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Monitoring and Evaluation at the Project Level

- Increased focus on results – we need to do a better job
  - Show progress in implementation
  - Impact of our projects
  - Demonstrate link between transport, growth, and poverty reduction
M&E at the Bank

Why aren’t we doing better?

- Government Reluctance
- Costs/Financing
- Data
- Technical capacity limited
Definitions and Approaches to M&E

- **PSIA - Poverty and Social Impact Analysis** during project preparation, ex-ante, feeds into policy design
- **Monitoring**: During program/project implementation
- **Evaluation**: Ex-post, focusing on lessons from implementation, particularly impact
- Should look at country/regional levels when possible (at least urban/rural).
PSIA

PSIA: mostly used for policy analysis – examines assumptions and causality from policy change to impacts on stakeholders

Analysis of the distributional impact of policy reforms on the well-being of different groups with a particular focus on the poor and vulnerable.

Tools: Economic models, social assessments
PSIA for Transport

- Reforms/Policies
  - Infrastructure
  - Transport services
  - Fuel levy/ subsidies
  - Road taxes
  - Regulation
**Monitoring: During program implementation**

- Assess program implementation on a regular basis
- Uses goals, indicators, and targets
- Information on inputs, outputs, as well as quality and process
- Indicators available with frequency
- Participatory monitoring, citizens report cards
Transport Performance Indicators

- Anchor work, comprehensive list of indicators focused on: access, affordability, quality, efficiency, fiscal cost, financial autonomy, institutional development
- Access to all season roads (% of population) – IDA indicator
- Anchor Contact: Peter Roberts
Evaluation

- **Process Evaluation:** Assesses project implementation, largely based on monitoring data, and qualitative assessment.

- **Impact Evaluation (ex-post):** Determines if a program had the desired effects on individuals, households, and institutions and whether these effects are attributable to the program intervention.
Impact Evaluation (ex-post)

- Requires the *counterfactual* - what would have happened if the project had not taken place.
- Not appropriate for all programs (pilot, replicable, input to future loans, government interest)
Methods of Impact Evaluation

- Experimental design
- Quasi-experimental design
- Qualitative methods
- Cost benefit/effectiveness
- Designs for Policy Reforms
Implementation issues for Monitoring and Evaluation

- Clarify objectives
- Who is responsible?
  - Inside/outside project/ministry, local/international, private/public
- Data requirements
  - Existing data resources?
  - Timing (fits with M&E framework)
  - Frequency
  - Quality
  - Spatially disaggregated data is a particular challenge
Data

- Administrative, MIS
- Household surveys
- Public finance
- Access data
- Use data
- Satisfaction surveys
- Infrastructure surveys
- Perceptions data
- Report cards
- Participatory methods
- Community surveys
- Demographic and health surveys (DHS)
- Census
Financing

- Trust funds
- From project, other Government Resources, Research Grants, Donors
- In Bank project evaluations, country usually pays but supplemented by outside funds.
Challenges

- Incentives (countries, cities, task managers)
- Financing (who pays?)
- Capacity (both in-country, Bank)
- Sustainability
- Political Economy (legitimacy of results can be questioned, etc. if unfavorable for projects)