitoring Progress

According to the OED (IEG) report M&E systems for CDD projects should be able to:

- 1) Tell whether adequate qualitative and quantitative progress is being made toward meeting the project objectives.
- 2) Tell whether the Bank’s resources are being used effectively and efficiently.
- 3) Give some indication of whether progress is being made in reaching the poor and the poorest.
- 4) Provide information on safeguard and fiduciary compliance.
- 5) Give an indication of whether sustainability can be ensured.

If the system is not accomplishing these five goals, corrections must be made at the mid-term review.

A Project Timeline for Impact Evaluation

Preparation

- Explore existing data that might be relevant for the project’s baseline.
- First workshop with local partners to discuss the Project Development Objective and the intermediate results. This should take place before the Project Concept Note is outlined (about 2 days).
- Second workshop with local partners to agree on the Project Development Objective, the intermediate results and the outcome indicators. During this workshop, the team should clarify with

the local partners how the indicators will be measured, what kind of data will have to be collected and who will be responsible for data collection. This should take place before the Quality Enhancement Review. (about 2 days).

- Start thinking about the M&E system. This should take place before the Quality Enhancement Review.

Appraisal

- Finalize the results framework.
- If the information available in the country is not deemed sufficient, the task team should make arrangements to collect quality baseline data. The data collection exercise should be finalized before project implementation starts (about 6 months).
- Work with the local partners to finalize the M&E system.
- Train the local staff on how to use the M&E system. Launch the M&E system and ensure that it is working properly.
- Ensure that the operation manual clearly state the field teams' responsibilities in terms of data collection.

Implementation and Supervision

- Ensure that the baseline is available before the project starts.
- Ensure that the progress reports are of good quality and are released on time. These reports should be used by management to understand what works and what does not and to modify the way the project is operating accordingly.
- Data similar to the baseline should be collected during the mid-term review. This should allow the project's management team to measure project's preliminary impacts and to make the necessary adjustments to project design.

Implementation and Completion

- Use the progress reports released up-to-date to prepare the Implementation Completion Report.

Evaluation

- Launch the last round of data collection. A note explaining what worked, what did not and why should be prepared and

disseminated to teams preparing similar projects.

For Further Reading:

1. Julien Labonne, Preparing a Results Framework for CDD projects: A Guidance Note, World Bank (Forthcoming-contact the SDV anchor for more information)
2. Sarah Adam, Evaluating Social Impact: A Toolkit for Task Teams and Social Funds Managers, World Bank (2006)
3. Julie Van Domelen, Economic Results of CDD Programs: Evidence from Burkina Faso, Indonesia and the Philippines, World Bank (2007)
4. Community-Driven Development and Social Capital: Designing a Baseline Survey in the Philippines, World Bank (2006)
5. Salimah Sanji and Mona Sur, "Developing a High Quality Baseline", Presentation in June (2006), New Delhi
6. Impact Evaluation and the Project Cycle, World Bank (2006)
7. Conducting Quality Impact Evaluations Under Budget, Data and Time Constraints, World Bank (2006)
8. The Effectiveness of World Bank Support for Community-Based and Driven-Development, OED (IEG) (2005)
9. Robert Chambers, Who Counts? The Quite Revolution of Participation and Numbers, IDS (2007)

The Social Development Department presents the "How to Series", a set of occasional papers aimed at synthesizing social development research and operational best practices in a format which is easily accessible to development practitioners.

For more information about the Series, visit us online at www.worldbank.org/socialdevelopment or contact us at socialdevelopment@worldbank.org

Portions of this note were adapted from the readings listed in the sources section. The note was compiled and authored by David Post. The author would like to thank Caroline Kende Robb, Gillette Hall, Rob Chase, Scott Guggenheim, Dan Owen, Julien Labonne, Danielle Christophe, and Robin Mearns.