Introduction

1. Results and Performance of the World Bank Group (RAP) is the annual review of what IEG evaluations (and validation work) reveal about the development effectiveness of the World Bank Group (WBG), which includes IBRD/IDA, IFC, and MIGA. The report synthesizes evidence from IEG evaluations, validations, and learning products complemented by relevant information from other sources (e.g., WBG corporate documents). RAP 2018 will be the ninth in a series that began in 2010 with the consolidation of separate annual reports that IEG prepared for the World Bank (IBRD/IDA), IFC, and MIGA, and it will be the sixth one since IEG adopted the approach of focusing one of the RAP chapters on a specific theme.

2. Like recent RAPs, RAP 2018 will have three main chapters. The first chapter will be dedicated to the special theme for RAP 2018, *Inclusive Growth*, and will recapitulate the content of IEG’s planned synthesis paper on inclusive growth. (IEG plans to present this synthesis paper during IEG’s Plenary Session at the 2018 Annual Meetings of the IMF and WBG, October 12-14 in Bali, Indonesia.). The second and core chapter will report on the results and performance of the most recent cohorts of WBG projects. For the World Bank, this cohort includes projects closed in FY15-17. For the IFC investments this includes projects evaluated in CY 15-17, and for IFC advisory services this includes projects evaluated in FY15-17. For MIGA, this cohort includes projects evaluated in FY12-17. The second chapter will also report on results from the recent cohort of country partnership frameworks. The third chapter will be devoted to the Management Action Record (MAR) and review the degree to which Management’s action plans prepared in response to IEG’s recommendations from major thematic, corporate and sector evaluations have been implemented, with a specific look at recommendations that relate to inclusive growth.

3. Over time, IEG has produced a large number of major evaluations that are relevant to the RAP 2018 theme, *Inclusive Growth*, including the 2015 evaluation of *The Poverty Focus of Country Programs* and the 2017 evaluation of *The WBG’s Support for Shared Prosperity*. RAP 2018 will draw from this body of evaluative evidence to distill findings and lessons on the WBG’s contribution to inclusive growth.

4. RAP 2018 will also include Regional and Practice Group updates, which will focus on the results and performance specific to World Bank Group Regions and World Bank Practice Groups. The Regional and Practice Group updates may be presented as separate companion documents or as appendixes, and ways to leverage on-line data dashboards will be explored. A separate appendix will be prepared with a summary of the main findings of IEG large and meso evaluations.
5. This concept note outlines the following for the RAP 2018 report: context; objectives and audience; scope and key questions; approach and methodology; engagement, communication, and dissemination; and team, budget, essential contributions, and timeline.

**Context: Inclusive Growth and World Bank Group Development Effectiveness**

6. The World Bank Group is well-positioned to play an important role in helping achieve inclusive growth in client countries. With an IDA 18 replenishment that provided a significantly larger envelope than in previous replenishment cycles, and with the recent capital increase for IBRD and IFC along with a strong financial position for MIGA, the World Bank Group has the financial capacity to support programs and policies in all client segments, during normal times as well as in time of crisis.

7. To fulfil the promise of inclusive growth, the World Bank Group needs to maximize its development effectiveness and ensure that the policies and programs it supports leave no one behind. First, despite recent gains in terms of development effectiveness, there is room for improvement, as illustrated by several findings from RAP 2017: For the World Bank, project outcome ratings\(^1\) exceeded the corporate target by volume, but not by number of projects, which was driven by the fact that the performance of a few large projects masked the less favorable performance that characterized the vast majority of smaller projects. For the IFC, the development outcome ratings of investment projects continued a downward trend that has been present over a ten-year period, with a sharper decline for IFC advisory services. For MIGA, the development outcome ratings of projects remained unchanged, a situation that has prevailed over a ten-year period.

8. Second, leaving no one behind will require a clear focus on inclusive growth -- a goal that has been elusive in many countries. Although many countries have achieved commendable economic success from a historical perspective, and the world has experienced a significant reduction in poverty, groups of people are left behind in many countries, including in some of the fast-growing economies. A recent report by Oxfam revealed that that four out of five dollars in economic gains made in 2017 had gone to the richest one percent.\(^2\) With increased globalization and interconnections of societies, the lack of inclusiveness of the growth process of national economies has become more visible to national populations and the international community, and the demand for inclusion becomes more pressing. Social discontent arising from steep inequality and uneven access to opportunities, combined with strains on natural resources, have caused conflicts in the past. Economic migration and forced displacement resulting from those conflicts destabilizes societies and places stress on host communities wherever they are in the world.

9. In 1973, WBG President Robert McNamara initiated a radical shift in WB strategy, sharpening its focus on the poorest groups in developing countries, especially "the approximately 40 percent of their
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\(^1\) “Project outcome ratings” refer to Outcome ratings assigned by IEG as part of an ICR Review (IEG’s validation of the Implementation Completion and Results Reports for a World Bank projects), or assigned by IEG as part of a Project Performance Assessment Review.

\(^2\) Oxfam, 2018, Reward Work, Not Wealth.
population who are neither contributing significantly to economic growth nor sharing equitably in economic progress.\textsuperscript{3} The approach to income distribution, however, was fundamentally one of poverty alleviation, and pursued by “accelerating the development of the poorer segments in the society rather than in terms of relative shares of income”.\textsuperscript{4}

10. Since then, various flagship reports – including three World Development Reports (1990, 2000/01, and 2006) – have shed light on the complex relationship between growth, poverty, and inequality, and contributed to recognizing not only the intrinsic value of equity, but also how equity affects the long-term development of countries and the welfare of their people.\textsuperscript{5} They have strongly influenced subsequent WBG strategies.

11. In 2001, committing itself to the Millennium Development Goals, the WBG adopted a strategy with two pillars: reducing poverty through economic growth, which was driven by the private sector, and investing in and empowering people, particularly the poor.\textsuperscript{6} In 2013, the WBG articulated a new strategy with two corporate goals - ending extreme poverty and boosting shared prosperity – to be achieved through growth, inclusion, and sustainability.\textsuperscript{7}

12. The 2013 WBG Strategy stresses that economic growth must create good jobs. It expresses inclusion as empowering all citizens to participate in and benefit from the development process, and embraces inclusive policies that promote equality of opportunity as well as actions that remove barriers against those who are often excluded, such as women, youth, and minorities. It emphasizes sustainability to ensure that today’s development progress is not reversed tomorrow. In support of the WBG’s twin goals, IDA17 introduced “inclusive growth” as a special theme, which was reformulated as “jobs and economic transformation” in IDA18, with emphasis on infrastructure, private sector development, job creation, and regional economic integration.\textsuperscript{8}

13. The advances in the WBG’s thinking as well as its strategies are rooted in the post-war economic paradigm. In the early years after World War II, the prevailing view was that growth involved an initial worsening inequality with a subsequent improvement in income distribution as growth trickled down to poorer people.\textsuperscript{9} Rising inequality was seen as inevitable and not a cause for concern, especially if incidence of poverty was falling. It was even argued that there was a trade-off between

\textsuperscript{3} McNamara, R. 1973, Address to the Board of Directors, Nairobi, Kenya.


\textsuperscript{6} WB, 2001, \textit{Strategic Directions for FY02-FY04: Implementing the World Bank Strategic Framework}.

\textsuperscript{7} WBG Strategy, September 18, 2013, DC2013-0009.


\textsuperscript{9} Kuznets, 1955, Economic Growth and Income Inequality, AER.
equity and efficiency. Some have argued that this thesis was confirmed by the trajectories of advanced economies, and some developing countries, including China during recent decades.

14. The experience of other countries, however, is different. In many countries, including some fast-growing economies, the growth process has failed to produce a turning point after which the rising trend of inequality is reversed; instead, poverty rates have persisted at high levels with groups of people being left behind. Globally, although the evolution of inequality varies from country to country, inequality is higher today than it was 25 years ago in a large number of countries. With increased globalization, technological changes, and interconnections of societies, the lack of inclusiveness of the growth process of national economies has become more visible and the demand for inclusion becomes more pressing. Social discontent arising from steep inequality and uneven access to opportunities combined with strains on natural resources have sometimes led to conflicts, migration, and forced displacement.

15. By the turn of the century, there was a growing recognition that inequality affects the long-term sustainability of growth, and that the equity-efficiency trade-offs may be avoided if redistribution involves an increase in the productive capacity of the poor. Recent research shows that although growth has generally helped reduce the incidence of poverty, this has been less the case in more unequal countries, and high inequality threatens to stall future progress against poverty by attenuating growth prospects. There is also an increasing understanding that poverty is multidimensional, that the impact of growth may differ not just across the income distribution, but also along gender, age, ethnicity, and geographical lines, and that the extent to which growth is inclusive depends not only on how people benefit from its outcomes but also how they engage in the growth process.

16. Despite the broad consensus about the need for a more inclusive model of growth, inclusive growth often remains vaguely defined, and many definitions co-exist in the literature. Focusing on recipients of growth outcomes, inclusive growth must benefit all segments of society, including the poor, the near-poor, middle income groups, and even the rich. Switching the focus from outcomes to opportunities, inclusive growth needs to amplify socioeconomic opportunities among all segments

---


of the population. Emphasizing the pattern of growth, inclusive growth has to be broad-based across sectors and encompass a large part of the labor force. Underlining the dual concept of participation and benefit-sharing, inclusive growth involves an expansion of the number of people contributing productively to and benefiting from growth. Given this variety in conceptual approaches, it is not surprising that empirical measures of inclusive growth have also been varied, including several attempts at constructing a composite inclusive growth index to guide development policies.

While the various concepts and measurement of inclusive growth emphasize different aspects of the broad agenda, they do not contradict one another. All of them can arguably be seen as describing the same aspiration, which is further expressed in the Sustainable Development Goals adopted by the global community in 2015. Separately, each of the 17 goals articulates an aspect of the inclusive agenda; together, they demonstrate the global commitment to leave no-one behind.

In essence, the various concepts of inclusive growth all incorporate a set of key elements for achieving more inclusive growth outcomes, which include:

i. Private sector-led growth that is broad-based across sectors and geographical regions to expand economic opportunities

ii. Human capital development that enhances productive capacities of all people, including the often-excluded, to participate in the growth process;

iii. A safeguard mechanism that ensures socioeconomic equity and resilience against risks to sustain long-term growth.

Anchored on growth, inclusion, and sustainability, the 2013 WBG Strategy subscribes to such a framework for achieving the twin goals. Indeed, the shared prosperity goal - to boost the incomes of the bottom 40 percent of the population – more explicitly emphasizes inclusive growth than has been the case in the past, and, as argued in a recent Policy Research Report, it “paves the way for a focus on inequality, not only of opportunity but also of final outcomes.”

Inclusive Growth in WBG Interventions – Some Evidence from Evaluations

A number of IEG evaluations have looked at the extent to which the World Bank Group has incorporated dimensions of inclusive growth in its knowledge, strategy, and lending work. The 2017 IEG evaluation on Growth for the Bottom 40 Percent considers five channels through which the
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18 Ianchovichina and Lundstrom, 2009, Inclusive Growth Analytics: Framework and Application, PRWP, No. 4851, WB.
WBG supports shared prosperity: building income-generating assets, promoting fair and transparent institutions, supporting equitable and sustainable macroeconomic policies, developing well-functioning markets, and facilitating public and private transfers. This evaluation complements the previous evaluation of the Poverty Focus of Country Programs. The recent evaluation of IFC’s Experience with Inclusive Business looks at its approach to support businesses that provide goods, services, and livelihoods on a commercially viable basis to people living at the base of the economic pyramid. These evaluations show that at the corporate level, the WBG is committed to inclusive growth but the operationalization of corporate strategies across the institution and across client segments is uneven.

21. In addition to these cross-cutting evaluations, selected IEG evaluations shed light on the inclusive growth dimensions of WBG sectoral programs. The following are a few examples:

- In its support to rural non-farm economy, WBG activities have reached the rural poor, reduced vulnerability and increased service access, but they have not generated sufficient, sustained income to lift a large number of poor people out of poverty.
- The WBG’s support to Urban Transport paid insufficient attention to the special needs of women and disabled persons. Affordability of urban transport services is rarely analyzed in the World Bank Group’s projects, with unknown impact on the mobility of the disadvantaged.
- The WBG’s support to Higher Education has emphasized quality but efforts to improve equity and diversity – or to measure these dimensions -- have received less attention; and projects that specified equity as a goal lacked specificity on target population groups.
- The WBG’s support to Health Services emphasized the needs of the poor, the impoverishing effects of illness, health system performance, and financing. However, when a World Bank or IFC project identifies specific disadvantaged population groups as the beneficiaries, the project’s distributional impacts are seldom monitored and evaluated.
- The WBG’s support for Water Supply and Sanitation recognizes disparities between urban, peri-urban, small-town, and rural areas but needs to promote cross-sectoral collaboration to find solutions to the complex problems of municipal pollution, groundwater over-abstraction, and urban flood management and resilience to climate-induced events especially in Lower-middle-income countries and Low-income countries.
- Many of IFC-supported investments aimed at Financial Inclusion of Low-Income Households are in low-income countries. However, within these markets, IFC’s support does not necessarily reach the poorest of the poor. Generating information on impact at the beneficiary level, and monitoring and reporting to what extent IFC’s loans reach the poor and microenterprises, will be important steps going forward.

22. Although these and other evaluations provide a helpful insight into various dimensions of inclusive growth, there is no single document providing a comprehensive view on the extent to which the WBG strategies and operations have been informed by considerations of inclusion or the extent to which the WBG’s support for improving inclusive growth have been effective. Chapter 1 of RAP 2018 will pull together relevant information from existing evaluations in an effort to close this gap.

Objectives and Audience

23. The overarching purpose of RAP 2018 is to provide information on results and performance of the WBG overall, with a special focus on an enhanced understanding of the contribution of the WBG to inclusive growth. The specific objectives are to:
i. report on the results and performance of the WBG’s country- and project-level work, as captured in recent validation reports, independent evaluations, and other analytic work;
ii. within the theme Inclusive Growth, distill lessons from IEG evaluations to inform the WBG on how it can enhance the effectiveness of its strategies and programs;
iii. take stock of how the WBG operationalized its support for inclusive growth;
iv. make findings from IEG evaluations that address different aspects of inclusive growth more easily accessible to a wide range of stakeholders;
v. analyze and report on the management actions in response to recommendations of previous IEG evaluations, with a specific look at recommendations that relate to inclusive growth; and
vi. present findings and messages in an easily readable way, to make the report a useful tool for operational learning.

24. The primary audience of RAP 2018 are the World Bank Group’s Board of Executive Directors. Other important stakeholders include WBG’s senior management; the OPCS Vice Presidency; management of the Global Practices and Regions; IFC and MIGA management (in particular, Directors and Senior Managers); Country Directors and Representatives; and Task Teams of operational projects. WBG clients also constitute an important audience for this report. RAP 2018 will be released publicly, and therefore the external stakeholder groups, including other development agencies and non-government organizations are important stakeholders. A stakeholder analysis is attached as Appendix F.

Scope and Key Questions

25. RAP 2018 will comprise three distinct chapters. Chapter 1 will focus on the special theme to provide a synthesis of IEG evaluative evidence on the WBG’s support for inclusive growth. The main questions to be addressed in the chapter are:

i. To what extent have WBG strategies and operations been informed by considerations of inclusion?
ii. What do we know about the effectiveness of WBG support for improving inclusive growth outcomes?
iii. What are the key lessons and knowledge gaps about the effectiveness of WBG approaches for fostering inclusiveness of growth?

26. While underscoring the fundamental role of growth in economic development, Chapter 1 will eschew discussions of WBG support for growth in general, but focus on the policies and strategies that promote the inclusiveness of growth. As such, it will not examine, for instance, macroeconomic stability in any depth despite its being a cornerstone of growth, poverty reduction, and equity enhancement. Similarly, it will not delve deeply into all aspects of markets and institutions even though they are critical foundations of development. In addition, since a recent IEG synthesis report has extracted available IEG evaluation findings on fiscal and environmental resilience, this report will not repeat those messages.23

27. Instead, Chapter 1 will gather available IEG evaluative evidence on WBG strategies and interventions that have a strong bearing on how the poor and the often-excluded groups, such as women, youth,

23 IEG, 2017, Crisis Response and Resilience to Systemic Shocks.
ethnic minorities, and people from lagging regions, participate in and benefit from the growth process. The central role of jobs, both wage employment and self-employment, will be highlighted. That is, the focus of the chapter will be on WBG support for creating jobs that are accessible to the poor and the often-excluded groups, and for improving their capacity to engage in income-generating activities. To the extent that transfers have an impact on people’s ability to seize economic opportunities and their resilience to shocks, the report will also include the relevant findings from IEG evaluations.

28. Figure 1 maps the topics covered in IEG evaluations to the framework described above in paragraph 18. It should be noted that many issues of relevance to inclusive growth are not reflected here, partly because of lack of recent IEG evaluation on the topic, and partly because of the chosen focus of the report. It is also acknowledged that certain issues are covered within broader elements of the framework; for example, infrastructure is a key factor for creating economic opportunities, even though it is described here as basic services under human capacity development. Where an issue is discussed under the framework does not fundamentally change the relevance or applicability of the underlying evaluative evidence.

Figure 1. A Framework for Inclusive Growth

29. This framework incorporates the various concepts of inclusive growth discussed above, but with a strong focus on the inclusiveness of the growth process. That is, in order for all segments of society to have a fair share of growth outcomes, the poor and the often-excluded groups must be able to contribute productively to and benefit from the growth process. To do so, growth must be broad-based across sectors and regions, and involve people at different skill levels; the poor and the often-excluded groups must have the capacities to participate in the wealth creation process; and society must help the most vulnerable at times of severe difficulties.

30. The special focus on the inclusiveness of growth is consistent with the findings that growth is not inherently pro-poor or inclusive of all people, but must be calibrated to benefit the poor and the often-excluded groups. Recent research shows that some strategies tend to produce better inclusion outcomes than others. The WB’s 2016 *Poverty and Shared Prosperity* report, for example, identifies six high-impact strategies for tackling inequality: early childhood development and nutrition, universal health coverage, universal access to quality education, cash transfers to poor families, rural infrastructure (esp. roads and electrification), and progressive taxation of income. This report will pay special attention to these issues while maintaining a strong focus on the role of jobs and economic opportunities in distilling IEG findings on WBG support for inclusive growth.

31. Chapter 2 will present trends in WBG project- and country-level results and performance, based on IEG’s validations of country-level and project-level self-evaluation reports as well as independent evaluations of projects.

32. Chapter 3 will report on the Management Action Record (MAR), which keeps the WBG Board of Directors and the public informed about the progress of Management’s implementation of its action plans prepared in response to the recommendations from IEG’s evaluations. The chapter will outline the implementation status of Management’s action plans in FY18 and provide an analysis of historical trends of both the implementation ratings and Management’s actions focused on inclusive growth.

33. The report will also include summaries of results and performance at the Regional and Practice Group levels, either as Appendixes or as separate documents. The standard project-level portfolio results and performance will be posted online with links to additional information from IEG evaluations covered in the report.

**Approach and Methodology**

34. Consistent with previous years’ approach, RAP 2018 will synthesize findings from existing IEG project, country, corporate, and thematic evaluations and learning products and engagements, analyze existing IEG and WBG data, conduct desk reviews to draw information from WBG documents, and refer to other relevant information as needed. Additional data may be collected through select interviews with key WBG staff and management. Where there are evidence gaps, the report will acknowledge these and suggest areas for future studies to the WBG. Table 1 in Appendix C provides an overview of topics, approaches, and space allocated to each topic in the main report.

35. To answer the three key questions relating to the special theme, Chapter 1 will draw from IEG thematic, country, and project evaluations, as well as learning products and engagements. The major and meso-evaluations, together with the learning reports, will constitute the primary sources of evidence on WBG engagement in each area. Typically, these evaluations address the questions of how and how effective WBG strategies and programs have supported client countries in the relevant thematic area. Based on analysis of what has and has not worked, they offer suggestions for future improvement. This report will extract findings and lessons from these evaluations through the lens of the poor and other frequently excluded people.

36. An attempt will be made to fill the evidence gaps with findings from IEG country program evaluations (CPEs) and Project Performance Assessment Reports (PPARs). It is recognized, however, that the countries and the projects selected for the CPEs and PPARs do not represent the WBG’s overall client composition or its portfolio. As such, they offer examples of the WBG’s approaches in a specific context, rather than generalizable lessons for the WBG as a whole.
37. The first key question focuses on the WBG’s approach to inclusion. Chapter 1 will distill findings from various IEG evaluations on how WBG corporate, institutional, sector, and country strategies, as well as its lending and knowledge portfolio, have incorporated considerations of the poor and other often excluded groups. Special attention will be paid to how higher-level strategies are translated into operational programs, and to the availability of evidence on how the WB has addressed possible trade-offs between focusing on growth alone or growth that is inclusive. The second key question is about the WBG’s contribution to inclusion outcomes. To answer this question, the chapter will assemble evidence of results at both project and country levels from all completed evaluations. Finally, lessons from all relevant IEG evaluations, with the necessary caveats, will be extracted to answer the third key question. They will be complemented by additional insights and observations gained through the synthesizing exercise. Any remaining evidence gaps will be noted.

38. Chapter 1 will review IEG evaluations completed between FY10 and FY18. (See Appendix D for a list of relevant IEG evaluations.) To the extent that there is uneven coverage of the topics or institutions, that many IEG evaluations were not conducted with an explicit lens on the poor and the often-excluded groups, and that the evaluations cover different time periods, it is expected that evaluative evidence will be uneven across topics. Where evidence gaps exist, the report will acknowledge these.

39. Chapter 2 will present overall and regional results and performance trend data with hyperlinks provided in the report to the standard trend and comparison graphs (e.g., by region, by country income group, by instrument type). (See the RAP 2017 Chapter 2 website for examples.) RAP 2018 will continue to present fully disaggregated ratings data to provide a clearer picture of project results and WBG performance. Chapter 2 will also present insights on:

i. Analysis of “what works” and “what does not” for World Bank projects, in particular related to
   i. quality-at-entry (see Appendix C, Detailed Methodology) and
   ii. lessons learned (based on recent ICRRs and/or PPARs);
ii. Analysis of “what works” and “what does not” based on the evidence from IEG’s validations of IFC investment and advisory services, and MIGA project-level self-evaluation reports;
iii. Update on IFC initiatives/actions related to work quality improvements for investment and advisory projects;
iv. Update on the analysis of the results and performance of evaluated IFC projects with combined advisory and investment support;

25 Some evaluations cover all three WBG institutions (WB, IFC and MIGA), while others only one of them.

26 Typically, IEG evaluations cover WBG activities in the 10 years prior to the evaluation. So the report will refer to WBG strategies and programs between, roughly, 2000 and 2017, although this will vary considerably across topics.

27 In FY17, a joint IFC-IEG working group completed an in-depth study exploring the underlying reasons for poor upfront work quality that was identified as the main driver of IFC investment projects’ declining development outcome ratings. A similar study was initiated by a joint IFC-IEG working group to identify the causes of IFC advisory services projects’ declining development effectiveness ratings. The findings and planned actions of the IFC-IEG learning engagements have been discussed in RAP 2017, therefore, no new analysis will be conducted for RAP 2018. Instead, the discussion of IFC work quality will provide an update of IFC’s actions.
Analysis of MIGA results and performance ratings both by number of projects and by volume.  

40. Similar to previous years, Chapter 2 will also report on: a) performance in meeting IFC and MIGA environmental and social requirements, b) reporting quality for World Bank safeguards, and c) the extent to which gender is reflected in the PDOs, components, or indicators defined for World Bank projects.

41. Chapter 3 will include an update on the implementation of action plans that respond to IEG recommendations from the evaluations produced between FY14-FY17. Reporting will detail percentages of implementation for action plans rated “negligible,” “moderate,” “substantial,” “high,” and “complete.” Following the approach used in RAP 2017, aggregation will be presented for action plans rated “high” and “complete” as well as for action plans rated “substantial,” “high,” and “complete.” In addition, the chapter will include a specific analysis of recommendations and associated action plans, when available, that relate to inclusive growth. The chapter will also provide a brief update on the pilots conducted in FY18 by IEG and WBG Management to deepen their engagement around major evaluations.

**Engagement, Communication and Dissemination**

42. A stakeholder analysis is attached as Appendix G. This analysis may provide the foundation for the development of an engagement, communication, and dissemination strategy.

43. The conference paper that will form the basis for Chapter 1 is expected to serve as the background document for an IEG Plenary Session during the Annual Meetings of the IMF and WBG, October 12-14, 2018, in Bali, Indonesia.

44. Soon after the RAP 2018 report is disclosed, IEG will launch a RAP 2018 website, which is expected to include interactive dashboards that enable users to filter data along key characteristics such as region, country, new Global Practice designation, instrument type, and FCV status. If possible, for World Bank projects only, a feature will be added to provide a table that lists the projects included in each set produced by filtering, and to make this list (including Project IDs and key characteristics) downloadable. For confidentiality reasons, no disaggregated information will be presented for IFC or MIGA projects.

45. Other dissemination ideas include workshops with relevant WBG staff and management, and presentation at the 2019 Spring Meetings. In addition, the findings may be discussed at the Results Measurement and Evaluation Stream seminars, and the potential for engaging with evaluation units from other MDBs will be considered.

46. Tamar Manuelyan Atinc, nonresident senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and former Vice President for Human Development of the WBG; Nora Lustig, Samuel Z. Stone Professor of Latin American Economics and Director of the Commitment to Equity Institute at Tulane University; Xavier Legrain, former Director in the World Bank’s Quality Assurance Group; and David Steel, former Operations Director in the World Bank’s MNA region will serve as peer reviewers.

---

28 In previous RAPs, MIGA project evaluation ratings are analyzed and presented by number of projects only. For RAP 2018, MIGA’s project evaluation ratings will be analyzed and presented by number of projects and by volume.
Consultations with relevant World Bank Group staff and management will be conducted following the usual practice of IEG.

**Team, Budget, Cooperation, and Timeline**

47. Auguste Tano Kouame (Director, IEGHE) and Emanuela Di Gropello (Manager, IEGHC) will provide overall direction and guidance for RAP 2018. Task Team Leaders up through the Concept Note One-Stop meeting were Joy Behrens, Xiaolun Sun, Aurora Medina Siy. Task Team Leaders after the Concept Note One-Stop Meeting will be Joy Behrens, Xiaolun Sun, and Melvin Vaz. Core Team members will include: Xiaoxiao Peng, Houqi Hong, Bahar Salimova, and Anthony Tyrrell. Gaby Loibl will provide overall administrative support. The team will be supported by short-term consultants and by IEG staff responsible for maintaining the Management Action Record. The team will seek inputs from other IEG staff and consultants across the VPU on specific aspects of the report preparation and dissemination.

48. The RAP 2018 report will be prepared with an estimated budget of $900,000. Approximately 10 percent of the total budget will be for the regional and Practice Group updates, and 5.5 percent will cover outreach and dissemination activities upon completion of the report.

49. Beyond the RAP 2018 team and budget, a number of efforts are crucial to the success of RAP 2018 and are recognized as essential cooperative contributions, summarized in Box 1 below. This list is not exhaustive.

50. The draft report is expected to be shared with WBG management for comments early in the third quarter of FY19 and the final report will be submitted to the Board late in the third quarter of FY19.
# Box 1: Essential Contributions Crucial to Success of RAP 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project ratings data, WB</td>
<td>- Provision of ICRR data by September 30, 2018, for at least 95% ICRs of projects closed in FY17 that have been submitted to IEG by June 30, 2018 (ICRR Coordination Team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project ratings data, IFC/MIGA</td>
<td>- Provision of XPSR validation and PCR Review data by September 20, 2018, for at least 90 percent of the XPSR and PCRs in the FY17 IEG review sample. Provision of PER validation data by September 30, 2018, for at least 80 percent of the FY17 PERs (IEGFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>- Technical support related to validation methodology and status of validations (ICRR Coordination Team [for ICRRs] and IEGFP [for XPSRs, PCRs, and PERs])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Technical support related to interactive dashboards using IFC and MIGA data (IEGFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Action Record</td>
<td>- Provision of data, analysis, and reporting on the Management Action Record update, by mid-November 2018 (IEGKC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data and systems</td>
<td>- Monitoring the capture of data from World Bank systems; monitoring data quality in datasets such as Datamart; liaison with analytical professionals in ITS, OPCS, and other sources of administrative data (IEGKC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Technical support related to database management, normalization of data, and construction and maintenance of data dashboards (IEGKC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>- Strategic and tactical communications support (including website design and production, copyediting, proofreading, design and production for printed report, dissemination strategy and implementation, and event preparation) (IEGKC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IEG.
Appendix A: Principal Sources of Data to be used for RAP 2018

*Project evaluations and validations.* These products include Project Performance Assessment Reports (PPARs) for both World Bank and IFC projects; Implementation Completion Report Reviews (ICRRs) for World Bank projects; Expanded Project Supervision Reports (XPSRs), IEG sector highlights, and IEG cluster notes for mature IFC investments; Project Completion Reports (PCRs) for IFC Advisory Services; and MIGA Project Evaluation Reports (PERs). Specifically, the portfolio review analyses for the World Bank within RAP 2018 will be based primarily on ICRRs for projects exiting the portfolio in FY15-17 and PPARs prepared in FY16-18; XPSRs for IFC investments reaching early operational maturity in CY15-17; PCRs completed for IFC advisory services in FY12-15; and MIGA PERs for guarantees reaching early operational maturity by FY12-17.

*Country evaluations,* including both Country Strategy and Completion and Learning Report Reviews (prepared for 54 countries during FY13-16) and 21 to be prepared in FY17. One CPE on MICs is expected in FY18.

*Sector, Global Practice, and thematic studies* produced by IEG since FY16, including some reports that are expected to be completed by the second quarter of FY 2019 (see Appendix C).

*Meso evaluations and learning products* produced by IEG since FY16, including some studies that are expected to be completed by fall 2018 (see Appendix C).

*Management Action Records* to capture the progress and gaps identified in degree of implementation of action plans in response to IEG’s recommendations and to assess ongoing efforts.

*Databases* that include IEG’s ICRR, XPSR-EvNote and PES, PCR-EvNote, PER-Validation Note and independent PER, and CASCR-R databases, as well as the World Bank’s Business Intelligence data warehouse.

*Documents and records* on relevant corporate strategies, initiatives, projects, programs, and evaluations, including annual reports of the World Bank Group’s member institutions, World Bank Group’s Corporate Scorecard, country strategies, project appraisal documents and results frameworks, and others. Other, external research will be drawn on as relevant / appropriate.
Appendix B: IEG Major Evaluations, Meso Evaluations, Project-Level Reports, and Country-Level Reviews Recently Completed or Expected to Be Completed (FY18-FY19)

Major Evaluations

1. A Thirst for Change: An Evaluation of the World Bank Group’s Support for Water Supply and Sanitation with Focus on the Poor
5. Toward a Clean World for All: An Evaluation of World Bank Group Support for Pollution Management
8. Evaluation of IFC’s Approach to Engaging Clients for Increased Development Impact
9. Mobilization of Private Capital (expected in FY19)
10. An Evaluation of World Bank Group Support in Situations Involving Conflict-induced Displacement (expected in FY19)
11. IEG Results and Performance of the World Bank Group 2017, Thematic Focus on Environmental Sustainability
12. Growth for the Bottom 40 Percent: The World Bank Group’s Support for Shared Prosperity

Meso Evaluations

1. IFC's Experience with Inclusive Business: An Assessment of IFC's Role, Outcomes, and Potential Scenarios
2. Great Expectations: Emerging Findings on IFC Asset Management Corporation (confidential)
3. Maximizing the Impact of Development Policy Financing in IDA Countries: A Stocktaking of Success Factors and Risks
## IEG Project-Level and Country Level Reviews Completed or Expected to Be Completed in FY17-FY18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPARs</th>
<th>Project-Level Validation and Independent Evaluation Products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| FY17        | World Bank: 55  
IFC: 8  
|             | • IFC Expanded Project Supervision Reports (XPSRs) and Project Evaluation Summaries (PES): 93 projects (40% coverage)  
• MIGA Project Evaluation Reports (PERs): 14  
• WB Implementation Completion and Results Report Reviews (ICRRs): 100% coverage (340 projects expected)  
• IEG Reviews of Completion and Learning Reviews (or of Country Assistance Strategy Completion Reports) (CLRs/CASCRs): 24 expected  
• IFC Project Completion Reports (PCRs): 45 projects (51% coverage) |
| FY18        | World Bank: 56  
IFC/MIGA: /None  
|             | • IFC Expanded Project Supervision Reports (XPSRs) and Project Evaluation Summaries (PES): 103 expected (40% coverage)  
• MIGA Project Evaluation Reports (PERs): 20 expected  
• WB Implementation Completion and Results Report Reviews (ICRRs): 100% coverage (268 expected)  
• IEG Reviews of Completion and Learning Reviews (or of Country Assistance Strategy Completion Reports) (CLRs/CASCRs): 11  
• IFC Project Completion Reports (PCRs): exact number TBD. |
Appendix C: Detailed Methodology

Chapter 1 methodology will be tailored to the questions on the WBG’s contribution to inclusive growth.

- To what extent have WBG strategies and operations been informed by considerations of inclusion?
- What do we know about the effectiveness of WBG support for improving outcomes?
- What are the key lessons and knowledge gaps about the effectiveness of WBG approaches for supporting inclusive and sustainable growth?

As a desk review, these questions will be answered through synthesizing findings and lessons from IEG evaluations and learning products (see Appendix D). There has not been one evaluation on WBG engagement with the inclusive growth agenda. Instead, many evaluations address different issues of relevance to inclusive and sustainable growth. Typically, IEG evaluations ask the questions of how and how effective WBG strategies and program have supported client countries in a particular area. Chapter 1 will examine the answers to these questions from the perspective of inclusion (e.g. education, access to finance) and extract findings as they relate to the poor and other often-excluded groups. Since most evaluations were not conducted with an explicit focus on inclusion, it is expected that certain evidence gaps exist. An attempt will be made to fill these gaps with IEG country program and project level evaluations.

Chapter 2 methodology will comprise the descriptive quantitative analysis presented in prior RAPs, focusing on World Bank Group trends in performance and results, complemented by focused analysis to explore specific questions of interest. RAP 2018 may present patterns in the performance of the WBG portfolio by region, income level, IDA/IBRD, FCV/Non-FCV countries, global practice, sector/industry, instrument, and other breakdowns, as relevant. Similar to RAP 2017, for World Bank projects, Chapter 2 will present a disaggregated view of Outcome ratings as well as Bank Performance ratings (showing the distribution of ratings across the six-point rating scale currently in use, in addition to the percent Moderately Satisfactory or above). A similar presentation of disaggregated outcome ratings of IFC investment and advisory as well as MIGA evaluated projects is also envisioned in Chapter 2.

Table 1 below provides an overview of the topics, approaches, and space allocated in the main report for each topic. Additional information on Chapter 2 appears after the table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Length (pages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ch 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Highlights</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has the WBG engaged on inclusion in its strategies and support programs?</td>
<td>Synthesis of existing IEG evaluations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effectively has the WBG contributed to achieving inclusiveness outcomes?</td>
<td>Synthesis of existing IEG evaluations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the key findings and knowledge gaps from IEG evaluations about inclusive growth?</td>
<td>Synthesis of existing IEG evaluations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ch 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Highlights</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>What are the patterns of performance of World Bank projects?</td>
<td>Distribution of Outcome ratings and Bank Performance ratings, over time; comparison across Regions, Practices, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What can we say about “what works” (or doesn’t work) from recent ICRRs and/or PPARs? (Focus on quality-at-entry and lessons learned.)</td>
<td>Analysis of quality at entry (several perspectives if possible); analysis of lessons learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent is gender mentioned in project development objectives, components, and indicators of World Bank project ICRRs?</td>
<td>Quantitative summary or distribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent is expected reporting on safeguards present in ICRs of World Bank projects?</td>
<td>Quantitative summary or distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFC</td>
<td>What are the patterns of performance of IFC investment and advisory projects?</td>
<td>Distribution of ratings over time; comparison by industry groups; country groupings (IDA-nonIDA; FCS-nonFCS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What can we say about “what works” (or doesn’t work) in recently evaluated IFC investment and advisory projects?</td>
<td>Synthesis of lessons on what worked and what didn't work among projects in the CY15-17 cohort for XPSR validations and in the FY15-17 cohort for PCR Reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What’s the update on IFC initiatives/actions for improving the work quality of investment and advisory?</td>
<td>Update on IFC actions related to work quality improvements for investment and advisory projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What can we say about the results and performance of IFC projects with combined advisory and investment support?</td>
<td>Update on the analysis of the results and performance of evaluated IFC projects with combined advisory and investment support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIGA</td>
<td>What are the patterns of performance of MIGA projects?</td>
<td>Distribution of ratings over time; comparison by sector teams; country groupings (IDA-nonIDA; FCV-nonFCV; by region) by both number of projects and volume.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What can we say about what works (or doesn’t work) in recently evaluated projects?</td>
<td>Synthesis of lessons on what worked and what didn't work among projects in the FY12-17 cohort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>What are the patterns of performance of WBG country programs?</td>
<td>Distribution of ratings over time for CPF/CLR reviews; comparison across regions; comparison across country status (FCV etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ch 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Highlights</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR</td>
<td>To what degree have action plans prepared in response to IEG’s recommendations from major evaluations been implemented? What has been historical trends and implementation progress of action plans and recommendations focused on inclusive growth?</td>
<td>Distribution of ratings; synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update on engagement pilots</td>
<td>Synthesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total pages**: 50
The analytical approach envisioned for questions in Chapter 2 is as follows:

a) *What are the patterns of performance of World Bank projects?*

As in RAP 2017, RAP 2018 will present trends in Outcome and World Bank performance ratings on a three-year rolling basis as well an annual basis. To provide information relevant to stakeholders, breakdowns by region, income level, IDA/IBRD, FCV/Non-FCV countries, practice group, global practice will be provided, either in the main report, in Appendixes, or in associated online dashboards. Similar to RAP 2017, RAP 2018 will not assess statistical significance of differences when reporting comparisons. (For World Bank project ratings data, the rationale for this is that information is presented based on the complete set of ICRR data, so it does not make sense to apply a statistical test designed for samples. Ways will be looked for to better account for risks in the interpretation and communication of results and performance.

b) *What can we learn about “what works” (or doesn’t work) in recent World Bank projects with ICRRs/PPARs, in particular about ways that quality-at-entry of World Bank projects could be improved, and how to reduce or overcome barriers to quality-at-entry?*

To complement the presentation of trend data, and to respond to questions raised by directors and management about reasons for the relatively low levels of quality-at-entry ratings, RAP 2018 will explore these questions through review of ICRRs and PPARs, structured interviews, focus groups, or other participatory interactions with World Bank staff (including TTLs, operational project team members, and managers). Ideas being explored include:

- Content analysis of ICRR and/or PPAR Lessons sections and summary of findings.
- Content analysis of ICRR and/or PPAR Quality-at-Entry sections and summary of findings; framework for content analysis would be informed by findings related to quality at entry from previous RAPs, the ROSES evaluation, the Learning evaluations, and other relevant material.
- If a project-level dataset of quality-at-entry ratings from past assessments by the World Bank’s former Quality Assurance Group (QAG) is available, provide a comparison of QAG quality-at-entry ratings vs. IEG outcome ratings. With such a dataset, it might be possible to compare outcome ratings for projects that had QAG assessments of quality at entry with similar projects that did not have QAG assessments. For such an analysis, the team would seek advice from the IEG Methods function regarding construction of a comparison group.
- Randomly or purposively select a small sample of projects from a recent and older portfolio, to compare the assessment in each of desirable features associated with quality at entry.
- Offer time of an IEG expert to critique the quality-at-entry of a small selection of projects, perhaps one per sector or region. (This is inspired by a RMES 2017 session presented by Soniya Carvalho and others.) Then, report on aggregate observations.
- Hold focus group opportunities in which operational staff are invited to become familiar with dashboards available, in exchange for providing insights on reasons for high or low quality-at-
entry ratings on specific projects in which they were involved. A careful selection protocol would need to be developed, and advice of the IEG Methods function will be sought. Extent of analysis will depend in part on resources available.

It may also be possible to look at issues of candor in supervision report ratings and proactivity in dealing with problem projects. (One reference for this would be RAP 2015, Appendix B, which reported on some regression analysis of IPF projects closed in FY09-14, which found a negative correlation between IEG outcome ratings and whether the project was ever listed as a “problem project,” within models that included a number of other variables.)

Based on interested expressed in findings related to joint operations, the FY17 IEG learning product “World Bank Group Joint Projects: A Review of Two Decades of Experience” will be reviewed and, if relevant in the context of reporting on results and performance, Chapter 2 will reflect on the messages of this learning product.

c) What are the patterns of performance of IFC and MIGA projects?

As in RAP 2017, RAP 2018 will present results and performance of in terms of IEG ratings of evaluated IFC investment and advisory projects on a three-year rolling basis. Ratings of projects validated and independently evaluated in CY15-CY17 (FY15-FY17 for IFC advisory projects) will be added to the long-term trend tracked by IEG in the past RAP reports. Results and performance of evaluated MIGA projects will be presented on a six-year rolling average by including the ratings of projects validated and independently evaluated in FY12 to FY17 to update the long-term trend tracked by IEG in the previous RAP reports. However, annual performance will be selectively mentioned to provide additional explanation about the trends underpinning the 3 or 6 year moving averages. Similar to RAP 2017, the analysis of results and performance trends of IFC investment, advisory and MIGA projects will be organized by region, industry/sector, country income levels, their respective strategic priorities, and other variables or indicators reviewed. In reporting the results of IFC advisory projects, RAP 2018 will present ratings and trends based on the new classification of IFC’s advisory business lines, subject to the completion of the reclassification of the previous business lines into the new business areas. RAP 2018 will also present MIGA project development outcome and effectiveness ratings by volume (gross exposure), in addition to the analysis of ratings trend by number of projects. Additionally, RAP 2018 will present a synthesis of what has worked well and not among the latest cohort of evaluated IFC investment, advisory and MIGA projects.

Given recent completion of the joint IFC-IEG in-depth study on IFC investment projects’ work quality in FY18, RAP 2018 will not update the quantitative analysis of the drivers of development outcomes of IFC investment projects. However, the quantitative analysis of development outcome ratings of investment projects with combined advisory and investment support will be updated and complemented by content analysis of project evaluation documents. In addition, RAP 2018 will present an update of the initiatives/actions taken by IFC as a result of the joint IFC-IEG in-depth studies of IFC work quality of investment and advisory projects.

29 RAP 2018 will update the analysis of the association between the development effectiveness ratings of IFC advisory projects and the work quality indicator (and two sub-indicators), which was IEG started to assess and rate in FY15.

30 This includes ratings trend of the sub-indicators of development outcome (for IFC investment and MIGA projects), development effectiveness (for IFC advisory projects) as well as the respective work quality indicators for IFC investment, advisory and MIGA projects.
d) What can we say about the extent to which considerations of gender are built in to World Bank projects?

Similar to RAP 2017, RAP 2018 will report a quantitative summary of the extent to which World Bank projects with self-evaluations included some element related to gender, either in the PDO, in the description of project components, or in the indicators used to assess achievement of outputs or outcomes. See RAP 2017, Appendix I for a description of the methodology to be used.

e) To what extent is the expected reporting on safeguards present in the ICRs of World Bank projects?

Similar to RAP 2017 (pp. 19-20), RAP 2018 will report a quantitative summary of the extent to which World Bank projects with self-evaluations included some the expected reporting on safeguards.

f) What are the patterns of performance over time of WBG country programs?

RAP 2018 will continue the trend analysis for country program performance, based on IEG ratings on CLRRRs, disaggregated by region and country status.

g) What aspects of the World Bank Group context are helpful background for interpreting information about ratings?

An appendix will provide frequently-requested background information on the evaluative framework and methodology for IEG’s validations of implementation completion and results reports for World Bank projects, which provide the basis for ratings of project performance.

Chapter 3 will include an update on the implementation of action plans that respond to IEG recommendations from the evaluations produced between FY14-FY17. Reporting will detail percentages of action plans whose implementation IEG has rated “negligible,” “moderate,” “substantial,” “high,” and “complete.” Following the approach used in RAP 2017, aggregation will be presented for action plans rated “high” and “complete” as well as for action plans rated “substantial,” “high,” and “complete.” Providing information on action plans whose implementation has been rated “complete” by IEG is intended to allow readers to understand the percentages of actions that were fully implemented vs. actions that were implemented to some degree. In addition, the chapter will include a specific analysis of recommendations and associated action plans, when available, that relate to inclusive growth. The chapter will also provide a brief update on the pilots conducted in FY18 by IEG and WBG Management to deepen their engagement around major evaluations.

The Regional and Practice Group Updates in RAP 2018 will provide specific results and performance information and be presented online as well as in the report appendices or as separate documents. The information provided will include results and performance by region and GP, as compared with other regions and GPs, respectively. IFC investment, advisory and MIGA project results and performance for each region will be integrated into the respective Regional Updates. Final drafts will be shared with the relevant units prior to their dissemination to the Board.
## Appendix D: IEG Evaluations and Learning Products Relevant for Chapter 1 on Inclusive Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Type of Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>IFC's Experience with Inclusive Business: An assessment of IFC's role, outcomes, and potential scenarios</td>
<td>Meso Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>An Evaluation of World Bank Group Support to Essential Health-Care Services</td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>Growth for the Bottom 40 Percent: The World Bank Group's Support for Shared Prosperity</td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>Growing the Rural Nonfarm Economy to Alleviate Poverty</td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>Higher Education for Development: An Evaluation of the WBG Support</td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>A Thirst of Change: The World Bank Group's Support for Water Supply and Sanitation, with Focus on the Poor</td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>Women's Empowerment in Rural Community-Driven Development Projects</td>
<td>Learning Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>World Bank Group Support for Housing Finance</td>
<td>Learning Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>Lessons from Land Administration Projects: A Review of Project Performance Assessments</td>
<td>Learning Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>Industry Competitiveness and Jobs: An Evaluation of World Bank Group Industry-Specific Support to Promote Industry Competitiveness and Its Implications for Jobs</td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>Results and Performance of the World Bank Group 2015 (Gender)</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>Results and Performance of the World Bank Group 2014 (MDGs)</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>The Poverty Focus of Country Programs - Lessons from WB Experience</td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>World Bank Support to Early Childhood Development</td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>Learning Note: Additional Financing for Transport and Information and Communication Technology (ICT)</td>
<td>Learning Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>The Big Business of Small Enterprises - Evaluation of the WBG Experience with targeted Support to Small and Medium- Size Enterprises, 2006-12</td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>World Bank Group Support to Health Financing</td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>World Bank Group Support to Public-Private Partnerships - Lessons from Experience in Client Countries FY02-12</td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>Social Safety Nets and Gender: Learning from impact Evaluations and WB Projects</td>
<td>Learning Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>Youth Employment Programs – An Evaluation of World Bank and IFC Support</td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>World Bank Group's Response to the Global Food Crisis</td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>Assessing IFC's Poverty Focus and Results</td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>A Portfolio Note: World Bank Support to Education Since 2001</td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>Growth and Productivity in Agriculture and Agribusiness: Evaluative Lessons from World Bank Group Experience</td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>Gender and Development: An Evaluation of World Bank Support, 2002-08</td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>Can a Market-Assisted Land Redistribution Program Improve the Lives of the Poor? – Evidence from Malawi</td>
<td>Working Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>Improving Effectiveness and Outcomes for the Poor in Health, Nutrition and Population: An Evaluation of the WBG since 1997</td>
<td>Thematic Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix E: Summary of Key Differences between RAP 2017 and RAP 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>RAP 2017</th>
<th>RAP 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 1: Theme</strong></td>
<td>Environmental sustainability</td>
<td>Inclusive growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Chapter 2: Performance | • In-depth qualitative analysis of factors that explain the difference between high and low performing projects with environment-related objectives.  
• A summary of the factors associated with project performance, as identified through quantitative empirical studies. | • Summary of what can be learned about “what works” (and what doesn’t) for World Bank projects, from quality-at-entry and lessons sections of recent ICRRs and PPARs  
• Synthesis of lessons on “what works” (and what doesn’t) based on recently evaluated IFC investment, advisory and MIGA projects |
| Chapter 3: MAR | • Analysis of the management action record with respect to recommendations related to environmental sustainability  
• Analysis of what worked well and what did not work well in the MAR engagement pilots | • Update on implementation of action plans in response to IEG’s recommendations  
• Analysis of the management action record with respect to recommendations related to inclusive growth  
• Update on the review of engagement pilots undertaken by IEG and WBG Management around major evaluations |
| Region and Practice Group Appendixes | • Included summaries of PPARs, CLRRs, Major Evaluations, Meso Evaluations | • Will not include summaries of PPARs.  
• Summaries of CLRRs completed in FY18 will be included in relevant Regional Appendix.  
• Summaries of Major and Meso Evaluations directly related to a given Region or Global Practice will be included in the Region and Practice Group Appendices.  
• Summaries of CLRRs, Major and Meso Evaluations will be included in a separate Appendix. |
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### Appendix G: Stakeholder Analysis

Analysis and grouping of stakeholders comprising audiences for this report is based on experience in previous IEG evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Stakeholder (or stakeholder Group)</th>
<th>Their interests (what they want from RAP 2018)</th>
<th>Types of decisions this stakeholder makes (that RAP 2018 may inform)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>1 WBG Board (as a whole)</td>
<td>☐ Information on how the WBG is performing – timely feedback  ☐ Project performance in countries</td>
<td>⇒ How to deliver on the WBG Goals and Strategy, focusing on inclusive growth  ⇒ Project results’ focus  ⇒ Institutional focus on Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 WBG Board, CODE</td>
<td>☐ How is the WBG addressing inclusive growth?</td>
<td>⇒ Board on the types of issues to consider in approving project/country programs from the lens of inclusive growth  ⇒ Topics for future IEG evaluations  ⇒ Priorities for OPCS, IFC, MIGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBG Senior</td>
<td>3 WBG Senior Management</td>
<td>☐ Twin goals: Eliminating poverty, Boosting shared prosperity  ☐ Enhancing development effectiveness</td>
<td>⇒ WBG strategy, priorities  ⇒ Enhancing results focus  ⇒ Enhancing inclusive growth in WBG’s work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 GP Senior Management</td>
<td>☐ How this GP is doing vs other GPs  ☐ How is inclusive growth being mainstreamed?</td>
<td>⇒ GP strategy, priorities  ⇒ Enhancing results focus  ⇒ Considering effective strategies for and approaches to inclusive growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Region Senior Management</td>
<td>☐ What results are being achieved in this Region?  ☐ What results are being achieved in particular countries?  ☐ What factors to consider to enhance countries’ results’ focus?</td>
<td>⇒ Region priorities  ⇒ Relationships with country clients  ⇒ Design of country programs, projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Group</td>
<td>Stakeholder (or stakeholder Group)</td>
<td>Their interests (what they want from RAP 2018)</td>
<td>Types of decisions this stakeholder makes (that RAP 2018 may inform)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Country Directors</td>
<td>☐ Attention to results</td>
<td>⇨ Content of country portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>IFC Senior Management</td>
<td>☐ Factors that affect performance</td>
<td>⇨ Content of portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Attention to results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIGA Senior Management</td>
<td>☐ Factors that affect development effectiveness</td>
<td>⇨ Prioritization of new product Lines and projects by sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Attention to results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>OPCS</td>
<td>☐ Reporting on portfolio (e.g. at ABCDQ meetings)</td>
<td>⇨ Content of operational policies and guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Reporting on corporate performance (Corporate Scorecard)</td>
<td>⇨ Improvements to systems, tools; simplification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Management of results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>IEG Senior Management</td>
<td>☐ High quality, credible work</td>
<td>⇨ Focus of future IEG evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Evidence understandable to stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Ability to provide timely messages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>☐ WBG work on inclusive growth</td>
<td>⇨ Deciding on WBG support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>