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Key takeaways

Report readership has decreased while perceptions of quality of IEG work has improved across all respondents.

Operational staff (and more so IFC) are more critical of IEG’s usefulness in project design, but IEG still perceived as influential.

Providing more practical, concrete lessons and recommendations along with more objective evidence would increase IEG’s value added and influence.
Staff participation decreased, while Board & Externals increased.

Sample size over time

- 2018: 1,896
  - Board: 22
  - Staff: 1,166
  - External: 708

- 2019: 1,137
  - Board: 21
  - Staff: 682
  - External: 434

- 2020: 1,908
  - Board: 22
  - Staff: 1,284
  - External: 602

- 2021: 1,830
  - Board: 33
  - Staff: 1,039
  - External: 758
Greater share of IFC respondents

Staff sample composition over time

2021

- WB 744
- IFC 265
- Other ICSID 14
- MIGA 14

1,039

2020

- WB 970
- IFC 296
- ICSID 2
- MIGA 16

1,284
Staff sample composition and adjustments over time

Similar distribution across staff grades
Regional distribution of external respondents over time

External respondents show similar distribution across regions.
Websites and newsletters remain the main form of ‘first contact’ with IEG.
Staff report decreased use of all products. Mixed results for Board.
Report readership has been declining for operational staff but remained steady for managers.
Board more focused on Thematic & RAP, Staff mostly on project evaluations.
Overall high appreciation of IEG work quality, with Board most satisfied.
Perception of evaluation quality has improved over last year.

Perception of evaluation quality (% satisfied) 2021 vs 2020

Note: Each bubble in the graph represents one aspect of evaluation design.
Managerial and HQ staff more critical of IEG’s evaluation quality

Staff perception of evaluation quality

By operational / managerial

By location

Note: Each bubble in the graph represents one aspect of evaluation design.
Mixed results on IEG value added: decline among operational staff, but slight increase among managers.
Utility of IEG reports for project design continues to decline over time....
...... mostly because of a perceived disconnect with operational reality

Reasons for low ‘learning value’ in project design

### Why not useful to project design?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detached from reality</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Detached from reality</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not useful to operations</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Too high level</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much focus on accountab.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>No operational experience</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No value added</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>No value added</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too late</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Too late</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No operational experience</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Not useful to operations</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor evidence</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Poor evidence</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too high level</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Too much focus on accountab.</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too time consuming</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Weak methodology</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to access</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Too time consuming</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignore feedback</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Ignore feedback</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly bureaucratic</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Hard to access</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Why not useful to project design? (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WB</th>
<th>IFC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detached from reality</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not useful to operat.</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too high level</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No operational exp</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor evidence</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too late</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too time consuming</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much focus on account.</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No value added</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to access</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak methodology</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignore feedback</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly bureaucratic</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No focus on IFC</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IEG seen as relevant and influential on WBG

Perceived IEG influence over time
(% positive responses)

Questions:
How aligned are IEG evaluations with the WBG's strategic priorities?
To what extent do you think IEG's work in the past 12 months influenced the effectiveness of WBG activities?
IEG products influence WBG activities

IMPACT ON WBG ACTIVITIES OVER TIME
(% OF POSITIVE RESPONSES)

- Board
  - 2017: 85
  - 2018: 75
  - 2019: 84
  - 2020: 91
  - 2021: 77

- Staff
  - 2017: 87
  - 2018: 88
  - 2019: 84
  - 2020: 91
  - 2021: 87

- Externals
  - 2017: 63
  - 2018: 95
  - 2019: 88
  - 2020: 91
  - 2021: 91

What should IEG do to increase WBG effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More practical recom.</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>More objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve commun.</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Listen to staff feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen to feedback</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>More practical recom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More objective</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Improve topic selection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

......
"Engage more - both formally and informally - with the Board to share IEG's deep understanding, knowledge and experience of the WBG”

Board suggestions on what IEG should do to improve its effectiveness

- Quality
  - Improve methods
  - Focus on impact (achievement of dev. outcomes)
  - Interrogate the assumptions of the Bank’s approach to dev. effectiveness
  - Evaluate more strategic topics (like SDGs)
  - Provide clear and specific recommendations
  - Be more objective

- Quantity
  - Produce more reports
  - Do more CPE and align them to CPF preparation

- Timing
  - Time the delivery of products to the board discussion of projects (like the ratings during regional updates)
  - Do more just in time products
  - Establish and maintain clear timeframes for delivery

- Behavior
  - Enhance IEG’s impact by working more closely with management
  - Be more proactive
  - Follow up to your recommendations
  - Be frank but constructive

- Comm
  - More aggressive communication
  - Present results in a nontechnical manner
Key findings

1. Readership of IEG reports has seen a decline among sample of operational staff but not managers
2. Virtually all aspects of evaluation quality have seen an improvements over the last 12 months, although HQ staff remain more critical than CO staff
3. IEG remains aligned to WBG priorities and continues to have a significant impact on WBG operations, even though staff are more critical than the Board.
4. The value of IEG products for project design continues to decline
5. IEG can enhance its value by providing more practical lessons, presenting more objective evidence and listening more to staff feedback
6. Board respondents encourage more direct engagement and recommend more strategic timing of report delivery
Thank you