

INDEPENDENT EVALUATION GROUP

**Work Program and Budget (FY17)
and
Indicative Plan (FY18–19)**

May 25, 2016

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AAA	Analytic and Advisory Activities
CAS	Country Assistance Strategy
CCSA	Cross-Cutting Solution Areas
CLEAR	Centers for Learning Evaluation and Results
CLR	Completion and Learning Review
CODE	Committee on Development Effectiveness
CPE	Country Program Evaluation
CPF	Country Partnership Framework
CSC	WBG Corporate Scorecard
DEC	Development Economics Vice Presidency
DGE	Director General, Evaluation
DPF	Development Policy Financing
ECD	Evaluation Capacity Development
ECG	Evaluation Cooperation Group
FCS	Fragile and conflict-affected situation
FY	Fiscal year
GP	Global Practice
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ICR	Implementation Completion and Results Report
ICRR	ICR Review
IDA	International Development Association
IEG	Independent Evaluation Group
IFC	International Finance Corporation
IPDET	International Program for Development Evaluation Training
IPF	Investment Project Financing
IT	Information technology
MAR	Management Action Record
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MIC	Middle income countries
MIGA	Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency
PCR	Project Completion Report
PER	Project Evaluation Report
P4R	Program for Results
PLR	Performance and Learning Review
PPAR	Project Performance Assessment Report
RAP	Results and Performance (IEG annual report)
SCD	Systematic Country Diagnostic
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
VFM	Value for Money
WB	World Bank
WBG	World Bank Group
XPSR	Expanded Project Supervision Report

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I
I. STRATEGIC CONTEXT	1
1. CHANGING INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL LANDSCAPE	1
2. IEG STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS	2
II. ENHANCING IEG IMPACT	5
1. CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES	5
2. INNOVATING AND REALIGNING BUSINESS LINES	6
3. ENHANCING QUALITY AND CREDIBILITY	11
4. ENHANCING KNOWLEDGE AND COMMUNICATIONS	13
III. PROPOSED WORK PROGRAM FOR FY17-19	15
1. MAJOR EVALUATIONS	15
2. PROJECT EVALUATIONS	21
3. VALIDATION PRODUCTS	21
4. LEARNING AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING	21
5. OTHER EVALUATION WORK	22
6. EVALUATION CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT	23
IV. STAFFING AND BUDGET	25
1. HUMAN RESOURCES	25
2. BUDGET PROPOSAL	26
3. ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK	30
ANNEX 1: IEG RESULTS FRAMEWORK	32
ANNEX 2: DESCRIPTION OF IEG STRATEGIC ENGAGEMENT AREAS	34
ANNEX 3: SELECTIVITY FRAMEWORK FOR IEG EVALUATION TOPICS	39
ANNEX 4: GAP ANALYSIS OF RECENT IEG EVALUATIONS	41
RECENT IEG EVALUATIONS BY SECTOR (FY10-16)	41
RECENT IEG EVALUATIONS BY THEME (FY10-16)	42
ANNEX 5: PROPOSED WORK PROGRAM FOR FY17-19	43
TABLE 1: WORK PROGRAM BY BUSINESS LINE	43
TABLE 2: MAJOR EVALUATIONS AND LEARNING PRODUCTS BY OBJECTIVES	45
TABLE 3: MAJOR EVALUATIONS BY INSTITUTION, WBG STRATEGIC FOCUS, AND IDA SPECIAL THEME	47
ANNEX 6: INDICATIVE LIST OF IEG LEARNING AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING ACTIVITIES IN FY16	48
ANNEX 7: LIST OF DGE STATEMENTS TO WBG EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS AND MANAGEMENT IN FY16	50

**Independent Evaluation Group Work Program and Budget (FY17)
and Indicative Plan (FY18-19)**

**Report to the Board from the Budget Committee and the
Committee on Development Effectiveness***

Joint Meeting of June 10, 2016

The Budget Committee and the Committee on Development Effectiveness (the committees) met to consider the *Independent Evaluation Group Work Program and Budget (FY17) and Indicative Plan (FY18-19)* (R2016-0101[IDA/R2016-0128, IFC/R2016-0157, MIGA/R2016-0034]).

The committees were supportive of IEG's work program and budget (FY17) and Indicative Plan (FY18-19) and reiterated the important role that IEG plays in enhancing oversight and accountability. Members welcomed IEG's focus on strategic directions, the shift from a product-driven approach to a learning mindset, and IEG's ongoing commitment to improve its engagement with Management and operational staff at all stages of the work process. Members encouraged IEG to better align its work program to that of the WBG and to consider demand and selectivity in designing its work plan in order to focus on core issues pertaining to development impact. Members looked forward to seeing more real-time evaluations, given their potential for impact and their relevance to the Board and staff. Members also recognized that broader evaluations were still needed, particularly on cross-cutting themes. A number of members commented that the work program was too ambitious and cautioned against overburdening staff and limiting their capacity to properly absorb IEG products. Members welcomed IEG's efforts to harmonize its evaluation instruments across the WBG, with some noting that due attention should be given to the distinctions of each institution's business model. In this respect, some supported IFC and MIGA PPARs given the accountability role they play, while others suggested the instrument be reviewed in FY17 to assess the products' content, resource impact on IFC and MIGA, and whether they achieve the objective of enhancing accountability and learning. The committees agreed that issues of selectivity, bunching, utility and credibility of IEG products should be addressed by CODE in the context of Recommendation 6 of the External Review of IEG action plan.

Members requested further detail on the types of mechanisms IEG planned to use to assess WBG demand for IEG products. They urged IEG to ensure earlier engagement with WBG Management on its work program and indicative plan before the draft comes to the first CODE informal meeting on the subject. They also asked that CODE be apprised of WBG Management's input and associated discussions so the committee could better understand areas of agreement/disagreement.

The committees urged IEG to address bunching, to put in place mechanisms that could track IEG's expenditures against its deliverables, and to avoid backlogs that could potentially affect IEG's budget. Members encouraged IEG to review its timelines and to use its quarterly business review process as a way of monitoring bunching. Members welcomed IEG's achievement of Expenditure Review targets and urged IEG to continue to improve efficiencies in travel and consultancy spending in order to catch up with wider WBG trends.

* This report is not an approved record.

**IEG WORK PROGRAM AND BUDGET (FY17)
AND
INDICATIVE PLAN (FY18-19)**

Executive Summary

Strategic Directions for FY17-19

1. To achieve the twin goals, the WBG needs to better understand what works and the reasons why, and draw lessons and good practices from experience. IEG has taken several steps over the past few years to re-align our work with the new WBG strategic directions, and generate the critical evaluation evidence needed to accelerate WBG development effectiveness. We have introduced new strategic objectives and a new results framework; refocused our work on three Strategic Engagement Areas of Inclusive Growth, Sustained Service Delivery for the Poor, and Environmental Sustainability; and continued to improve and innovate our business lines.

2. The External Review of IEG challenged us to do more: *“while IEG is evolving and is at the beginning of a period of innovation and renewal, it is critically important that IEG make more substantive changes.”* In particular, IEG was urged to pay greater attention to utilization of its work, and the value of fewer, shorter, and sharper products that build in double-loop learning.

3. Deepening the influence of IEG’s work and increasing WBG staff use of IEG products is a top priority. To this end, we will focus on the following four key issues in FY17-19.

- **Innovation and realignment of IEG business lines** – including stronger alignment of major evaluations with WBG strategic priorities; improving the process of engaging with WBG Management and building in more feedback loops during evaluation work; making reports shorter with the introduction of strict page limits; and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the project-level validation system.
- **Enhancing the quality and credibility of IEG work** – including deepening our quality assurance framework; developing a new methods function under the Director General to provide strategic and technical leadership to enhance our methods and data work, including strengthening methodologies related to the assessment of inclusive growth, gender equality, and value for money; and continued updating of standards and tools for data, including more use of beneficiary feedback mechanisms.
- **Improving learning and knowledge sharing** – through a significant redesign of how we deliver learning and knowledge services; developing stronger knowledge partnerships with the Results Measurement and Evidence Stream, Global Practices, and other technical operational units; upgrading our knowledge management tools and systems; and introducing more innovative formats and templates to make IEG reports more readable and accessible.
- **Managing human and financial resources more effectively** – with a focus on implementing and updating IEG’s strategic staffing plan, completing the organizational renewal, and continued strengthening of budget management and sequencing of report delivery.

Proposed Work Program

4. Major Evaluations. In line with CODE's recommendation for increased selectivity and fewer large evaluations, IEG will deliver eight major new evaluations and one annual synthesis of results and performance each year.

- The evaluations that CODE approved in last year's work program for FY17-18 have all been retained (with the exception that the earlier proposed evaluation on Informal Sector has been dropped, as this portfolio has now been largely covered in other evaluations). The timing of some of the earlier approved evaluations has shifted, in response to suggestions from CODE and WBG Management, and as part of IEG's focus to reduce report bunching.
- The proposed evaluations provide strong coverage of most of the WBG strategic focus areas, as set out in the "Forward Look," the FY17-19 Strategic Planning, Budgeting, and Performance Review (W) process, the IFC Business Strategy and Outlook FY17-19, and the provisional IDA18 Special Themes. There are a few strategic areas where we are not planning major evaluations, but will address through Project Performance Assessment Reports (PPARs) and learning activities -- such as leadership of global and regional issues (like pandemics, natural disasters, climate change, and regional integration), and some IFC focus industries (like agribusiness and technology).
- In line with CODE's guidance for a "One WBG" perspective, two-thirds of the evaluations cover all three WBG institutions, and 80 percent cover both World Bank and IFC. About three-quarters of the major evaluations will contribute to the first objective of the IEG results framework of deepening evidence about the results of WBG programs and activities. FY17 evaluations will focus on (1) early assessment of the shared prosperity goal, (2) rural non-farm economy, and (3) higher education in the **Inclusive Growth area**; (4) water supply and sanitation, and (5) urban transport in the **Service Delivery area**; and (6) the annual Results and Performance Report, with a thematic focus on Managing for Results.
- About one-quarter of the work program will focus on the second objective of generating evidence about the early implementation experience of the new WBG Strategy. FY17 evaluations include: (1) the Systematic Country Diagnosis and Country Partnership Framework process; (2) IFC client engagement model; and (3) data for development.

5. PPARs. As agreed last year, IEG will scale up the number of PPARs of World Bank operations in FY17-19, in line with the earlier objective to cover about 20-25 percent of closed projects to ensure robust learning and accountability for actual project performance (the coverage rate fell to about 15 percent in FY14-15). IEG will continue with the pilot launched in FY15 to conduct a small number of PPARs on IFC and MIGA investments.

6. Validation of WBG Self-Evaluations. IEG will continue to validate WBG project completion reports, and review options to improve and streamline the validation of Bank Implementation Completion and Results Reports with CODE and Bank Management in FY17, based on the recently completed evaluation of the WBG self-evaluation system. IEG will also continue to review and validate the completion reports of country strategies.

7. Learning and Knowledge Sharing. IEG proposes to revamp this business line, based on the recently completed stocktaking of the pilot experience with learning products over the past two years. Key changes include: shifting from preparation of lengthy reports to short, timely, and more user-friendly formats that respond to high priority staff demands; strengthening WBG engagement and ownership by requiring upfront “joint ownership” with an operational counterpart that spells out purpose, audience, scope, engagement plan, and actual use; deepening IEG staff skills related to adult learning pedagogy; and creating a more streamlined and nimble process for effective delivery of learning activities while ensuring strong managerial accountability for results and value for money.

8. Evaluation Capacity Development (ECD). In line with earlier CODE guidance, IEG will seek opportunities to deepen our contribution to ECD while ensuring that we maintain our focus and resources on the independent evaluation mandate and support to WBG development effectiveness. Our main engagement on ECD will continue to be the two ongoing large partnership programs: Centers for Learning on Evaluation and Results (CLEAR), and the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET). In addition, we will scale up the use of local evaluation expertise on IEG evaluation teams where feasible, and promote increased attention to ECD issues in WBG country strategy work, in collaboration with the relevant operational units.

Budget Request

9. IEG’s FY17 work program is based on a total budget request of \$34.6 million, comprising a \$33.8 million regular budget to be approved by the Board, and \$0.8 million in trust funds. This resource envelope is consistent with the flat budget framework agreed with the Board in FY12, and adjusted to reflect the planned savings from IEG’s Expenditure Review that was approved by CODE in FY14.

10. In FY17-19, about 80 percent of resources will support the first objective of deepening evidence about the results of WBG programs and activities; and about 20 percent will focus on the second objective of generating evidence on the early implementation experience of the WBG Strategy. The proposed spending trends are fully aligned with IEG’s strategic directions: the proportion of spending on major evaluations declines from 25 percent in FY13 to 23 percent in FY17-19, while the proportion of spending on other evaluation products increases from 11 to 13 percent, reflecting the increased selectivity on major evaluations, and corresponding scale up of learning engagements and PPARs.

11. In response to the earlier independent review of the FY13 work program and budget, IEG has strengthened internal work programming and budget practices, and monitoring of expenditures and outputs. These measures have contributed to reduction of cost over-runs on major evaluations and achievement of the cost savings targets set out in IEG’s Expenditure Review. Nonetheless, slippages and bunching of reports have persisted in FY15-16. IEG has put in place a firm program to reduce bunching in FY17. Key measures include allocating more resources in the year before delivery so that field work and data collection will be done earlier, better upfront planning of tasks, and more effective tracking and reporting.

12. The current independent review of the FY17 work program and budget is being finalized. IEG will implement appropriate measures following the CODE and Budget Committee review and discussion of the findings.

I. Strategic Context

1. Changing Internal and External Landscape

1. IEG's strategic directions in FY17-19 build on the recommendations of the External Review of IEG completed in June 2015, and respond to significant changes that are underway internally in the WBG and externally in the broader development community.

2. During the past year, the WBG launched "Forward Look" discussions about the long-term future of the WBG institutions. The Forward Look has identified five areas where the WBG must evolve to remain fit for purpose for the coming 15 years:

- Improve its ability to meet the needs of all its client groups, including FCS, HICs, and supporting clients at subnational levels, and innovate to deliver better country solutions;
- Reinforce its leadership on global and regional issues and fulfill its potential for reducing the impact and cost of crises such as pandemics, natural disasters, and forced displacement, and bring new instruments to bear to mitigate or shorten protracted crises;
- Expand customized knowledge services, particularly South-South learning;
- Renew efforts to become more efficient and flexible to address client interest in a faster and more agile development partner; and
- Make the billions-to-trillions agenda a reality through significantly increasing mobilization, especially from the private sector, while also maintaining global leadership in mobilizing concessional finance and ensuring that it goes to those who most need it.

3. As part of the Strategic Planning, Budgeting, and Performance Review (W) process, WBG Management has identified the highest priority development issues facing country clients. For FY 17-19, Management has established the following strategic priorities to frame the focus of WBG activities:

- Enhance effectiveness of core physical, human, institutional and natural capital investments to reach the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) through interventions that traditionally have had high poverty alleviation impacts including among others, energy, water and sanitation, infrastructure, health services, agriculture, macroeconomic stability, private sector participation, jobs, and fragility;
- Support clients' efforts to mitigate and bolster resilience to climate change;
- Help clients diversify their economies away from commodities and build resilience systems to respond to the global economic slowdown;
- Reduce root causes of and promote resilience to prevent fragility, conflict, and violence;
- Reduce involuntary migration, and develop solutions to respond to disruptions that such migration causes;

- Support efforts to attract private sector resources to developing country clients and sectors that have traditionally not benefitted from them, helping to de-risk investment environments and support public-private partnerships; and
- Promote the economic inclusion of women and other traditionally disadvantaged groups.

4. Within these broad directions, the IFC Strategy and Business Outlook FY17-19 emphasizes industries and themes that contribute to productivity growth and address sources of risk. Priority industries include infrastructure, agribusiness, financial and social inclusion, and technology. The social inclusion elements, anchored in joint WBG strategies, are focused on universal access goals. The priority cross-cutting themes (responding to the downturn, climate finance, and fragile and conflict situations), and focus regions (Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and Middle East and North Africa) represent areas of highest risk and opportunity.

5. The first meeting of the IDA18 replenishment called for strong coherence between the ongoing Forward Look discussions and IDA18. It agreed to carry forward and deepen the IDA17 focus on Climate Change, Gender Equality, and Fragility, Conflict and Violence. It also endorsed an additional theme on Economic Transformation and Jobs, with an emphasis on new and upgraded infrastructure, spatial economic transformation, private sector development, job creation, and regional economic cooperation and integration. The meeting also endorsed the proposal to add a fifth special theme on Governance and Institution Building, which could include an emphasis on improving domestic resource mobilization, curbing illicit financial flows, strengthening public financial management and improving public sector capacity.

6. Externally, the global community is now focused on implementing an ambitious agenda agreed in 2015 – the SDGs, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda on Financing for Development, the COP21 agreement on climate change, and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction. At the same time, it is confronting severe global challenges: weak global growth, increasing refugee flows and rise in violent extremism, climate change, natural disasters, and health crises and pandemics. Despite overall progress in poverty reduction over the past decade, progress at the country level has been uneven. The goal of eliminating extreme poverty by 2030 will not be achieved given the current global context without significant shifts in within-country inequalities.

7. Global risks and volatility will continue to affect the financing and implementation of this ambitious global agenda. Global growth disappointed again in 2015, slowing to 2.4 percent, and is expected to recover at a slower pace than previously envisioned. A more protracted slowdown across large emerging markets would have substantial spillovers to other developing economies, and eventually hold back the recovery in advanced economies. A broad-based slowdown across developing countries would pose a threat to hard-won gains in raising people out of poverty.

2. IEG Strategic Directions

8. Against this backdrop, IEG faces a unique opportunity to deepen its impact, and make a significant contribution to the successful implementation of the new WBG strategic directions. To achieve the twin goals in a sustainable manner, the WBG need to better understand what works and the reasons why, and draw lessons and good practices from experience to inform decision making and future action. As the External Review noted, *“The success of the Bank’s strategy depends heavily on creating a results-oriented culture of learning within the WBG, and on the steady flow and use of high-quality, timely*

and context-sensitive self and independent evaluation evidence about what does and does not work for cycles of course corrections, continuous improvement and accountability across the larger Bank system....”

9. Over the past two years, IEG has taken several important steps to better align our work with the new WBG strategic directions, and more effectively generate relevant evaluation evidence to accelerate WBG development effectiveness.

10. First, we introduced **two new strategic objectives** in FY15 to guide our work:

- **What Works:** Deepening evidence about the results of WBG program and activities – and their effectiveness for accelerating growth, inclusiveness, and sustainability – to contribute to the achievement of the WBG’s interim target of 9 percent poverty and progress on shared prosperity by 2020; and
- **Real-Time Learning:** Generating evidence on the early implementation experience of the WBG Strategy to enable mid-course corrections and promote a stronger internal culture for results, accountability, and learning, with a focus on three areas: (1) Helping Clients Tackle the Most Important Development Challenges, (2) Becoming the Solutions Bank, and (3) Working in Partnership.

11. Second, we developed a **new Results Framework** in FY15 to map out how we intend to achieve these objectives – one of the first MDB evaluation agencies to do so. The Results Framework includes a “chain of logic” on how the deliverables set out in the work program feed into intermediate (1-3 years) and medium-term (4-6 years) outcomes. It also introduced key performance indicators to assess both intermediate progress (have inputs and outputs been delivered effectively, and are they generating the expected short-term outcomes?) and medium-term impact (are the intermediate outcomes leading to the expected results required to achieve the objective?).

12. The External Review provides several helpful suggestions to enhance the usefulness and effectiveness of the Results Framework: *“IEG’s current Results Framework assumes utilization; it does not explain specifically how its products contribute to the achievement of the WBG’s goals or how the WBG could optimally use its products or how its processes serve to achieve outcomes. IEG’s Results Framework, as it stands now, is too heavily product focused (deliverables are almost all written reports) and lacks attention to the end-user. We agree that utility lies as the heart of IEG’s theory of change, and plan to revise and strengthen the Results Framework, and develop more meaningful key performance indicators, in early-FY17 as part of the broader process of updating the IEG Mandate and TOR that CODE has endorsed. The revised Results Framework will provide a stronger basis for CODE oversight of IEG results and performance over the course of the fiscal year.*

13. Third, we introduced **new Strategic Engagement Areas** in FY16 to help develop a more selective and coordinated program of work that will leverage IEG resources on “game changers” where we can have maximum impact on the overall challenge of meeting the twin goals in a sustainable manner. This new approach is designed to create a stronger platform for medium-term strategic engagement with Management on critical development challenges. Following consultations with internal and external stakeholders, we selected three Strategic Engagement Areas to underpin the FY16-18 work program: Inclusive Growth, Sustained Service Delivery for the Poor, and Environmental Sustainability (see Annex 2 for detailed descriptions). **We propose to continue and**

deepen our focus on these strategic directions in FY17-19, as they align closely with the WBG strategic priorities.

14. Our strategic focus on Inclusive Growth and Environmental Sustainability will continue beyond FY19, in view of the complexity of the issues and large scope of WBG assistance in these areas. We expect to complete evaluation work on Service Delivery in FY18, and discuss options for new Strategic Engagement Areas in FY17. These options may include **Urban Development** or **Resilience** to address the nexus of growing challenges related to migration, resilience, disaster risk management, and sustainable infrastructure development. These themes are well aligned with those the WBG has identified as key priorities in the Forward Look and W Process.

II. Enhancing IEG Impact

1. Challenges and Opportunities

15. The External Review of IEG provided a careful and thoughtful analysis of our performance and impact. It stressed the importance of examining IEG within the larger WBG system of CODE, the Board, and Management and staff – and found:

“Many parts of this system are broken. As a result, the WBG does not have the robust cycles of learning, course corrections, continuous improvement and accountability necessary for progress towards achieving key development goals. IEG alone cannot change the larger WBG system and processes. We find that the WBG needs an overarching evaluation policy and stronger CODE oversight of IEG to enhance learning and accountability.”

The External Review noted that “*IEG is an essential corporate asset*” and “*helps ensure the WBG’s accountability and promotes learning by addressing questions about whether the WBG is doing things right and doing the right things.*” However, the panel emphasizes that “*while IEG is evolving and is at the beginning of a period of innovation and renewal, it is critically important that IEG make more substantive changes and develop a more comprehensive renewal strategy.*” In particular, IEG was urged to pay greater attention to utilization of its work, and the value of fewer, shorter, and sharper products that build in “double loop learning.”

16. To enhance IEG’s impact, the External Review recommended: increased emphasis on learning in IEG’s work; improvements in the quality, timing, volume, length, and utility of IEG evaluations; deeper engagement with external experts and stakeholders; more and better strategic engagement with Management, particularly during the process of developing recommendations; more attention to capacity development; the need for regular independent reviews of IEG; clarity on the Director General’s term; and more CODE oversight of IEG. CODE has put in place a road map and action plan process to review each recommendation, and identify appropriate and time-bound follow-up steps.

17. The 2015 Client Survey also provides helpful data to review the relevance, quality, and impact of IEG’s work. The findings, summarized below, show improvement with respect to the use and influence of IEG products over the past four years.

- **Independence:** Perceived independence of IEG is rated very high across all audiences (around 85 percent of positive ratings), and has remained mostly stable for Staff and Externals, but has dropped a few points over the past two years among Board members.
- **Relevance:** IEG’s work continues to be perceived as very relevant to WBG’s mission across all three audiences of Board, Staff, and Externals, with topline ratings ranging between 85 and 95 percent.
- **Quality:** Among Staff who are reading IEG’s reports, topline satisfaction with the overall quality of IEG’s products (only asked to Staff) remains very high and fairly stable, at 74 percent.

- **Utility:** Use of IEG’s products is most frequent among Board members: over three quarters have used one in the past year; compared with just over half among Staff.
- **Impact:** While solid majorities across the three audiences consider IEG’s work as having an impact on the WBG’s effectiveness, the proportions have decreased and are now nearing the 2012 survey. Among Board members, perceived impact of IEG on effectiveness of the WBG’s activities is at its lowest in 2015, compared against the last four surveys.
- **Influence:** Influence of IEG’s reports in improving understanding of specific development topics continues to be viewed very positively among Board and Externals (about 85% overall), and is also well regarded among Staff (ranging from about 65 to 75%). However, influence ratings in helping to understand what works in development, and development results of projects/operations have declined among Board members.

18. As with previous client surveys, WBG staff ratings are consistently less favorable than the Board and external clients -- though there is significant variation, with lower grades and country-based staff generally responding more favorably than higher grades and DC-based staff.

19. Deepening the influence of IEG’s work and increasing WBG staff use of IEG products remains a top priority. To this end, IEG continues to focus on three key issues: (1) innovation and realignment of IEG business lines, (2) enhancing the quality and credibility of IEG work, and (3) enhancing knowledge and communications.

2. Innovating and Realigning Business Lines

Sector and Thematic Evaluations

20. IEG is continuing to introduce more innovative evaluation topics and approaches to be able to respond more rapidly to the evolving business needs of the WBG, and support mid-course corrections. Examples include the process evaluations to facilitate real-time learning of the early implementation experiences of the new WBG country engagement model and the IFC client engagement model in FY17, and the GP/CCSAs in FY19. Likewise, we are addressing the early implementation experience with the twin goals. The FY17 *WBG Support for Shared Prosperity in Country Programs* will assess how effectively the Bank is incorporating and implementing distributional goals into operational programs – it complements the FY15 *Poverty Focus of Country Programs: Lessons from World Bank Experience*.

21. In line with the WBG shift to a development solutions culture, the major evaluations are also focusing much more on: multi-sectoral themes that cut across GPs and CCSAs; full integration of lending, knowledge, and convening services; and WBG collaboration and synergy – not only across the three institutions, but also among operational units within each institution. For example, the FY17 *World Bank Support to Growing the Rural Non-Farm Economy*, FY18 *Public Finance for Investment and Jobs*, and FY18 *Engaging Citizens* illustrate this stronger “solutions” approach.

22. In addition to making strategic choices on evaluation coverage and aligning topics with key WBG priorities, IEG has been focusing on improving the process of engaging with Management and building in more feedback loops during evaluation work. The External Review rightly notes that “*the current process of producing an evaluation and addressing evaluation recommendations creates an*

unproductive, confrontational and adversarial dynamic between IEG and Management and diminishes learning and accountability.” IEG therefore piloted a new engagement step in two evaluations in FY16 called “ReACT Workshops,” designed to create more conversation and debate around evaluation findings and the formulation of recommendations. The ReACT Workshops have led to more strategic and solutions-based dialogue -- Management has been able to focus more on absorbing the findings and identifying appropriate solutions, and IEG has been able to craft more effective recommendations that will produce better outcomes.

23. In line with the CODE Road Map and Action Plan to follow up the External Review, IEG will scale up the use of ReACT Workshops as well as test other processes in FY17 to deepen Management engagement in evaluation work. IEG and Management have established a working group to develop an action plan on next steps, which will be shared with CODE for information. IEG and Management will then prepare a stock-taking report on the experience of the pilot activities in end-FY17, including suggestions for any proposed changes to the current process for recommendations, action plans, and the Management Action Record, for CODE review and endorsement.

24. IEG is putting in place new processes and incentives to ensure shorter and more concise reports. As of July 1, 2016, strict page limits will be introduced for all products: 15 pages for the approach paper, 5 pages for the executive summary, and 50 pages for the main text of an evaluation (with relevant analytical material included in annexes).

Country Evaluations

25. IEG has piloted a new “Clustered Country Program Evaluation” (CCPE) instrument, designed to improve cost effectiveness, broaden country coverage, and promote cross-country and South-South learning on certain common themes. The first pilot on resource rich countries was completed in FY15, and the second one on small states will be distributed to CODE in end-FY16.

26. As agreed in last year’s work program, IEG is undertaking a stocktaking to assess the relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of the CCPE pilot. The stocktaking will be finalized in early-FY17, after CODE has reviewed the second pilot and shared its feedback. The initial work for the stocktaking has highlighted the following issues:

- The clustered approach needs to be better understood and articulated, particularly the differences between what can be learned from a full country evaluation on the one hand, within a clustered approach, and from a series of country case studies in a thematic evaluation;
- There are some advantages to individual country CPEs, particularly to cover large countries;
- The clustered CPE approach is most likely to add value when there is a well-defined set of common characteristics that define the cluster to facilitate synthesis of cross-cutting lessons;
- The selection of countries is important and an option to consider in future is a regional cluster; and
- There is value in having a single analytical framework on the cluster theme when planning a group of CPEs.

27. One possible way forward is to supplement the CCPE approach with a limited number of case studies and desk studies during the synthesis phase, to provide a richer and broader perspective, and to bring in some of the advantages of a thematic approach while also retaining a whole country perspective in how the analysis is conducted. The use of additional case studies was a positive aspect of the resource rich CCPE, as the Chile and Botswana case studies were referred frequently to during the lesson learning process.

Project-Level Evaluations

28. IEG reviewed and updated the methodology and procedures for World Bank Project Performance Assessment Reports (PPARs) in FY16 to make this a more relevant, rigorous and self-standing analysis that can bring deeper insights and lessons to Bank management and operational staff. The revisions drew upon a range of pilot PPARs carried out in FY15 in which innovative use of technology and local evaluators was made. IEG has also invested in more effective ways of disseminating the lessons and findings from this product line. IEG plans to continue improvements in FY17, with continued use of more rigorous methods, improved PPAR template to enhance readability and accessibility, and greater emphasis on outreach.

29. IEG launched a pilot in FY15-16 to apply the World Bank PPAR methodology to a small number of IFC and MIGA operations, in line with our objective for harmonization of evaluation instruments across the three institutions. Six PPARs were completed in FY15 and eight are expected for FY16. As agreed in last year's work program, IEG has completed a stocktaking of the experience, and implications for accountability and learning of this new product in IFC and MIGA. Key findings include:

- **The PPARs have added a new element of transparency and accountability** by sharing project-level evaluation information with the Board (who otherwise receive no individual assessments of project-level results and performance of IFC and MIGA operations, unlike with World Bank operations, but only aggregated performance data).
- **The PPARs -- and their distribution to the Board -- have incentivized increased learning and reflection on development effectiveness between IFC operational teams and IEG.** Issues of discussion have included: how the structure of investments may affect IFC's incentives to pursue project development objectives; the timing and speed of building the client's environmental and social capacity in the case of large, complex and modular investments with significant environmental and social risks; and the role and use of economic analysis in projects that benefit from government subsidies.
- **Independent, field-based evaluations can provide a deeper and more accurate assessment of development effects compared to desk reviews** (which form the basis for IEG's validation of IFC and MIGA's project completion reports). Field work allows for independently collected data and information on stakeholders and beneficiaries perspective to better understand broader impacts of IFC and MIGA projects.

30. The stocktaking flagged that the "first generation" of PPARs had high transaction costs, as IEG and IFC spent time developing and discussing the overall approach and methodology, and addressing confidentiality concerns about client and project information and the security classification for each PPAR. IEG, IFC, and MIGA have now clarified the protocol for selecting,

conducting, and disclosing PPARs, which will contribute to lower transaction cost and increased efficiency. IEG proposes to continue with IFC and MIGA PPARs in the FY17-19 work program, and will seek opportunities to engage IFC and MIGA Management in discussion of selected PPARs that raise important policy dimensions.

Project Validation

31. As reviewed in the recent completed *Behind the Mirror – A Report on the Self-Evaluation Systems of the World Bank Group*, there is need to reform the Implementation Completion and Results Report (ICR) system to correct the incentives and signals surrounding self-evaluation. Staff perceive that the prevailing interpretation of the IEG/OPCS harmonized objectives-based approach to rating and validating ICRs limits the appetite for innovation and causes inflexibility for project management. The ICR system should better account for unintended positive and negative outcomes, beneficiaries' perspectives, and unforeseeable shocks in how results are measured and projects are rated. There is a need to promote more constructive interactions between IEG and operational departments over project validations without losing sight of IEG's accountability function.

32. Following CODE's review of *Behind the Mirror*, Management will develop its Action Plan to implement the agreed recommendations – and IEG will develop complementary actions to improve the validation process within IEG. These actions will be reviewed with CODE in FY17, including the scope for streamlining the system and options for moving to sampling of ICR Reviews, rather than the current 100 percent coverage. The analysis of options will take into account the data requirements of the Corporate Scorecard and the corporate goal of tracking unit-level performance.

33. IEG has eliminated its backlog of reviews of the World Bank Implementation Completion and Results Reports (ICRRs) after implementing the agreed actions spelled out in last year's work program. This resulted in 93 percent of the FY15 ICRR portfolio informing the 2015 RAP. More recently, there has been a temporary slippage in the processing of ICRRs due to delays and technical problems with the new ICRR IT platform; however, we expect the system to be functioning smoothly soon, leading to the same level of ICRR completion for the 2016 RAP.

34. To ensure that ICR Reviews generate the key data to assess WBG progress on the twin goals, IEG is introducing a system of markers in the ICR Review process to identify project relevance to, and measurement of, impact with respect to gender in development, poverty targeting, and distributional goals. These will be formulated to provide quick guidance on the extent to which projects address these issues, and facilitate more in-depth analysis through screening the relevant portfolio.

35. IEG continued to update the framework for the self-evaluation system of IFC and MIGA projects. We completed discussions with IFC on the guidelines for revised advisory Project Completion Reports (PCRs) and investment Expanded Project Supervision Reports (XPSRs). The new PCR guidelines were introduced in January 2016, supported by joint IFC-IEG training. The launch of online training is planned in FY17. The revised XPSR guidelines were piloted in FY16 and will be fully implemented in FY17, with training planned in the coming year. IEG and MIGA completed and tested guidance for a new MIGA product (non-honoring of financial obligations). This guidance will be included into the revision of Project Evaluation Reports (PERs) in MIGA, planned to start in FY17. In the process of the guidelines revision, progress was made in aligning

the private sector project evaluation frameworks with those of the Bank, while reflecting the differences in their business models and approaches.

Learning Products

36. In line with the earlier guidance from CODE, IEG has accelerated its focus on learning and knowledge sharing. After a period of piloting in FY14-15, IEG developed in FY15 guidelines for the definition, selection, and processing of learning products. In FY16, IEG delivered twelve major learning products that synthesized IEG evaluation findings. Examples include Maximizing Development Impact for IDA, WBG Transformational Engagements, and a series on operational dimensions of Development Policy Financing (see Annex 5 for full list).

37. In addition to these major products, IEG continued to deliver a wide range of brief, “just-in-time” learning products, often at the request of WBG technical units. Recent examples include lessons for WBG response to humanitarian crises; synthesis of IEG findings for the Financing for Development Conference in Addis, and the United Nations Sustainable Development Summit; IFC Sector Highlights; and new IEG websites for each GP/CCSA that provide “one stop” information on relevant evaluations, IEG contacts, and upcoming work relevant for that group. IEG also delivered a large number of informal learning and knowledge sharing activities for WBG operational staff and external stakeholders (see Annex 6 for an indicative list of activities in FY16).

38. As agreed in last year’s work program, IEG has conducted a stock-taking on the use and influence of IEG learning products. The review found that the potential of learning products has not been fully realized. While there have been some successes, there has been confusion over the scope and purpose of learning products within IEG and WBG, leading to a perception of learning products as “evaluations in disguise.” Key weaknesses include: inadequate clarity on the purpose and essentials of good practice learning and knowledge sharing; insufficient attention to demand and learning needs of WBG staff in the selection of topics; a focus on long reports (which have triggered lengthy review processes within IEG and WBG) rather than short, focused, and user-friendly formats; and lack of sustained engagement and collaborative learning processes with target audiences.

39. In response to the stock-taking, IEG recommends a substantial redesign of our current approach to learning and knowledge sharing. We propose to focus on four critical steps (the specific activities and their costs are reviewed in paras. 72-74 in the work program section).

- **Clarify IEG’s Learning Objectives and Strategy** – including developing a clear vision and guidance on purpose, principles, and good practices of IEG learning work. The renewed vision will focus much more on: the process of learning rather than delivering a product, demand not supply-driven topics, and sustained rather than single engagement with users.
- **Move from “Product” to “Learning” Mindset** -- including (1) shifting from preparation of lengthy reports to short, timely, and focused products in more user-friendly formats that respond to high priority, real time learning demands from operational staff (i.e. more “just-in-time” notes on urgent issues, presentations and workshops on sector and theme portfolio performance, practical “how to” advice, notes on good practices); and (2) establish more effective mechanisms and procedures to assess and prioritize WBG demand for learning topics, and engage WBG operational staff in preparation and use of products.

- ***Redesign Process for More Nimble and Effective Delivery*** – including (1) shift from pre-identification of topics in annual work program to *ex post* reporting of actual deliveries in CODE Quarterly Report; (2) streamline current learning product typology and associated processing paths, shift WBG engagement point from corporate stakeholders to actual operational partners, and agree upfront with Management on appropriate review process for specific products; and (3) improve communication, branding, and knowledge-management around learning deliveries, including building better on-line repository of knowledge.
- ***Strengthen IEG Staff Capacity and Incentives for Effective Adult Learning*** – including (1) deepening IEG staff skills for adult learning pedagogy and collaborative client engagement behaviors through provision of expert coaching, advice, training, and toolkits; (2) establish a quality assurance process where learning experts provide “peer review” for effective adult learning; and (3) strengthen incentives and recognition to promote agreed learning objectives, use of new toolkits, and effective learning behaviors.

3. Enhancing Quality and Credibility

Quality Assurance Framework.

40. Over the past few years, IEG has put in place a comprehensive quality assurance framework. Good quality starts with the selection of the right evaluation issues, so IEG has continued to refine its process for selectivity and prioritization of the work program, as described in Annex 3. During evaluation preparation and implementation, key quality elements include: quality standards for approach papers, “demand-driven” quality enhancement reviews as requested by TTLs, internal IEG review meetings on the draft approach paper and evaluation report with external peer reviewers, and review and feedback by WBG Management on the draft approach paper and evaluation report. As reviewed in para. 22, we have introduced ReACT Workshops as an additional feedback loop to deepen engagement with Management on the findings of a draft report and the formulation of recommendations. After the completion of the report, IEG conducts an “after-action review” where IEG staff have a structured debrief process to analyze what happened, why, and how the work could have been done better.

41. In FY16, IEG took several steps to further enhance the quality assurance framework.

42. First, the pilot exercise of meta-evaluation launched in FY14 was completed, whereby an independent panel of four external experts provided an assessment of the utility, validity, feasibility, and propriety of recent IEG evaluations. The process took longer than originally envisioned but has proved useful in validating IEG’s self-assessment of strengths and areas for improvement of IEG product quality. The meta-evaluations found that the IEG reports were generally satisfactory in terms of relevance, timeliness, identifying intended use, and overall feasibility and propriety. They flagged the need for stronger theories of change to adequately guide the design of data collection and analysis, stronger linkages between findings and recommendations, and enhanced focus on validity, particularly with regard to selecting country case studies more strategically, and ensuring that causal questions are explicitly included in evaluations and systematically answered using appropriate designs and methods. IEG found the meta-evaluation framework developed by the panel to be an extremely helpful tool, which we intend to internalize in the design and implementation of our work.

43. Second, drawing on the feedback of the meta-evaluation exercise, IEG updated the quality standards for approach papers, which had last been revised in 2012. These changes are designed to (1) sharpen the theory of change underpinning the evaluation and the formulation of specific evaluation questions linked to the subject and stakeholder needs; (2) better link the selection of methods and data to the specific evaluation questions, with more focus on how any gaps in existing data (for example, about impact and results) will be addressed; and (3) ensure robust and consistent focus across all evaluations on WBG performance related to twin goals and cross-cutting issues such as gender, inclusion, social and environmental risks, safeguards and performance standards. We also issued new guidance notes and reference materials, including a note on the design and use of country case studies in evaluations.

Methods and Data

44. IEG has continued to invest in testing, adapting, and developing new methods and data to ensure that we maintain cutting-edge rigor and quality in the evaluation of WBG development effectiveness.

45. First, we have established a new methods function under the Director General to provide strategic leadership to refine and improve IEG evaluation methods and data. A new Methods Advisor has been recruited, who will focus on: (1) strengthening evaluation methods in IEG products and services, including piloting of new and innovative evaluation techniques, with a focus on helping IEG staff select the best available evaluation methods and design to address specific evaluation questions; (2) ensuring consistent and efficient collection, use, and presentation of data in IEG evaluation work, including leading the community of practice of IEG portfolio and data analysts; and (3) supporting the development of IEG staff evaluation skills, and IEG's global presence in professional fora on evaluation methods and data. The Methods Advisor will draw on existing staff technical expertise from across IEG, and bring in external global experts on specific topics as needed.

46. Second, we have continued to focus on improving methods to assess WBG contributions to the achievement of the twin goals, particularly with regard to shared prosperity and sustainability dimensions. On shared prosperity, we are deepening our understanding and refining our approaches to growth analytics and decomposition, household survey evidence of project incidence, and qualitative evidence on participation, voice and accountability among excluded communities at the local level. On sustainability, we are continuing to ensure a strong and integrated review of environmental and social risk management in evaluation and validation work.

47. Third, IEG has completed significant work on integrating gender into all IEG evaluation work. New guidance materials have been issued that provide practical guidelines and tools to assess gender equality in project level validations, country program evaluations, Project Performance Assessment Reports, and major evaluations, as well as a "gender resource database" to help evaluators. New gender flags are being introduced in IEG reviews of ICRs, as well as for the review the Completion and Learning Reviews (CLR) of Country Partnership Frameworks (CPF), to ensure stronger monitoring of gender outcomes in WBG programs. Going forward, our work stream on gender will focus on continued training for evaluators, an updated intranet page for easy retrieval of the new tools, continued knowledge sharing and close collaboration with the Gender CCSA and the Results Measurement and Evidence Stream (RMES), and outreach to external partners, who have expressed great interest in these new tools.

48. Fourth, in response to CODE's feedback in last year's work program discussions, IEG launched a new work stream on value for money (VFM) in FY16. VFM analysis aims to provide decision makers with the tools to ensure accountability and transparency in spending by first seeking and evaluating whether available resources have been allocated as efficiently as possible to generate the maximum impact. The WBG has never formalized a definition of VFM, and its corporate and sectoral guidelines apply the term in different ways to different concepts. The purpose of this work stream is to develop guidelines and tools for VFM analysis, pilot the application of more rigorous assessment of VFM in IEG's work, and continue learning and knowledge sharing on VFM with OPCS, DEC, RMES, and other relevant WBG stakeholders.

49. Finally, IEG continues to update standards and tools for data, and ensure consistency in processes and analyses across IEG products and services. We have launched several pilots to tap into large internal and external data sets ("big data") and beneficiary feedback mechanisms to deepen and diversify the sources of evidence we use in evaluations. New standards and protocols for data collection and sharing have been established to make our evaluation data more accessible to stakeholders. We have developed a new web-based handbook for IEG staff on data analysis and portfolio review, designed to ensure high and uniform standards of quality across IEG evaluation work, foster staff exchange across departments, and harmonize our internal processes.

4. Enhancing Knowledge and Communications

50. IEG has continued to enhance the accessibility and usability of its **knowledge**, with the ultimate goal of enhancing influence across its key target groups, and improve the effectiveness of its processes and systems. Key actions include:

- LessonFinder (earlier called ELearn) continued to be populated in FY16, with new lessons from XPSRs, PERs and PCR; a new portal has been introduced to facilitate the analysis of results by sectors, regions or topic, and provide "one-stop" learning from all private sector project evaluations; and all lessons have been reclassified to match IFC's new lesson classification system. Portal usage and experience will be closely monitored, and the feasibility and cost/benefit to expand the database to include lessons from World Bank PPARs and ICR Reviews will be assessed, in partnership with some GPs/CCSAs.
- Continued championing of the new Results Measurements and Evidence Stream in partnership with Management, so that it can become an effective network of professionals across the Bank Group; IEG will focus on scaling up use of the evaluation competencies approved in FY15, and development of a new "RMES Academy," a clearinghouse on results measurement and evidence good practices.
- Workflow automation for PPARs and ICR Reviews, funded by the capital budget, have been implemented, with further refinements planned in FY17; work on disclosure tracking system is underway.
- New text analysis methods continue to be piloted that make it easier to explore and search massive document collections, and provide faster insights into relevant portions of the operations portfolio.
- IEG will launch a new revamped website in FY17 with improved search capabilities, enhanced user interaction features, improved MAR sub-site, and a new online consultation system to enable stakeholders keep abreast with and contribute to ongoing IEG evaluations.

51. To successfully deliver an expanded learning and knowledge sharing program, IEG will continue to focus on enhancing its **strategic communications function**.

- In FY16, IEG introduced new strategic communication tools and processes to help better plan and execute efficient and cost-effective outreach strategies for IEG products.
- IEG's outreach events, external website, and social media channels are the primary vehicles for engaging internal and external stakeholders. In FY16, IEG hosted 20 major internal dissemination events and three external events in support of key evaluations. IEG also continued to grow its online presence and outreach.
- IEG continued to test innovative formats and templates to make IEG reports more readable and accessible. For example, a new interactive version of the FY15 Social Safety Nets and Gender report was piloted, which enables end-users to rapidly search for and locate specific content on the most common topics of interest (see: <http://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/ssn/>).
- IEG continued to scale up use of Constituent Relationship Management technologies to build a network of IEG users, and deliver more targeted and meaningful engagement experiences with staff, development practitioners, and external stakeholders.

III. Proposed Work Program for FY17-19

1. Major Evaluations

52. As reviewed in last year's work program, IEG follows a comprehensive screening process to identify strategic evaluation priorities for the work program (the process is summarized in Annex 3). Key steps include:

- Conducting work program consultations with CODE, WBG Management, and external stakeholders;
- Identifying knowledge gaps within the three Strategic Engagement Areas where IEG evaluation work would add value;
- Reviewing evaluation coverage over the past six years related to the size of WBG lending (summary tables are included in Annex 4);
- Mapping existing and planned work against the IEG Results Framework; and
- Assessing all proposed topics against the IEG selectivity framework.

53. Based on this analysis, IEG has developed the three-year work program, included in Annex 5. The work program tables are presented with three different lens: (1) by IEG business lines; (2) by the objectives and results areas of the IEG Results Framework; and (3) by WBG institution and WBG strategic focus areas (as set out in the FY14 World Bank Group Strategy, FY16 Forward Look, FY17-19 IFC Business Strategy and Outlook, and provisional IDA18 Special Themes).

- As earlier agreed with CODE, IEG has reduced the number of major evaluations to promote enhanced selectivity and focus on the critical issues; we will continue to deliver eight major new evaluations, and one annual synthesis of results and performance each year.
- The proposed evaluations provide strong coverage of most of the strategic focus areas of (1) the WBG Strategy and Forward Look (with less coverage of leadership on global and regional issues, which we intend to review through PPARs), (2) the IFC focus industries (with less coverage of agribusiness and disruptive technologies), and (3) provisional IDA Special Themes (with less coverage of fragility, conflict, and violence, since we have recently completed two major evaluations in this area).
- The evaluations that CODE approved for FY17-18 in last year's work program have all been retained, with the exception that the earlier proposed evaluation on Informal Sector has been dropped, as this portfolio has now been largely covered in the FY14 SME evaluation and FY17 Rural Non-Farm Economy evaluation. However, the timing of some of the earlier approved evaluations has shifted, in response to programming suggestions from CODE and WBG Management, and as part of IEG's focus to reduce the bunching of deliverables.
- In line with CODE's guidance for a "One WBG" perspective, two-thirds of the evaluations cover all three WBG institutions, and 80 percent cover both World Bank and IFC.

54. **Evaluations Related to Objective 1: What Works.** About three-quarters of the major evaluations in the FY17-19 work program will contribute to the first objective of the IEG Results Framework, related to deepening evidence about the results of WBG programs and activities.

55. Eight evaluations will focus on the Strategic Engagement Area related to **Inclusive Growth**, reflecting the critical importance of this area for the twin goals:

- *FY17 Accelerating Prosperity through Higher Education* (which had been called *Tertiary Education* and planned for FY16 in last year's work program) will assess the performance and results of World Bank support to higher education, particularly with regard to quality, financing mechanisms, equality of access, and contributions to improved productivity and labor market outcomes, economic diversification and growth, and poverty reduction;
- *FY17 WBG Support for Shared Prosperity in Country Programs* will serve as a companion piece to the FY15 poverty reduction evaluation and assess early evidence on how well the Bank has pursued distributional objectives in its strategies, projects and key knowledge products, and how it has recently reoriented its country strategies and lending and knowledge instruments towards the corporate goal of shared prosperity;
- *FY17 Rural Non-Farm Economy* will assess how successfully the WBG has linked the rural poor to productive opportunities in the rural non-farm economy (comprising trading, agro-processing, manufacturing, and service activities) and the impact of these efforts on reducing poverty, economic growth and diversification, and decreasing inequality;
- *FY18 Public Finance, Jobs, and Growth* will assess public finance policies and tools (primarily public revenue policy and expenditure allocation measures) that WBG supports through operational and analytic work to foster investment, growth and jobs; it will address the consistency of their use, the evidence of direct and indirect impacts, and the effectiveness of these tools across client countries, including fragile and conflict states, low and mid-income, and extractive industry dependent countries where leveraging resource endowments to foster sustainable long-term growth is particularly challenging;
- *FY18 Mobilization of Private Capital* will assess the relevance, efficacy, efficiency, and additionality of WBG core mobilization programs and other de-risking mechanisms designed to help the WBG strategically enhance its role towards mobilization of private capital for development, and achievement of the goals set out in the "billions to trillions" strategy;
- *FY19 Sustainable and Inclusive Business* (which had been called *Corporate Sustainability and Development* and planned for FY18 in last year's work program) will review IFC's efforts to increase the developmental impact of private sector interventions, including economic diversification, and enhance the inclusiveness, sustainability, accountability and transparency of private sector work via efforts to promote inclusive business models;
- *FY19 Facilitating Trade* will assess the results and performance of WBG support for trade policy reform and market access, trade facilitation, and efficient trade logistics, with a focus on assessing the pro-poor impact of WBG trade work; and
- *FY19 Decentralization and Support to Local and Subnational Governments* will look at the large and growing portfolio of lending, knowledge, and partnerships at the subnational level, including how well WBG support to subnational programs supported service delivery in practice, the

cross-cutting challenges of decentralization, lessons from different entry points and models, how well does the support fit with local governance and promote efficiency, and effects on participation of citizens and accountability of local officials.

56. Three evaluations will address the Strategic Engagement Area related to **Sustained Service Delivery to the Poor**:

- *FY17 Sustaining Water Supply and Sanitation Services* will assess the extent to which WBG support has been effective in helping countries sustain water supply and sanitation services to the poor, with a focus on what has and has not worked, scalability and replicability of interventions;
- *FY17 Sustainable Urban Transport Services* will assess to what extent the WBG has supported sustainable urban transport development in client countries that contributed to economic efficiency and growth of cities, environmental quality, the welfare of the poor and vulnerable groups, and road/traffic safety;
- *FY18 Essential Health Care Services* (which had been called *Scaling Up Nutrition* in last year's work program) will update IEG's FY09 health sector evaluation and focus on the effectiveness and outcomes of World Bank and IFC support for essential health care for the poor, in line with the new SDG target for universal access to quality essential health-care services; and
- In FY19, a synthesis of the findings of the three evaluations will be prepared as we conclude the work in this Strategic Engagement Area, with a focus on identifying the key service delivery and behavior change interventions that have resulted in sustained service delivery for the poor.

57. Five evaluations will address the Strategic Engagement Area related to **Environmental Sustainability** (in addition to the thematic focus of the FY18 RAP, as noted in para. 60):

- *FY18 Toward a Clean World for All* (which had been called *Environmental Management of Air and Water Resources* and planned for FY17 in last year's work program) will assess to what extent the WBG has been relevant, effective, and efficient in addressing pollution concerns in client countries through targeted interventions, and the use of safeguards and performance standards in pollution-heavy industries.
- *FY18 WBG Support to Carbon Finance* will review the extent to which WBG carbon finance programs have been effective in supporting emission reductions, increasing access to energy for the poor, helping to protect forests and farmers by introducing smarter land management practices, building readiness for market-based initiatives, and influencing global policy and standards setting, thereby providing lessons for the next generation of climate finance starting in 2020;
- *FY18 Renewable Energy* will review WBG support to promote the development of renewable sources of energy, including institutional and technical capacity, policy environment, availability of financing for cost differences, and trade-offs between financial and environmental costs;

- *FY19 Environmental Degradation* will assess how the WBG is assisting country clients to understand the drivers and effects of resource scarcity and design appropriate interventions, with a focus on dryland management, sustainable land and water management, and impacts of migration and disaster risks; and
- *FY19 Sustainable Cities* (which had been planned for FY18 in last year's work program) will assess implementation of the "green cities" focus of the WBG urban development strategy, with a focus on support for low carbon livable cities, climate resilient growth, improved solid waste management systems, and sustainable financing and planning that addresses pollution and livability challenges.

58. **Country Program Evaluations** will remain a cornerstone of the work program, designed to enhance accountability and learning for results in country programs. Subject to further discussion with CODE in early-FY17 about the stocktaking of the Clustered CPE approach (see paras. 25-27), we propose to conduct *four individual CPEs of dynamic middle income countries (MICs)* in FY18-19, and then produce a synthesis report. The design of the overall approach, the best way to achieve synthesis and lesson learning, and the criteria for selecting the countries will be decided once the stocktaking is completed. IEG will seek to build on some of the advantages of a clustered approach but also respond to the initial issues raised during the first two Clustered CPE pilots, including getting the right tradeoff between depth of analysis for each single country (which is useful to the Board, the WBG country team, and the country authorities), and learning across the cluster (which has added a new dimension to IEG's country evaluations and has also received positive feedback).

59. In addition, IEG proposes to do a small pilot country study in FY17 on *Reimbursable Advisory Services (RAS) in Saudi Arabia*, the Bank's oldest RAS Program, in response to a request by Bank Management and country authorities. RAS has become an increasingly important instrument to meet country demand beyond what the World Bank's administrative budget or relevant trust funds can support, particularly in middle- and high-income country clients, including non-borrowing members. This case study would be prepared as a learning engagement and would help IEG develop a methodological framework for a possible future evaluation of RAS.

60. The annual **Results and Performance Report** will continue to provide a summary of aggregate WBG performance, a special thematic chapter, and updates covering the Regional and Global Practice Vice-Presidencies. The following thematic chapters are proposed:

- *FY17 Managing for Results*, which would assess how effectively the WBG has developed and implemented a "managing for results" system that is conducive to achieving the results articulated in the corporate scorecard;
- *FY18 Environmental Sustainability in Operations*, which would review how WBG has integrated environment, climate change, and disaster risk considerations into the design of WBG country strategies and operations; and
- *FY19 Working in Partnership*, which would review WBG performance in global and regional partnership programs as well as country-level partnership activities.

61. **Evaluations Related to Objective 2: Real-Time Learning.** About one-quarter of the major evaluations in FY17-19 will contribute to the second objective of the IEG Results Framework, related to generating independent evaluation evidence to assess the early

implementation experience of the WBG Strategy. These evaluations are designed to enable real-time learning and mid-course corrections, and promote a stronger internal culture for results, accountabilities, and learning.

62. Two evaluations will focus on the WBG Strategy pillar related to **Helping Clients Tackle the Most Important Development Challenges**.

- *FY17 SCD/CPF Process Evaluation* (which has shifted from FY16 to FY17 in order to capture a sufficient number of SCD/CPF experiences) will assess the early implementation experience of the SCD/CPF process and identify areas that can be strengthened to enhance country engagement. The work on SCD will focus on: evidence basis and framing of the issues; growth, poverty, shared prosperity, and sustainability; identification of priorities for achieving the twin goals; and WBG integration. The work on CPF will focus on: alignment with country development priorities, the twin goals, and sustainability; country ownership, selectivity, realism, and systematic accounting of risks; quality of results frameworks; and WBG integration.
- *FY17 IFC Client Engagement Model* will assess the extent to which IFC's recently launched enhanced client engagement model is contributing to the achievement of increased development impact and contributing to the WBG twin goals; and if the assumed benefits of the model – an expanded client base, more effective client relationships, and a stronger position as trusted advisor – have contributed to developmental success.

63. A second set of evaluations will focus on the WBG Strategy pillar related to **Becoming a Solution Bank**. These will review the effectiveness of learning and knowledge in operations, including the early implementation experience of the GPs and CCSAs, and assess the relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness of operational instruments. We reviewed P4R and DPF in FY15-16, and are proposing to look at the remaining instruments in FY17-19: Investment Project Financing (as a learning engagement under our new approach to learning) and Guarantees (as part of the FY18 Mobilization of Private Capital Evaluation).

- *FY17 Data for Development* will review the effectiveness of Bank support to country clients in producing, disseminating, and using development data, in line with the new WBG Development Data Framework, and provide early reflections on the extent to which the establishment of the Data Council in 2014 and the launch of the Strategic Actions Program for Addressing Development Data Gaps 2016 – 2030 are beginning to, or are likely to, help address the gaps and challenges surrounding development data;
- *FY19 Process Evaluation of GP/CCSAs* (which had been planned for FY18 in last year's work program, but now shifted to FY19 in view of the continued evolution of the GP/CCSA business model) will review the clarity of roles, efficiency of delivery, interface with country engagement model, level of "jointness," process to deploy expertise and knowledge to meet client needs, and process to collect, curate, and share knowledge.

64. Several evaluations will focus on the WBG Strategy pillar related to **Working in Partnership** (in addition to the thematic chapter of the FY19 RAP, as noted in para. 60). This work stream will assess the effectiveness with which partnerships support the mission of the WBG and its

relevant global commitments, the performance of the WBG as a development partner, and how effectively the WBG plays its convening role.

- *FY18 Engaging Citizens* will address WBG support for transparency, accountability and participation to enhance citizen voice, beneficiary feedback loops that contribute to mid-course corrections in implementation of operations, and partnership with civil society organizations in order to strengthen the demand side of governance and complement service delivery through public and private institutions.
- IEG will continue to integrate the review of individual partnership programs into the major thematic evaluations. For example, in FY17, *Rural Non-Farm Economy* will review Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFFSP); *Sustaining Water Supply and Sanitation Services* will review the Water and Sanitation Program (WSP), Water Partnership Program (WPP), and water related activities of the Public-Private Infrastructure Advisory Facility (PPIAF) and the Global Partnership on Output-Based Aid (GPOBA); *Sustainable Urban Transport Services* will review the Sub-Saharan Africa Transport Policy Program (SSATP); and *Data for Development* will review the Partnership in Statistics for Development in the 21st Century (Paris 21) and Statistics for Results Facility (SRF).
- IEG will continue to review WBG performance in donor coordination and convening at the country-level as part of country program evaluations, including whether potential donor coordination and harmonization opportunities were properly identified in the CPF, and the effectiveness of WBG participation in key donor coordination and harmonization mechanisms.

65. **Monitoring Implementation of Evaluation Recommendations.** The Management Action Record (MAR) reform process has been an important step to enhance the quality and impact of major evaluations as well as strengthen monitoring and accountability related to implementation of agreed actions in the Management Action Plan. Key outcomes include:

- Improved quality of IEG recommendations, including clearer links to findings, prioritization, better clarity and specificity, and considerations of feasibility and cost effectiveness;
- Stronger engagement with WBG management while drafting the recommendations;
- More specific actions to be taken to implement IEG recommendations in Management Response, and clearer timeline and monitoring arrangements; and
- Enhanced assessment of progress on implementation and reduced inconsistencies in ratings between IEG and Management.

66. The on-line MAR system that was introduced in FY14 provides a central repository of findings, recommendations, management responses, detailed action plans and implementation, for use by all key stakeholders. The MAR data set is now available on the external website – an important step in the WBG’s commitment to transparency and Open Data.

67. As part of our focus on Strategic Engagement Areas, IEG will review implementation of evaluation recommendations related to each Strategic Engagement Area, to ensure that our collective recommendations are strategic and coherent, and provide a platform for effective dialogue

with Management. Other process changes related to MAR in FY17 include: (1) improving the engagement process with Management on evaluation recommendations and findings; (2) conducting a stock-taking of the MAR process over the past two years in partnership with Management, and identifying steps to enhance the impact and effectiveness of the MAR process; and (3) continued system enhancements based on the experiences over the past two years. IEG will continue outreach efforts to familiarize Executive Directors' staff, WBG Management, and other stakeholders on the use of the on-line system and enhanced MAR website.

2. Project Evaluations

68. In the past, IEG has aimed to conduct PPARs on about 20-25 percent of closed World Bank projects, in order to ensure (1) a robust assessment of actual project performance (particularly with regard to sustainability of project impacts over time and client feedback), and (2) an independent review of the quality and accuracy of the self-evaluation system. However, in recent years, the PPAR coverage rate has dropped to about 15 percent, for two reasons: (1) we maintained production of 40-45 PPARs per year despite an increase in the overall volume of lending, and (2) we redeployed staff time from PPARs to the priority task of eliminating the backlog of Bank ICR Reviews. As reviewed in last year's work program, IEG proposes to increase the annual delivery of PPARs, from 50 in FY15 to about 68 in FY19, thereby covering about 20 percent of closed projects.

3. Validation Products

69. Country Completion and Learning Review Validations. IEG will continue to review 100 percent of all CLRs in FY17 – 19. About 22 CLRs are expected to be reviewed in FY17. In addition, as the new country engagement is rolled out, IEG is continuing to review and discuss with CODE how to provide useful evaluative input for the initial round of PLRs.

70. Project Validations. IEG will continue to review WBG project completion reports, to foster both accountability and learning in the self-evaluation system. In FY17, IEG will continue to review 100 percent of completed IDA/IBRD lending operations with available self-evaluations, as well as 100 percent of completed recipient-executed trust funded projects greater than or equal to \$5 million with available self-evaluations. Looking forward, IEG will review with WBG Management and CODE the scope for streamlining the system and the options for moving towards a strategic sampling basis, as reviewed in paras. 31-32.

71. IFC will prepare self-evaluations for 40 percent of randomly selected mature investments, all validated by IEG. For closed projects, IEG will prepare independent project evaluation summaries (PES) in lieu of XPSRs. In case of Advisory Services, IEG will validate 51 percent of project completion reports, based on random representative sampling. For MIGA, the self-evaluation accompanied by IEG's validation and independent evaluation by IEG will together cover 100 percent of MIGA's mature guarantees.

4. Learning and Knowledge Sharing

72. As reviewed in paras. 36-39, IEG proposes to significantly redesign our current approach to learning and knowledge sharing. Instead of focusing on the production of a dozen lengthy reports, we will shift to short, timely, and focused products in more user-friendly formats that respond to high priority, real time learning requests from operational staff.

73. To achieve this new direction, we propose to pilot in FY17 a new **Rapid Results Learning Fund** of \$750,000 under the Director General, which would approve and fund larger IEG learning engagements on a rolling basis, based on clear eligibility criteria. All proposals for funding would require upfront “joint ownership” with a relevant Bank Group operational unit, and would spell out the purpose, audience, scope, engagement plan, and intended use of the work. In addition, we would provide a small allocation to each of the four IEG units as part of their core budgets to support nimble preparation of small, fast, just-in-time learning work in response to opportunities or issues as they arise, as we did in FY16. We will also provide additional support for expanded coaching, training, and quality assurance process to deepen IEG staff capacity for effective adult learning solutions.

74. IEG will develop a robust system to monitor the delivery, cost, and use of all learning activities, to ensure managerial accountability for results, value for money, and effective reporting. We will provide a summary of activities delivered through the new Rapid Results Learning Fund in the CODE Quarterly Report to keep CODE apprised of implementation, and will complete a stock-taking with Management in end-FY17 to assess the effectiveness of this new approach.

5. Other Evaluation Work

75. DGE Statements to Board and Management. IEG will continue to issue DGE Statements to the Executive Directors that summarize relevant evaluation evidence, to help inform their review of WBG thematic and sector strategies, operational policies, and other issues related to WBG development effectiveness. In addition, IEG will continue to provide early feedback directly to Management on these issues prior to their submission of the documents to the Board (a list of DGE Statements provided to the Board and Management in FY16 is included as Annex 7).

76. Joint Evaluation Work. IEG will collaborate with the European Commission (EC) and other development partners on a joint evaluation of all donor budget support operations to Ghana from 2006 to 2015, in line with the suggestion for more joint evaluation work in CODE’s Proposed Road Map and Action Plan in response to the External Review. The work will involve two outputs: (1) a series of PPARs prepared by IEG on World Bank development policy operations in Ghana; and (2) a joint evaluation report produced in partnership with the EC, which will incorporate the findings of IEG’s PPAR series as well as other evaluative evidence. The joint report, which will follow OECD/DAC methodology for budget support evaluation analysis, will not be a formal IEG product (and will carry the relevant proviso that the opinions expressed in joint report do not necessarily represent official views of IEG).

77. Impact Evaluations. IEG views impact evaluation methods as an important tool to produce and synthesize evidence on the effectiveness of specific development interventions. IEG will not produce prospective impact evaluations since they require early project engagement, which could compromise IEG’s ability to independently evaluate the projects at closure. However, retrospective impact evaluations that generate treatment and comparison groups’ ex-post and are lower cost will continue to be part of IEG’s toolkit. This work would be fully aligned with and feed into the major evaluations and learning products in the work program, to ensure strategic relevance.

78. In FY17, IEG will produce two impact evaluations that will feed into the FY18 evaluation on citizen engagement. The first will cover a community monitoring project in Burkina Faso, and the second will be on a community driven development project in Nepal. We will also continue to

produce systematic reviews of the impact evaluation literature to accompany major evaluations when there is an evidence-gap to fill by doing so. These systematic reviews will also provide value-added for the WBG where there is considerable unmet demand for harvesting the evidence-base on specific development questions.

79. Working Papers on Methods. IEG will prepare working papers on key methodological issues, as part of our focus on clarifying and updating IEG's methods in line with global best practices. In FY17, IEG will prepare two sets of working papers covering: (1) our recent analytical work on Value for Money (see para. 48), and (2) the methodological frameworks to assess service delivery models and behavior change interventions for our work on Sustained Service Delivery to the Poor (other topics for working papers on methods will be identified after the arrival of the Methods Advisor).

6. Evaluation Capacity Development

80. As requested by CODE, IEG has reviewed the strategy and work program for Evaluation Capacity Development (ECD), following the recommendation of the External Review that *“IEG’s work should be broadened to build M&E capacity in client countries, in partnership with the WBG, other MDBs, development organizations and the countries themselves.”* We propose the following four strategic directions in FY17-19, building on CODE's guidance for a balanced approach that deepens IEG's work in capacity development while maintaining our core focus on the independent evaluation mandate.

81. **First, the main thrust of IEG's work in broadening ECD efforts will continue to be carried out in collaboration with partners through the two ongoing major initiatives:** Centers for Learning on Evaluation and Results (CLEAR), and the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET).

- Continued strengthening of the CLEAR partnership and preparing for Phase III. With “phase II” currently under implementation (FY16-19) and fully funded, IEG will focus in FY17 on: (1) introducing a stronger business-oriented management approach to the choice and delivery of service offerings – allowing the Center partners to complement the initially more opportunistic service strategies with a more purposefully selective approach; (2) developing, jointly across the CLEAR community, global knowledge on the “how to” and “what works” in ECD and identifying avenues for effectively sharing this knowledge with other providers of ECD services; and (3) developing jointly delivered “global” services, such as standardized courses on specific evaluation topics that would be available at several CLEAR locations. In addition, IEG will set out strategic directions for CLEAR's Phase III towards a more sustainable and decentralized model.
- Bringing IPDET to developing countries, and updating its curriculum. A strategic review of IPDET was conducted in FY16, which indicated a growing demand for high quality, IPDET-type, executive learning offerings in developing countries. The review recommended a renewal of IPDET's curriculum and expansion of IPDET course delivery to the “global south.” In FY17, IEG, in coordination with Carleton University, will complete a curriculum review for IPDET that will lead to updated content – in particular with regard to developing country experiences, adopting more modern pedagogical approaches, and developing better and more opportunities for off-site accessibility of IPDET knowledge and the IPDET community. IEG will then engage all IPDET partners and other important

ECD stakeholders to explore options and agree on how best to scale up IPDET course offering to developing countries.

82. **Second, IEG will continue to deepen our direct M&E capacity building efforts,** building on the suggestions included in the Proposed Road Map and Action Plan prepared by CODE in response to the External Review. Key steps include:

- Review the availability of existing data bases of local talent currently managed by other external ECD partners, and see how IEG might make better use of, or build on, these existing resources;
- Scale up the use of local talent in IEG evaluation work, both as members of evaluation teams and peer reviewers, when feasible; we will first analyze how much local expertise we currently employ in our evaluation work to establish a benchmark, and then we will set meaningful targets for FY17-19; and
- Continue to provide good practice notes and other relevant toolkits drawn from IEG evaluation work, and broaden our learning engagements with operational staff (through RMES, GP clinics, the “DPO Academy,” the “CPF Academy,” IFC credit courses, etc.), to help strengthen M&E systems in WBG operations.

83. **Third, we will promote increased attention to ECD issues in the Bank’s country strategy work.** The first step will be to discuss options with WBG Management and do a stocktaking with the relevant GPs, OPCS, DEC, and the Regions about the adequacy of existing tools and guidance for diagnosing existing evaluation capacities and their constraints at the country level. If there is a gap, IEG would then work with internal WBG partners as well as the many external stakeholders working on ECD, to help develop appropriate tools and guidance as needed. These diagnostic tools would then be available to country teams and country authorities to use as part of the SCD process, to help identify the critical gaps in countries’ capacity to produce and use evaluation evidence to achieve their development goals. These assessments would enable country teams and country authorities to identify the priority capacity building investments and technical assistance to strengthen the quality, relevance, and timeliness of national monitoring and evaluation functions. If there is traction and engagement with operational staff to scale up ECD in country programs, IEG would explore developing a network or community of practice of relevant partners – similar to what we have done with RMES.

84. **Fourth, IEG will continue to promote evaluation capacity in the global public agenda,** spurring dialogue and action. We will focus on strengthening the relevance, coherence and impact of development partners’ investments in capacity development, through continued collaboration with key ECD players like EvalPartners (a global initiative set up in 2012 by the International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation and UNICEF), the OECD DAC EvalNet Task Group, the Evaluation Cooperation Group, and UNEG. We will continue to focus on “what works” in ECD, sharing and identifying opportunities for collaboration, and developing joint initiatives as appropriate.

85. IEG will provide an update on the implementation of these four strategic directions in next year’s work program.

IV. Staffing and Budget

1. Human Resources

86. IEG will continue to manage its staff levels and skills mix to support the strategic directions set out in the IEG results framework and work program. In line with WBG HR reforms, IEG is focusing on the following steps.

87. **Driving Strategic Staffing.** IEG completed a strategic staffing exercise in FY15, in parallel to the process followed in the WBG, and will continue with implementation of the agreed strategic staffing directions in FY17-19. We will remain focused on three core issues: (1) What skills does IEG have and need? (2) What are current workforce levels and plans? and (3) How can we best align staffing levels and skills mix with our strategic business needs in FY17-19? Recent and on-going actions include:

- Recruiting new staff in areas where we need to deepen our skills, including agriculture and environment, health, urban development, methodologies, and knowledge management;
- Shifting from the use of Extended Term Consultants to term appointments for GE/GF level skills, in line with the changing contract architecture of the Bank Group; and
- Redeploying resources from “backline” functions to “frontline” evaluation work, including reducing the number of Director, Advisor, and other sustaining cost positions.

88. **Renewing the Organization.** IEG implemented an organizational change process in FY15-16 to deepen collaboration and synergy within IEG, and ensure that IEG’s products, processes, and structure are “fit for purpose.” We followed a systematic and participatory process of organizational diagnosis and change, supported by external leadership consultants. In January 2016, we completed the transition to a new organizational structure, designed to reduce overhead, better align with WBG norms for managerial span of control, ensure clearer interface and engagement with the new WBG units, and facilitate increased staff collaboration and mobility in larger labor pools. As part of the change process, we have (1) created a new Methods Adviser, (2) established new Cluster Coordinators who will provide leadership vis-à-vis our clients in the WBG and lead communities of practice within IEG, and (3) focused intensely on strengthening the underlying collaborative behaviors of managers and staff – “moving the boxes” without corresponding changes in behaviors and incentives will not lead to successful change.

89. **Creating Career Opportunities.** The annual review of talent has been conducted and its recommendations are being implemented. This exercise will ensure there is a right mix of formal training, mentoring, and on-the-job development opportunities to equip staff at all levels with the evaluation knowledge and skills they need to grow professionally. In addition, IEG is regularly using the evaluation competencies developed in FY15 to help enrich professional development by giving staff a clearer view of what is needed in a job at different levels. IEG continues to run special mentoring, onboarding, and technical training program for its staff, and is participating in the GE Readiness Program, a ten-month professional development program to build GE Analyst skills.

90. **Fostering a More Diverse and Inclusive Workplace.** IEG is strengthening its focus on diversity and inclusion (D&I). While IEG scores higher than the overall WBG on diversity

indicators related to women representation in GF+ technical staff and in management, it scores below on Part II representation in management and significantly below on Sub-Saharan African and Caribbean representation in GF+ technical staff. Generally, IEG scores the same as or slightly higher than the overall WBG on inclusion indicators from the 2015 Employee Engagement Survey. IEG continues to implement the D&I Compact approved in FY15, with a focus on: (1) ensuring D&I issues are mainstreamed throughout IEG, (2) improving managerial accountability and promoting transparency, and (3) strengthening mechanisms for openness, voice, dignity and respect. IEG has focused heavily on ensuring more diverse longlists and shortlists during recruitment processes, including outreach by IEG leadership in Africa to build a pipeline of future candidates and get IEG better known in potential recruitment markets.

91. As of end-March 2016, staffing levels in IEG declined to 101 people (compared to 105 one year earlier), in line with natural turnover and our specific strategic staffing decisions. We are now focusing on recruitment to address skill gaps and the phase out of ETC appointments, and expect to return to the historical range of 105-110 in FY17.

92. IEG compares favorably relative to the Bank Group in terms of internal mobility of staff, which allows for active management of the staff skills base. IEG management is conscious of the need to draw both on Bank Group experience and on external experience from other organizations. The proportion of professional staff (GE+) at end-March 2016 that were recruited from outside the WBG stood at 49 percent, close to the 48 percent a year before. IEG will continue to maintain staff and other fixed costs at a level consistent with a fixed cost ratio of around 75 percent to allow for adequate flexibility.

2. Budget Proposal

93. **Sources.** IEG's projected resources to deliver its FY17 work program total \$34.6 million, comprising a \$33.8 million regular budget to be approved by the Board, and \$0.8 million in trust funds. This resource envelope is consistent with the flat budget framework agreed with the Board in FY12 and adjusted to reflect planned savings from the third year of IEG's Expenditure Review.

94. The regular budget is set out in Table 1, which shows recent trends as well as projections. In line with the most recent practice of the Bank Group, the figures are presented in nominal terms. There is no change in the proposed contributions from individual institutions, each will maintain its relative proportion of funding of IEG. As the nominal budget of IEG decreases in FY17, so do the individual contributions in absolute terms. The percentages relative to the total budget of each institution are broadly constant in line with the changing envelopes of the respective institutions. IEG's regular budget remains flat in real terms since FY05.

Table 1: IEG Institution Contributions, FY14–19

<i>(in nominal dollars)</i>	FY14 Budget \$m	FY15 Budget \$m	FY16 Budget \$m	FY17 Proposed \$m	FY18 Indicative \$m	FY19 Indicative \$m
WB Contribution	26.6	26.5	26.4	26.3	27.1	27.9
IFC Contribution	7.0	7.0	7.0	6.9	7.1	7.4
MIGA Contribution	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6
Total IEG	34.2	34.1	34.0	33.8	34.8	35.9
Contribution as % of IEG funding						
WB	78%	78%	78%	78%	78%	78%
IFC	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
MIGA	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
IEG as % of parent institution budget						
WB ^{1/}	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.1%	1.2%	1.2%
IFC ^{2/}	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%
MIGA ^{3/}	1.3%	1.1%	1.1%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
Total	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%

1/ WB: Net Administrative BB Budget, FY16 World Bank Budget document, page 11, table 2.2

2/ IFC: Total Administrative Budget, IFC FY16 Budget document, page 42, table 14

3/ MIGA: Total Administrative Budget, MIGA Three Year Business Plan (FY15-17) and FY16 Administrative Budget document, page 23, table 4

95. **Trust funds.** IEG expects to receive \$0.8 million in trust funds in FY17, including: (1) \$0.6 million from the multi-donor trust fund that was established in FY10 to support IEG’s evaluation capacity development program, including the CLEAR secretariat; and (2) \$0.2 million continuing from a Japan Policy and Human Resource staff grant. As described in last year’s work program, IEG updated its procedures in FY16 on the use of trust funds, to align with evolving Bank Group guidance set out in the revised Trust Fund Handbook.

96. **Capital budget.** No new capital budget is requested for FY17. The most recent capital budget allocation was approved in FY14 and the project closed in December 2015. The project established a high-quality search function covering all document collections relevant to IEG’s evaluation research; introduced new electronic process automation for streamlining complex and labor-intensive document production; and expanded the use of text analytics for greater insight and productivity.

97. **Expenditure Review.** IEG completed an internal Expenditure Review in FY14 to identify opportunities to enhance efficiency and reduce costs, in parallel to the WBG initiative. Four key findings emerged from the Review:

- Benchmarking data confirmed that IEG’s budget share (0.9 percent of total WBG budget) falls in the lower range of comparable multilateral institutions;¹
- IEG continues to experience some weaknesses in budget management and bunching of deliverables, in particular effective tracking of expenditures against task plans;

¹ Comparator institutions include: Asian Development Bank (evaluation budget share of 1.8 percent), African Development Bank (1.7 percent), Inter-American Development Bank and Islamic Development Bank (1.3 percent), and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (1.2 percent).

- IEG performs better than the Bank on some variable cost efficiency measures, but compares unfavorably on specific measures in the travel and consultant areas; and
- IEG's share of sustaining and indirect costs stands above comparable units in the WBG, reflecting a relatively large share of GI/GH staff as well as high office-space-to-staff ratio.

98. Based on the analysis, IEG made several recommendations that would generate net cost savings of 8 percent of IEG's budget in FY15-17, which were reviewed and endorsed by CODE and the Board. These include reduction in GI/GH staffing levels, improvements in variable cost management (particularly related to consultant fees and travel costs), efficiency gains from ongoing IT investments, reductions in office space, and other measures. In addition, IEG is continuing to focus on redeploying resources from "backline" functions to "frontline" evaluation work. In FY17, the total savings from the implementation of the Expenditure Review are projected to stand at \$2.7 million and have been reflected in the spending trends, described below.

99. **Spending trends.** Table 2 sets out trends in resource use over the FY13 - 19 period, including regular budget resources, trust funds, and other income. IEG's strategic directions are reflected in the spending proposals, as follows:

- The proportion of spending on Major Evaluations declines from 25 percent in FY13 to 23 percent in FY17-19, in line with the earlier decision agreed with CODE to reduce the number of major evaluations and redeploy the savings to other product lines like learning and PPARs.
- The proportion of spending on Other Evaluation Products increases from 11 percent in FY13 to 13 percent in FY17-19. This reflects:
 - The earlier agreement with CODE to scale up the delivery of learning and knowledge products, which increase from \$0.5 million in FY13 to \$1.6 million in FY17-19;
 - The agreement in last year's work program to increase the coverage of PPARs, as reviewed in para. 68, which increases from \$1.5 million in FY15 to \$3.0 million by FY19;
 - The corresponding decrease in Other Evaluations, from \$1.5 million in FY13 to \$0.1 million in FY17-19, as IEG is not planning any freestanding global program reviews in FY17-19.
- Spending on validation products has been projected at roughly the same level in FY17-19. The spending plans for outer-years will be revised pending further analysis and discussions about the scope for (1) streamlining of the ICRR and CLR validation process (which would reduce costs), and (2) possible piloting the validation of World Bank AAA products (which would increase costs).
- Spending on Knowledge and Communications Services is projected at roughly the same level in FY17-19 (this budget item includes publications and outreach, internal knowledge management, internal methods work, and internal staff learning costs). Within this category, we are assuming (1) cost-efficiencies arising from the shift from printed reports to e-reports, and from face-to-face learning delivery to e-learning, and the introduction of new text analytic

tools that will reduce staff time in research, made possible by the capital budget program; and (ii) increased expenditures for methods work.

- Sustaining costs remain broadly even in nominal terms, with savings corresponding to the phased reduction of GI/GH positions and backline functions offset by annual staff salary increases.

Table 2. Summary of Sources and Uses, FY13–19

<i>(in nominal dollars)</i>	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimate	Proposed	Indicative	Indicative
	\$'m						
Sources							
Total Budget	33.4	34.2	34.4	35.7	36.6	37.7	38.9
Carryover	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Expenditure Review Savings	-	-	(0.7)	(1.7)	(2.8)	(2.9)	(3.0)
Total Trust Funds & EFOs	1.2	2.2	1.3	1.7	0.8	0.8	0.8
Total Sources	35.3	36.4	35.1	35.7	34.6	35.6	36.7
Uses							
Major Evaluations	8.8	8.7	8.5	8.3	8.1	8.2	8.4
Other Evaluation Products	4.0	5.7	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.6	4.8
Project Performance Assessments	2.0	1.8	1.5	2.1	2.5	2.9	3.0
Learning Products and Services	0.5	0.8	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.7
Other Evaluations	1.5	3.1	1.1	0.7	0.2	0.1	0.1
Validation Products	5.0	5.1	4.9	5.1	4.9	5.0	5.2
Country Level	0.8	0.8	0.7	1.0	0.8	0.9	1.0
Project level	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.2
Knowledge and Communications	5.6	5.3	5.2	5.8	5.7	5.9	6.0
o/w Publications and Outreach	1.0	1.2	0.9	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
o/w Knowledge Management	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.7
o/w Methodology	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.8
o/w Staff Learning	0.7	0.7	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.9
Evaluation Capacity Development	1.7	1.2	1.1	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4
Sustaining	5.3	5.5	5.6	5.4	5.4	5.5	5.6
Indirects *	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.2	4.7	5.0	5.3
Total Uses	35.1	36.3	34.4	35.5	34.6	35.6	36.7
Proportion of spending on:							
Major Evaluations	25%	24%	25%	23%	23%	23%	23%
Other Evaluation Products	11%	16%	13%	12%	12%	13%	13%
Validation Products	14%	14%	14%	14%	14%	14%	14%
Knowledge and Communications	16%	15%	15%	16%	16%	17%	16%

* Indirects include IEG reorganization cost in FY16 and move to new office space in FY18-19

100. Table 3 sets out spending trends by expense categories for regular budget resources. From FY14 to FY19, staff costs are projected to increase by 10 percent in nominal terms, reflecting annual price increases and the replacement of ETCs with term appointments, in line with strategic staffing plans. Consultant costs largely remain the same, as annual prices increases have been offset by reduction in rates, in line with our Expenditure Review targets. In line with the Expenditure Review measures, travel cost, reduced both in volume and rate, are expected to rise in line with the increased cost of travel.

Table 3: Expenditure Trends by Expense Category, FY14-19 (BB only)

<i>(in nominal dollars)</i>	FY14 Actual \$'m	FY15 Actual \$'m	FY16 Estimate \$'m	FY17 Plan \$'m	FY18 Indicative \$'m	FY19 Indicative \$'m
Fixed Costs						
Staff Costs	20.3	20.9	20.6	21.6	21.9	22.3
Communications and IT	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5
Equipment and Buildings*	1.4	1.4	1.6	1.5	1.7	1.8
Total Fixed Costs	22.7	23.4	23.4	24.4	25.0	25.6
Variable Costs						
Consultants and Temps	7.0	6.5	6.8	6.9	7.0	7.2
ETC & ETT	1.3	1.1	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Travel Costs	1.7	1.1	1.4	1.4	1.6	1.7
Representation and Hospitality	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Contractual Services	0.8	0.7	1.0	0.6	0.8	0.9
Other Expenses	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Total Variable Costs	11.5	10.0	10.7	9.4	9.9	10.3
Total Expenses	34.2	33.3	34.1	33.8	34.9	35.9

* Equipment and Buildings includes IEG reorganization move in FY16 and a move to new office space in FY18-19

3. Accountability Framework

101. IEG adheres to WBG budget rules and procedures. IEG is subject to Controller’s Quality Assurance reviews of selected expenses and has consistently received favorable ratings on adherence to budget rules, procedures, and policies. IEG’s control environment continues to be ranked as one of the strongest in its peer group.

102. In regard to external audit, the contributions by World Bank, IFC, and MIGA are audited as part of regular external audits of those institutions.

103. In November 2006 the Board approved a procedure formalizing CODE’s role in overseeing IEG’s budget and safeguarding its independence in the governance structure of the WBG. This procedure includes the periodic review of IEG’s budget proposal every 2-3 years by an independent external budget analyst, validating the adequacy of IEG’s annual budget proposal as well as its consistency with the overall WBG budgetary principles.

104. The earlier independent review was conducted for FY13 and concluded: “*IEG’s budget formulation and management is broadly satisfactory as there have been no major changes from budget practice, expenditures, and outputs achieved in the recent past.*” Specific recommendations were made to reduce bunching, improve costing and monitoring of deliverables, and introduce stronger tracking of expenditures against plans, all of which IEG has been implementing.

105. Slippages and bunching of major evaluations were a significant problem in FY16, exacerbated by the internal reorganization that contributed to some delays in launching work on

evaluations and learning products. IEG has put in place a firm program to reduce bunching in FY17 (though four evaluations are still expected to be delivered in the fourth quarter), and eliminate bunching in FY18, where there will be an even distribution of evaluations by quarter. Key measures include: allocating more resources in the year before delivery so that field work and data collection will be done earlier, better upfront planning of tasks, more effective tracking and reporting, and periodic management reviews and coordination of deliveries across all IEG products. In addition to real time technical tracking of milestones, IEG management conducts a Quarterly Business Review Meetings with Department Management Teams, focusing on individual products and tasks and troubleshooting delivery bottlenecks.

106. Budget management has improved, as IEG Management has implemented several measures in response to the earlier budget review to strengthen budget management:

- Greater realism in developing robust budgets in Approach Papers;
- Instilling stronger budget discipline among TTLs, adhering to task budgets and prioritizing individual components;
- Systematic monitoring by TTLs and Managers of actual costs against Approach Paper budgets and a resolution mechanism should new developments arise;
- Closer focus by TTLs and Managers on managing elapsed time, and staff and consultant costs, between the Approach Paper and Final Report Review Meetings; and
- Regular IEG Leadership Team oversight of elapsed time and costs, and more proactive decisions on corrective actions, where needed.

107. The current independent review of the FY17 work program and budget is being finalized. IEG will implement appropriate measures following the CODE and Budget Committee review and discussion of the findings.

Annex 1: IEG Results Framework

Objective 1: What Works – Deepening evidence about the results of WBG program and activities – and their effectiveness for accelerating growth, inclusiveness, and sustainability – to contribute to the WBG’s interim target of 9% poverty and progress on shared prosperity by 2020

Deliverables	Intermediate (1-3 years)		Medium Term (4-6 years)	
	Outcomes	Indicators	Outcomes	Indicators
Major sector, thematic, and country evaluations and learning products focused on WBG contributions to twin goals –with particular reference to: - WBG Scorecard categories - IDA Special Themes - IFC Areas of Strategic Emphasis	- Greater understanding of: - When and how WBG activities lead to growth, inclusiveness, and sustainability (learning) - Whether WBG activities are aligned with the twin goals and effective in contributing to their achievement (accountability) - IDA Performance	- Overall feedback on quality of IEG work from Client Survey - External assessment of quality of major evaluations - Self-assessment of strategic alignment of major evaluations - Efficiency measure of elapsed time in evaluation processing - Value for money measure - Measures of usage of IEG work by Board and WBG staff	- Better informed policy and operational choices by the Board, Management, and Clients - Enhanced WBG development effectiveness in terms of contributing to the attainment of twin goals.	- IEG influence on client results supported by WBG operations - Client feedback on IEG influence and impact - External assessment of actual use and impact of evaluations - Level of adoption of evaluation recommendations and Management actions in MAR - Measure of IEG knowledge flows
Corporate performance data for WBG Scorecard and IDA RMS	Timely delivery of high quality performance data	- Compliance with service standards for validation delivery	Stronger portfolio performance from improved M&E	- IEG portfolio performance ratings
Stronger methods for evaluating WBG contributions to inclusive growth, gender, sustainability	New methods mainstreamed in IEG evaluation work	- Completion of Methods Action Plan	Increased relevance and quality of evaluation evidence	- External assessment of accuracy and validity of evaluations

Objective 2: Real-Time Learning – Generating evidence on the early implementation experience of the WBG Strategy to enable mid-course corrections, and promote a stronger internal culture for results, accountability, and learning

Helping Clients Tackle the Most Important Development Challenges

Deliverables	Intermediate		Medium Term	
	Outcomes	Indicators	Outcomes	Indicators
Process evaluation of early implementation of new country engagement model	Adjustments to the country engagement model to increase effectiveness, if needed	- Feedback on quality of IEG work from country clients in Client Survey	- Enhanced country-level performance (ownership, selectivity, results focus)	- Client feedback on WB effectiveness and impact on results
Country-level learning products	Use of IEG evaluation evidence in SCD, CPF, PLR, and CLR	- Coverage of IEG evaluation evidence in SCD, CPF, PLR, CLR	- Stronger country-level results (outcomes, growth, inclusiveness, and sustainability) - Enhanced quality of SCD, CPF, PLR, and CLR	- IEG ratings on outcomes of country strategies - IEG ratings of WB performance on country strategies - Coverage of evaluation capacity development in country strategy
System for validation of self-evaluation in PLR/CLR	Self-evaluation system is incentivized to serve learning and accountability	- Compliance with service standards for validation delivery	Learning cycles lead to continuous improvement	
Support evaluation capacity development in client countries	Mainstreaming of ECD in country engagement model and enhanced coordination with WBG SCB work	- Stakeholder feedback on ECD product quality and use	Client-driven demand for high quality WBG support for ECD	

<i>Becoming a Solutions Bank Group</i>				
Deliverables	Intermediate (1-3 years)		Medium Term (4-6 years)	
	Outcomes	Indicators	Outcomes	Indicators
Evaluations of lending and knowledge services and instruments, including early implementation experience of GP/CCSA and IFC reforms	Adjustments to lending and knowledge services and instruments to increase efficiency and effectiveness, and alignment if needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Feedback from GP/CCSA, IFC, MIGA on quality of IEG work in Client Survey - Coverage of IEG evaluation evidence in major GP/CCSA, IFC, MIGA knowledge products - Coverage of IEG evaluation evidence in WBG operations - Level of adoption of relevant evaluation recommendations and Management actions in MAR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GP/CCSA, IFC, MIGA marshal best knowledge to provide world class, integrated, evidenced-based solutions - Teams work on cross-practice and public-private solutions - Improved quality and impact of investment, knowledge, and convening services - Stronger internal culture and competencies around results delivery for clients 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholder feedback on WBG knowledge - IEG ratings on outcomes of WBG operations - Level of adoption of relevant evaluation recommendations and Management actions in MAR - IEG ratings of quality at entry and quality of supervision of WB and IFC projects
Sector and thematic learning products supporting global knowledge flows in GP/CCSA, IFC, MIGA	Use of knowledge from IEG evaluations in the work of GP/CCSA, IFC, MIGA			
Appraisals of operational self-evaluation and development risk management systems	Adjustments as needed to enhance efficiency and effectiveness of systems			
Operational learning products to strengthen results and evidenced-based operations	Use of IEG lessons learned and good practices in operations			
System for validation of self-evaluation of lending and knowledge	Self-evaluation system is incentivized to serve learning and accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compliance with service standards for validation delivery - Completion of action plan to restructure ICR validation system 	Learning cycles lead to continuous improvement	
<i>Working in Partnership</i>				
Deliverables	Intermediate (1-3 years)		Medium Term (4-6 years)	
	Outcomes	Indicators	Outcomes	Indicators
Evaluations of WBG partnership and trust fund programs	Adjustments to partnership and TF arrangements to increase efficiency, effectiveness and alignment, if needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coverage of partnerships in IEG evaluation work - Feedback from partners on quality of IEG work in Client Survey - Level of adoption of relevant evaluation recommendations and Management action in MAR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alignment of TFs and Partnerships with twin goals - Leverage external knowledge, resources, and collaboration for greater development effectiveness - Increased efficiency and effectiveness of partnerships - Citizens engaged in design and monitoring of operations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alignment of WBG partnerships with Strategy - Level of adoption of relevant evaluation recommendations and Management action in MAR - Use of beneficiary feedback during project implementation
Evaluations of collaboration with development partners, particularly private sector and citizens	Learning and accountability on effectiveness on collaboration and leveraging stakeholders' contributions for inclusive growth			
Learning products	Use of knowledge from IEG evaluations to improve partnership arrangements			

Annex 2: Description of IEG Strategic Engagement Areas

1. Inclusive Growth

Overview

Economic opportunity and productive jobs are atop the development agenda in all countries. It is the cornerstone of development, generating the resources for growth, providing pathways out of poverty, and improving living standards for all. Realizing economic potential requires a vibrant private sector and capable government. But models that have worked for development success stories, such as China and Korea, are proving elusive. Many countries face jobless growth, growing inequality, environmental degradation and persistent unemployment or under-employment that impede prosperity and poverty reduction. A key development challenge is generating growth that is inclusive, resilient and sustainable and that creates jobs.

Factors central to addressing this challenge include: macroeconomic stability, an enabling business environment, and the rule of law; capable public and private institutions; access to productive assets (land, knowledge, capital, infrastructure) and to markets; harnessing the powers of economic integration and technological change; and policies for creating jobs that are good for development and transformational for people's lives. Sustainably addressing these challenges will be ephemeral without reducing vulnerability to crises. While these issues are wide ranging, much else is needed to eliminate extreme poverty and share prosperity, including access to basic services, security, investing in human development, voice and empowerment, and good stewardship of natural capital—global, regional and local. These issues will be covered in other strategic engagement areas.

Several recent IEG evaluations focus on issues that are central for inclusive growth: evaluations of WBG activities in Investment Climate, SMEs, Innovation and Entrepreneurship, PPPs, Trade Finance, and Youth Employment. Ongoing work covers the areas of Inclusive Finance, Jobs and Competitiveness, Supporting Tertiary Education for Growth and Opportunity; Capital Market Development, and Rural and Urban Development Strategies.

Both formal and informal sector job creation hinges on mobilizing public and private investment, and developing effective public and private institutions. This Strategic Engagement Area squarely addresses the public-private interface necessary for inclusive growth that creates jobs. Four priority evaluations have been identified for the next three years: (1) The critical importance of the informal sector for the poor in many countries, both lower and middle income, is often overlooked and forms the core of this evaluation; (2) The effective role of the private sector in supporting development priorities relies on good corporate governance and corporate social responsibility and form the core of the second topic; (3) the third topic addresses the effectiveness and role of public financial instruments (tax and expenditure policies) to mobilize and direct private investment flows, both foreign and domestic, to priority areas; and finally (4) how has the WBG supported shared prosperity and reduced inequality through country engagement, a topic squarely aligned with economic opportunity, but touching also on issues central to the other Strategic Engagement Areas with respect to equality in access to basic services and sharing in sustainable access to land, clean water, forests, and other natural resources.

Potential Impact

Promoting inclusive and shared growth is one of the most daunting and pressing global challenges. It is at the center of the World Bank Group Strategy and critical for the twin goals. Addressing this challenge requires strong partnership between the public and the private sectors and, within the World Bank Group, integration of the Group's public and private sector capabilities. With its focus on the public-private interface, this Strategic Engagement Area connects directly with the agenda of "One World Bank Group". Evaluation of the private-public interface--fostering investment opportunity, improving the 'quality of growth', and promoting broad participation in the economy--holds the promise of being transformational, lifting Bank effectiveness.

2. Sustained Service Delivery for the Poor

Overview

Access to social services are essential for poverty eradication. The 2004 World Development Report illustrated that illiteracy, ill health, gender inequality, and environmental degradation are all aspects of being poor. Going back to Robert Chambers rapid rural appraisal and participation, the development community has recognized that access to services to enhance human capital is essential to escape poverty.

Looking back at more than ten years of delivering services to the poor. Progress has been made against some of the relevant MDGs, such as equity and enrolment rates, but the WDR equally emphasized access, quantity, and quality of health, education, water, sanitation, and electricity services. While this definition has broadened in the Social Inclusion Strategy of the World Bank Group to include other services than these (adding social protection, information, transport, and credit markets), the model for service delivery suggested in the WDR 2004 remains an important entry point to understand whether the poor have access to the quantity and quality of services that helps them live decent lives and participate in economic opportunities.

Remaining challenges. Governments devote about a third of their budgets to health and education, yet it is unclear how much reaches poor people. Even when public spending can be reallocated toward poor people, the resources do not always reach the frontline service provider and, if it does, quality is not assured: the incentives for effective service delivery are often weak, wages may not be paid or service-delivery monitored. Other problems that can undermine services include corruption, political patronage, lack of social accountability, and a lack of demand (due to real or perceived poor quality of service, lack of time to seek the service, cultural barriers or lack of knowledge). The WDR suggested a three-pronged model of accountability in the '*service delivery chain*':

- i) ***poor people*** who require voice in policy making, provide feedback on services received, and participate in monitoring and accountability, using modern technology or other means of participation;
- ii) ***government*** who must contract and govern service provision, including promoting models that ensure services reach the poor, secure quantity and quality over time, weigh trade-offs between different sectors (local and national governments thinking about options in service provisions across sectors), develop models that allow various providers

to participate in cost-effective ways (RBF, pay-on-demand, and other schemes), and institute systems that allow monitoring, feedback and learning over time; and

- iii) **providers** who must be responsive to people and fulfill contracts, involving diverse service providers from public, private, and community sectors.

Questions of political economy and service delivery in difficult contexts – fragile, remote, low population density, socially excluded minorities – play an overarching role across these dimensions of accountability.

The focus of this Strategic Engagement Area over the next 3 years. This Strategic Engagement Area will deliver a series of three evaluations, each focusing on a specific sector or sub-sector: urban transport; water supply and sanitation; and nutrition. A common framework, to be developed and published in a Working Paper, will be applied in the three service delivery evaluations. Using this comprehensive framework, each evaluation will be able to describe the models most commonly supported in that particular sector, and compare effectiveness of the models in terms of reaching the poor, in terms of quality, behavior change and impact, and in terms of sustaining the services over time. The findings are likely to differ across political, cultural and implementation capacity realities.

Using this common approach, IEG will then produce a “chapeau” or synthesis product that draws upon and contrasts findings from the three sectors, as well as other relevant existing evaluative material in IEG. This product will also be able to identify service delivery models that may have been used (successfully or not) in certain sectors supported by the Bank Group but not in others, thus potentially uncovering gaps where innovation can occur.

Potential Impact

Evaluations will tell us what works and what doesn't in service delivery, so the first way we will have an impact is in identifying more comprehensively what works under what circumstances and in which sectors in relation to all four dimensions of service delivery - access, quantity, quality and sustainability of services. A focus on evaluating whether systems have been built to continuously monitor, provide feedback, take corrective action, and learn, will help understand whether and how service delivery has been built to be sustained.

As the GPs and CCSAs are developing their strategies to tackle development challenges, IEG's findings on whether and how service delivery has been sustainable can have a transformational impact on Bank operations. Most GPs which involve service delivery such as health, education, social protection, transport, water, energy, Social, Urban, Rural, (and Resilience), agriculture, etc. are likely to be involved in the proposed topic most directly.

Gap Analysis

Support to service delivery to the poor is, directly or indirectly, at the heart of most of the WBG's business. IEG has carried out a few evaluations that address specific services, e.g. transport, electricity access, financial services. These have to varying degrees assessed targeting of the poor and financial sustainability, but have not been able to assess sustained outcomes. A number of services such as water and sanitation, nutrition, and urban services have not been assessed recently. IEG has previously not considered 'the science of sustained delivery' with a cross-sectoral perspective, has

not addressed the role of citizen engagement and social accountability in ensuring successful service delivery to the poor, and has not assessed service delivery with a social inclusion or environmental sustainability lens.

3. Environmental Sustainability

Overview

Growth and poverty reduction requires sustainable management of natural resources, and mitigation of environmental externalities. Sustainable environmental management is both difficult, and critical for poor people because of well-known problems of collective action. In many cases, natural capital is over-exploited, with non-sustainable growth patterns. It is difficult for those affected – poor, diffuse, and without effective voice – to organize for more efficient and equitable resource management. So the poor are disproportionately affected.

Climate change is a prominent example. But others include:

- air pollution, which kills over 3 million people annually, mostly in the developing world
- unsustainable exploitation of groundwater, imperiling the livelihoods of hundreds of millions
- overexploitation and destruction of fisheries
- rural and urban flooding due to deforestation, loss of wetlands, urban paving and poor drainage
- land degradation from overgrazing

Promoting sustainable patterns of consumption and production and protecting and managing the natural resource base, including sustainable approaches to landscape management, water resources, energy efficiency, and climate change, are at the core of the twin goals. Natural resources and ecosystem services are fundamental to meeting basic needs (e.g. providing livelihoods, shelter, food and fresh water) and reducing income inequalities, both in rural and urban settings. They are also a key component of the inclusion and shared prosperity agenda, particularly regarding traditionally marginalized and disempowered communities, such as women, children and indigenous communities. Natural resource degradation or contention also contributes to violent conflicts in many IDA and IBRD countries.

Signaling the centrality of this issue, more than one third of the 16 SDGs make direct reference to actions that would improve the sustainability of the environment and natural resource base.

Examples of these goals include:

- Ensure availability and sustainable management of water [and sanitation] for all (Goal 6)
- Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all (Goal 7)
- Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns (Goal 12)
- Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts (Goal 13)
- Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas, and marine resources for sustainable development (Goal 14)
- Protect, restore, and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss (Goal 15).

While each country has primary responsibility for the management of its own natural resource base, because of the global common nature of much of this base, global partnership and therefore global mobilization of financing from a variety of sources are demanded in order to promote environment and natural capital sustainability. In sum, delivering evaluation evidence in this area is not only of high priority for domestic and global policy making but urgent and indispensable for eradicating extreme poverty and improving the lives of the bottom 40 percent of the population.

Potential Impact

While climate change has risen in attention over recent years, less attention has been paid to some of the other urgent environmental issues. Making this issue a focal point for IEG will help galvanize the profile of environmental sustainability issues, including their key role in addressing the twin goals.

Gap Analysis

While IEG has extensively evaluated climate change, and has done an evaluation of forestry issues, there has been no comprehensive evaluation of environmental issues since 2008, and environmental issues have had limited treatment in sectoral evaluations. The issues mentioned above – air pollution, water basin management, fisheries, urban environmental management – are ripe for examination.

Annex 3: Selectivity Framework for IEG Evaluation Topics

To identify the specific evaluation topics for the work program, IEG followed five steps.

First, as reviewed in Chapter 1, we have prioritized three cross-cutting Strategic Engagement Areas to (1) enhance IEG’s focus on “game changers,”(2) better leverage IEG resources across product lines, and (3) maximize influence and impact. These areas are designed to build a robust and integrated knowledge base about WBG contribution to the twin goals – and generate strategic findings to help the Board and Bank Group make informed decisions about WBG programs.

Second, we reviewed and updated the “gap analysis” that was introduced three years ago to assess the coverage of IEG evaluations over the past six years, and identify knowledge gaps within the Strategic Engagement Areas where IEG evaluation work would add value. The analysis looked at gaps in the evidence base related to the strategic directions of the WBG (as set out in the FY14 World Bank Group Strategy, FY16 Forward Look, FY17-19 IFC Business Strategy and Outlook, and provisional IDA18 Special Themes). We also reviewed our evaluation coverage related to the size and spend of WBG lending (summary tables are included in Annex 4).

Third, we mapped existing and planned evaluation work against the two objectives of the IEG Results Framework to identify pressing knowledge areas where additional evaluation evidence was needed to achieve the intermediate and medium term outcomes that we have set out.

Fourth, work program discussions were held with CODE, the senior leadership teams of the three institutions, GPs and CCSAs, IFC industry groups, and other internal partners, to solicit their recommendations for evaluation priorities. External consultations were held with civil society organizations, think tanks, and other global partners. Overall, there was strong endorsement for alignment of the IEG work program with the WBG Strategy and reform agenda, and the value of the three Strategic Engagement Areas to enhance selectivity and influence.

Fifth, all proposed topics were subject to the IEG selectivity framework, which focused on the following key questions:

1. What is the scope and purpose of the product?

- How does the product contribute to the IEG Results Framework and the three Strategic Engagement Areas?
- How does the product relate to the twin goals, the strategic priorities set out in new WBG Strategy, and corporate reform agenda?
- How does it connect to other external strategic directions such as Sustainable Development Goals, and country client priorities?
- How is the timing of the product aligned with key WBG corporate deliverables and decision points?

2. How is this a game changer?

- How is this a transformational topic that will maximize impact?

- Who is the specific audience that we seek to influence?
- What is the level of Board, WBG Management, and GP/CCSA interest in this area?

3. **Why IEG?**

- What makes IEG uniquely positioned to conduct this work?
- What is the value added that an independent evaluation perspective would bring, compared with WBG self-evaluation, DEC research, existing external evaluations, etc.
- Will the product address a knowledge gap in IEG, follow up an earlier evaluation, or follow up an important and unresolved MAR issue?

4. **What are the challenges and risks?**

- What are the key implementation challenges or risks for IEG working on this product and achieving impact (internal skills and knowledge, methodology and data, political economy, level of client commitment and engagement, etc)?

Annex 4: Gap Analysis of Recent IEG Evaluations

Recent IEG Evaluations by Sector (FY10-16)

Sector	% of WB Lending (FY15)	Evaluations
Agriculture and Rural Development	7.6	Global Food Crisis Response (FY13)
		Managing Forest Resources for Sustainable Development (FY13)
		Impact Evaluations in Agriculture (FY11)
		Growth and Productivity in Agriculture and Agribusiness (FY11)
		GPR: Forest Carbon Partnership (FY12)
		GPR: International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science, and Technology for Development (FY10)
Education	9.5	World Bank Support to Education Since 2001 (FY11)
Energy and Mining	10.1	Electricity Access (FY15)
		Clustered CPE on Resource Rich Countries (FY15)
		Challenge of Low-Carbon Dev.: Climate Change and WBG - Phase II (FY10) Climate Change and WBG: Win-Win Energy Policy Reforms - Phase I (FY09) GPR: EITI (FY11)
Finance	9.4	Capital Market Development (FY16)
		Inclusive Financing (FY15)
		WBG Response to the Global Economic Crisis - Phase II (FY12)
		WBG Response to the Global Economic Crisis - Phase I (FY10)
Health and Other Social Services	16.0	Health Systems Financing (FY14)
		Social Safety Nets and Gender Equality (FY14)
		Maternal and Child Health Care Systematic Review (FY13)
		What Can We Learn from Nutrition Impact Evaluations? (FY10)
		Social Safety Nets (FY11)
		Improving Effectiveness and Outcomes for the Poor in Health, Nutrition and Population (FY09)
		GPR: GAVI (FY14)
		GPR: The Global Fund to Fight AIDs, Tuberculosis and Malaria (FY12)
Industry and Trade	5.3	Jobs and Competiveness (FY16)
		Support to SMEs (FY14)
		Public-Private Partnerships (FY14)
		Investment Climate Reform (FY14)
		Trade Finance (FY13)
		Innovation, Entrepreneurship, and Competitiveness (FY13)
		Support to SMEs (FY13)
ICT	0.8	Capturing Technology for Development (FY11)
Public Administration, Law, and Justice	18.3	World Bank Country-Level Engagement on Governance and Anticorruption (FY11)
		World Bank Engagement at the State Level (FY10)
		Improving Municipal Management for Cities to Succeed (FY10)
Transportation	11.9	Improving Capability and Financial Viability to Sustain Transport (FY13)
Water, Sanitation, and Flood Protection	11.2	GPR: Global Water Partnership (FY10)

Recent IEG Evaluations by Theme (FY10-16)

Theme	% of WB Lending (FY15)	Evaluations
Economic Management	1.7	Clustered CPE on Resource Rich Countries (FY15)
		WBG Response to the Global Economic Crisis - Phase II (FY12)
		WBG Response to the Global Economic Crisis - Phase I (FY10)
Environment and Natural Resources Management	8.0	Adapting to Climate Change: Assessing WBG Experience - Phase III (FY13)
		Managing Forest Resources for Sustainable Development (FY13)
		The Challenge of Low-Carbon Dev.: Climate Change and WBG - Phase II (FY10)
		GPR: GEF (FY14)
		GPR: Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FY13)
		GPR: Global Water Partnership (FY10)
Financial and Private Sector Development	19.3	Capital Market Development (FY16)
		Jobs and Competitiveness (FY16)
		Inclusive Finance (FY15)
		Support to SMEs (FY14)
		Investment Climate Reform (FY14)
		Public-Private Partnerships (FY14)
		Innovation, Entrepreneurship, and Competitiveness (FY13)
		Assessing IFC's Poverty Focus and Results (FY11)
		GPR: EITI (FY11)
		Earnings and Growth and Employment Creation in 3 MICs (FY11)
		MIGA Financial Guarantees (FY11)
Human Development	16.0	Early Childhood Development (FY15)
		Health Systems Financing (FY14)
		Maternal and Child Health Care IE Review (FY13)
		World Bank Support to Education Since 2001 (FY11)
		What Can We Learn from Nutrition Impact Evaluations? (FY10)
		GPR: GAVI (FY14)
		GPR: The Global Fund to Fight AIDs, Tuberculosis and Malaria (FY12)
GPR: Stop TB Partnership (FY10)		
Public Sector Governance	6.6	World Bank Country-Level Engagement on Governance and Anticorruption (FY11)
		World Bank Engagement at the State Level (FY10)
Rule of Law	1.9	
Rural Development	11.9	Global Food Crisis Response (FY13)
		Impact Evaluations in Agriculture (FY11)
		Growth and Productivity in Agriculture and Agribusiness (FY11)
Social Development, Gender, and Inclusion	4.1	2015 Results and Performance Report – Gender Chapter (FY16)
		Social Safety Nets and Gender Equality (FY14)
		Social Safety Nets (FY11)
		Analyzing the Effects of Policy Reforms on the Poor (FY10)
Social Prot. and Risk Management	15.3	Poverty Focus of Country Programs (FY15)
		Youth Employment Programs (FY12)
		Social Safety Nets (FY11)
Trade and Integration	4.0	Trade Finance (FY13)
		WB Involvement in Global and Regional Partnership Programs (FY11)
Urban Dev.	11.2	Improving Municipal Management for Cities to Succeed (FY10)

Annex 5: Proposed Work Program for FY17-19

Table 1: Work Program by Business Line

Business Line	FY16 Actual	FY17	FY18	FY19
1. Major Evaluations				
Thematic and Sector Evaluations	1. Capital Market Development 2. Jobs and Competitiveness	1. Higher Education 2. Shared Prosperity in Country Programs 3. Rural Non-Farm Economy 4. Water Supply and Sanitation 5. Urban Transport Services	1. Clean World for All 2. Public Finance for Investment and Jobs 3. Mobilization of Private Capital 4. Essential Health Care Services 5. Carbon Finance 6. Renewable Energy	1. Sustainable Cities 2. Facilitating Trade 3. Sustainable and Inclusive Business 4. Environmental Degradation 5. Decentralization
Corporate and Process Evaluations	3. Review of P4R 4. Assessment of WBG's Self-Evaluation Systems	6. Process Evaluation of SCD and CPF 7. Data for Development 8. IFC Client Engagement Model	7. Engaging Citizens	6. Process Evaluation of GP/CCSAs
Country-Focused Evaluations	5. Fragile Situations in Non-FCS Countries 6. Clustered CPE on Small States (<i>2 country reports plus synthesis report</i>)		8. CPEs on MICs	7. CPEs on MICs 8. CPE MIC Synthesis Report
Results and Performance Report	7. RAP 2015: Gender Equality	9. RAP 2016: Managing for Results	9. RAP 2017: Sustainability in Operations	9. RAP 2018: Working in Partnership
2. Other Evaluation Products				
PPARs	World Bank: 50 IFC/MIGA: 8	World Bank: 55 IFC/MIGA: 8	World Bank: 60 IFC/MIGA: 8	World Bank: 60 IFC/MIGA: 8
Systematic Reviews and Impact Evaluations	2 impact evaluations	2 impact evaluations	<i>[TBD in prior year]</i>	<i>TBD in prior year]</i>

Business Line	FY16 Actual	FY17	FY18	FY19
Learning Products	Maximizing Development Impact in IDA (LP II) Lessons from Joint WBG Projects (LP I) WBG Transformational Engagements (LP II) Domestic Resource Mobilization in WBG Instruments (LP I) Financial Sustainability of Electricity Sector (LP I) Gender Impacts of CDD (LP I) Land Administration (LP I) DPO: Political Economy Analysis (LP I) DPO: Environment Sector (LP I) Off-Grid Electricity (LP I) Housing Financing (LP I) Learning in IFC (LP I)	<i>[TBD -- selected in consultation with Management, based on operational needs]</i>	<i>[TBD -- selected in consultation with Management, based on operational needs]</i>	<i>[TBD -- selected in consultation with Management, based on operational needs]</i>
3. Validation Products				
Country Strategy Completion Report Validations	22 estimate	22 expected	<i>[TBD in prior year, based on expected CAS/CPF delivery]</i>	<i>[TBD in prior year, based on expected CAS/CPF delivery]</i>
Project Completion Report Validations	IFC XPSR: 40% coverage (80 projects estimate) MIGA PER: (14 estimate) WB ICRR: 100% coverage (275 projects estimate)	IFC XPSR: 40% coverage (96 projects expected) MIGA PER: (20 expected) WB ICRR: 100% coverage (250 projects expected)	<i>[TBD in prior year, based on actual project closure]</i>	<i>[TBD in prior year, based on actual project closure]</i>
AAA/AS Completion Report Validations	IFC PCR: 51% coverage (45 projects estimate)	IFC PCR: 51% coverage (87 projects expected)	<i>[TBD in prior year, based on actual project closure]</i>	<i>[TBD in prior year, based on actual project closure]</i>

Annex 5: Proposed Work Program for FY17-19

Table 2: Major Evaluations and Learning Products by Objectives

Objective 1: What Works – Deepening evidence about the results of WBG program and activities – and their effectiveness for accelerating growth, inclusiveness, and sustainability – to contribute to the achievement of WBG’s interim target of 9% poverty and progress on shared prosperity by 2020				
Results Area	FY16 Actual	FY17	FY18	FY19
Major sector and thematic evaluations and learning products				
➤ Inclusive Growth	- Capital Market Development - Jobs and Competitiveness - <i>Domestic Resource Mobilization</i> - <i>Housing Finance</i>	- Higher Education - Shared Prosperity in Country Programs - Rural Non-Farm Economy	- Public Finance for Investment and Jobs - Mobilization of Private Capital	- Facilitating Trade - Sustainable and Inclusive Business - Decentralization
➤ Sustained Service Delivery for the Poor	- <i>Gender Impacts of CDD</i> - <i>Financial Sustainability of Electricity Sector</i> - <i>Off-Grid Electricity</i>	- Water Supply and Sanitation - Urban Transport Services - <i>Working Papers on Methodological Framework for Service Delivery</i>	- Essential Health Care Services	- <i>Synthesis of FY16-18 Work on Service Delivery</i>
➤ Environmental Sustainability	- <i>Land Administration</i> - <i>DPO: Environment Sector</i>	-	- Clean World for All - Carbon Finance - Renewable Energy - RAP 2017: Environmental Sustainability in Operations	- Environmental Degradation - Sustainable Cities
Country evaluations	- Fragile Situations in Non-FCS Countries - CCPE on Small States		- CPEs on MICs	- CPEs on MICs - CPE MIC Synthesis Report
Corporate performance data	- RAP 2015: Gender Equality - <i>Maximizing Impact in IDA</i>	- RAP 2016: Managing for Results	- RAP 2017: Environmental Sustainability in Operations	- RAP 2018: Working in Partnership

[Note: Deliverables in italics are learning products]

Objective 2: Real-Time Learning – Generating evidence to assess the early implementation experience of the WBG Strategy to enable mid-course corrections, and promote a stronger internal culture for results, accountability, and learning				
Results Area	FY16 Actual	FY17	FY18	FY19
<i>Helping Clients Tackle the Most Important Development Challenges</i>				
Evaluations of country and client engagement		- SCD/CPF Process Evaluation - IFC Client Engagement Model		
Country-level learning products		<i>[TBD -- selected in consultation with Management, based on operational needs]</i>	<i>[TBD -- selected in consultation with Management, based on operational needs]</i>	<i>[TBD -- selected in consultation with Management, based on operational needs]</i>
<i>Becoming a Solutions Bank</i>				
Evaluations of lending and knowledge services and instruments	- Review of P4R <i>- Learning in IFC</i> <i>- DPO: Political Economy Analysis</i>	- Data for Development - RAP Chapter on Managing for Results		- Process Evaluation of GP/CCSAs
Appraisals of self-evaluation and risk management systems	- Assessment of WBG Self-Evaluation Systems			
Operational learning products	- <i>Transformational Engagements</i> <i>- Lessons from WBG Joint Projects</i>	<i>[TBD -- selected in consultation with Management, based on operational needs]</i>	<i>[TBD -- selected in consultation with Management, based on operational needs]</i>	<i>[TBD -- selected in consultation with Management, based on operational needs]</i>
<i>Working in Partnership</i>				
Evaluation of partnerships			- Engaging Citizens	- RAP 2018: Working in Partnership
Learning products on partnerships		<i>[TBD -- selected in consultation with Management, based on operational needs]</i>	<i>[TBD -- selected in consultation with Management, based on operational needs]</i>	<i>[TBD -- selected in consultation with Management, based on operational needs]</i>

[Note: Deliverables in italics are learning and knowledge sharing products]

Annex 6: Indicative List of IEG Learning and Knowledge Sharing Activities in FY16

First Quarter

- *Taking the Pulse: [How] Can IFC and MIGA Bring Profitability and Impact Together?* (IEG launched its *Results and Performance of the World Bank Group 2014* report with a panel of IFC and MIGA leaders).
- *A Dialogue with IEG on Early Childhood Development* (IEG hosted this session for members of the Bank Group ECD Community of Practice to discuss key findings from IEG's two recent evaluations on ECD).
- *[Are We] Making the Right Choices? Informing Our Work to Reduce Poverty* (IEG launched its evaluation *The Poverty Focus on Country Programs* at this debate featuring panelists from across the Bank Group).
- *Wilton Park Meeting: New Frontiers for Evaluation in an Era of Market-Oriented Development* (IEG presented, moderated and acted as host/facilitator in this event in United Kingdom).
- IEG developed special synthesis publications for: (i) the Third International Conference on Financing for Development in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: *Financing for Development*; (ii) SDGs for the World Bank Group Annual Meetings: *Transforming Our World – Aiming for Sustainable Development*; and (iii) how the World Bank Group learns and adapts for the World Bank Group Annual Meetings: *[Informed] Solutions from a Solutions Bank? Getting More Bank for the Buck*.
- IEG developed a new product called *IEG Insights* – a two-page information sheet that presents lessons from major evaluations and make them applicable for users in the development field. Topics covered: *Women in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States*, and *Natural Resources in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States*.
- *MAS “Know More” Series: Strong Results in Manufacturing—Drivers and Lessons from XPSRs* (IEG staff presented to IFC MAS staff).

Second Quarter

- *[Getting to] Informed Solutions from the Solutions Bank* (At the Annual Meetings in Lima, IEG conducted a session, presenting lessons from its evaluations *Learning and Results in World Bank Operations, Phase I*; *Results and Performance of the World Bank Group 2015*; and *The Poverty Focus of Country Programs*.)
- *Towards Young Children Thriving: Addressing the Intersectorial Challenges to Child Development* (IEG held a session for Bank Group staff and live-streamed to external stakeholders to present findings from its maternal health impact evaluation).
- *Resource-Rich Developing Countries: How the World Bank Group Engages* (IEG held a session for Bank Group staff to discuss findings from this cluster of country evaluations).
- *Making Financial Inclusion Work for the Poor* (IEG presented the findings from its evaluation *Financial Inclusion: A Footbold on the Ladder to Prosperity?* to Bank Group staff and moderated the subsequent panel discussion.)

- *Lessons for MIGA from World Bank Group Support to Electricity Access* (IEG held a session for MIGA staff to present findings and lessons from this evaluation.)
- *Knowledge and Innovation Workshop* (IEG staff presented a talk at the Warwick Business School's Knowledge and Innovation Network winter workshop in Coventry, UK on the lessons learned agenda.)
- *Online Educa 2015* (IEG made a keynote presentation in Berlin to more than 2,000 participants at the world's largest conference for learning and knowledge sharing, with a focus on service providers in the knowledge management and learning areas.)
- *IEG and African Development Bank on Electricity Access* (IEG and AfDB sponsored a joint event in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire, to share findings of *World Bank Group Support to Electricity Access*.)
- *IFC Additionality* (IEG staff presented the lessons from this learning product at a meeting of the Strategy Officers Network at IFC)

Third Quarter

- *Using Evaluation Evidence to Improve the Effectiveness of Partnership Programs* (IEG organized a workshop that brought together M&E representatives of partnership programs, independent evaluators, bi-lateral and multilateral development partners, and private foundations evaluation offices who commission and conduct partnership evaluations).
- IEG presented findings from its evaluations at three panel discussions during the *World Bank Group Fragility, Conflict and Violence Forum 2016*.
- *Financial Inclusion Workshop in Tanzania* (Organized jointly by WBG Finance & Markets GP, IEG, and the Bank of Tanzania, the workshop highlighted findings from the IEG Evaluation-*Financial Inclusion: A Foothold on the Ladder Toward Prosperity*).
- *Environmental and Natural Resources Global Business Meeting* (IEG co-sponsored 3 sessions for WBG staff and external participants).

Fourth Quarter (as of May 25, 2016)

- *Sustaining Early Childhood Development Impacts* (IEG hosted a Webinar for the CPC Learning Network, Columbia University, New York).
- *IFI Development Policy Operations: How Environmental and Social Standards Apply* (Seminar co-hosted by IEG during the WBG Spring Meetings along with the Bank Information Center and World Bank).
- *RMES Together 2016* (IEG co-sponsored, along with OPCS and IFC, the annual learning event for the Results, Measurement and Evidence community of practice in the World Bank Group).
- *Launch Bridging the Gap: How to Finance Universal Access to Financing* (IEG launched its learning product on World Bank Group Support for Housing Finance with a panel including WB, IFC, Bank of Mexico and George Washington University speakers).

Annex 7: List of DGE Statements to WBG Executive Directors and Management in FY16

DGE Statements to Executive Directors

- Statement on External Review of IEG, July 8, 2015, (CODE)
- WBG Support for the 2013 Agenda for Sustainable Development, September 15, 2015 (CoW)
- 2015 Development Policy Financing Retrospective: September 21, 2015 (CODE)
- Update to CODE on IFC's Management of E&S Risks in its FI Business, October 2, 2015 (CODE)
- Statement on WBG Gender Strategy (FY16-23) Gender Equality, Poverty Reduction and Inclusive Growth, December 8, 2015 (Board)
- Update on IFC Asset Management Compact, December 10, 2015 (Board)
- World Bank Group Forest Action Plan FY16-20: World Bank Contribution to the Forest Agenda, April 6, 2016 (CODE)

DGE Statements to WBG Management

First Quarter

- IDA Mid Term Review Progress Report: Climate Change, September 1, 2015
- IDA Mid-Term Review Progress Report: Gender Equality, September 1, 2015
- IDA Mid Term Review Progress Report: Inclusive Growth, September 18, 2015
- IDA Mid Term Review Progress Report: Inclusive Growth and Fragile and Conflict Affected States, September 18, 2015
- WBG Gender Strategy, September 25, 2015

Second Quarter

- Draft IDA FY15 Annual Report, October 9, 2015
- IDA 16 Retrospective: Delivering Development Results, October 19, 2015
- IDA 17 Mid Term Review Technical Paper: Options for an IDA Non-Concessional Financing Facility, October 30, 2015
- IDA 17 Mid-term Review Paper: Maximizing Development Impact, November 4, 2015
- WBG Gender Strategy, November 6, 2015

Third Quarter

- Development Committee Progress Report on Mainstreaming DRM in the WBG, February 5, 2016
- Development Committee Paper: Fragility, Forced Displacement, Humanitarian – Development Nexus and Migration, February 12, 2016
- A Stock-Taking of the WBG's response to Illicit Financial Flows, February 24, 2016
- WBG Climate Change Action Plan, March 7, 2016
- WBG Forest Action Plan, March 17, 2016

Fourth Quarter (as of May 25, 2016)

- Draft Proposal to establish a Pandemic Emergency Financing Facility, April 1, 2016
- Concept Note Poverty and Shared Prosperity Report 2016, April 6, 2016