

**Concept Note**  
**IEG Results and Performance of the World Bank Group 2016**  
**Managing for Development Results**  
**July 28, 2016**

## **Introduction**

1. Results and Performance of the World Bank Group (RAP) is the annual review of what recent IEG evaluations reveal about the effectiveness of the World Bank Group (WBG), which includes IBRD/IDA, IFC, and MIGA, in addressing current and emerging development challenges. The report synthesizes evidence from recent IEG evaluations complemented by relevant information from other sources (e.g., WBG corporate documents). RAP 2016 will be the seventh in a series that began in 2010 with the consolidation of separate annual reports that IEG prepared for the World Bank (IBRD/IDA), IFC, and MIGA, and it is the fourth one since IEG adopted the approach of focusing on a specific theme. RAP 2015 covered gender integration in the WBG, and the theme for RAP 17 will highlight “Environmental Sustainability.”
2. The theme for RAP 2016 is “Managing for Development Results” (henceforth referred to as M4R). In FY15 and FY16, IEG assessed learning for results within WBG and reviewed the self-evaluation systems of the WBG, both addressing core aspects of M4R in the WBG. Other learning products and evaluations, such as *The Poverty Focus of Country Programs*, also touched on key foundational components of M4R. RAP 2016 will build on these and other existing IEG evaluations, reports, and evidence base and endeavor to provide a more comprehensive picture of the WBG’s M4R by contextualizing it within the broader M4R framework as applied to international development. In this context, the report will explore complementary issues related to the WBG’s work with its clients in M4R.
3. Chapter 2 will report on the results and performance of WBG’s activities closing during FY13-15, and the final chapter will be devoted to the Management Action Record (MAR) and review the degree to which recommendations based on IEG’s evaluations have been implemented.
4. Using an established approach, this Concept Note outlines the context, objectives, scope, approach, and team for the proposed FY16 report. (Appendix A provides a brief summary of the differences between RAP2016 and RAP15.)

## **Context: Managing for Results in a Complex and Changing Context**

5. Key developments in the last three years in the WBG and in the development community have resulted in a renewed and qualitatively different emphasis on results, placing onus on the WBG to manage for those results differently:
  - In 2013, the World Bank Group established a new strategy to meet the challenge of contributing to the newly established twin goals of ending extreme poverty and promoting shared prosperity;

- The largest to-date IDA replenishment took place in 2014, with a greater emphasis on results measured through the IDA results measurement system, and IDA 18, and its measurement system, are currently under discussion; and
  - The year 2015 drew the Millennium Development Goals to a close, and the development community renewed its commitment to a new set of broader and more ambitious Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), agreed upon in September 2015, with a deeper concern for sustainability, with implications for countries' ownership and capacity.
6. Generally defined as *a management strategy or approach aligned with achieving organizational results*, the concepts regarding and approaches to M4R have a long history in both private and public sectors, and a vast academic and applied literature exists on the topic (e.g., Government Accountability Office, 2015; Kang, 2005). The literature encompasses fields ranging from organizational learning and adaptability (e.g., Senge, 2010) to specific frameworks for using metrics to drive key decisions such as budget allocations (e.g., Robinson, 2007), to explicitly creating learning loops and experimentation in complex situations (e.g., Andrews et al., 2016). Making results transparent to the public, and getting citizen feedback, is another notable strand of the literature regarding accountability of public programs (Gigler, B. & Bilur, S., 2014). Overall, this literature highlights two foundational principles of M4R (see figure 1):
- There is a robust system for measuring and monitoring results in which: i) desired results are identified, defined, and communicated clearly; and ii) metrics related to the results and that matter for ongoing decision-making (based on a theory of change) are measured and monitored on an ongoing basis.
  - Adaptive and dynamic management and ongoing learning is instituted, using the specific metrics, to understand the drivers of results and to apply data and evidence to different types of decision-making for continual improvement to achieve sustained results.

**Figure 1: Principles of M4R**



7. The literature integrates concepts regarding measurement, assessment, learning, management, and decision-making, but with an emphasis on outcomes, whether it is poverty reduction, student learning,

or improved health, not simply on inputs, processes, and outputs. Inputs, processes, and outputs are measured and acted upon (metrics), insofar as they determine or contribute substantially to the desired outcomes. In addition, the literature is increasingly encompassing thinking around how to develop institutional and organizational systems and capacities (ultimately culture) that engage people in agile, regular learning and adaptation using evidence, in order to best position the organization to deliver to the organization's goals, and not just on specific inputs, process, and output metrics alone.

In international development, a series of agreements, including the Paris Declaration (2005), the Accra Agenda for Action (2008), and, more recently, the Busan Declaration (2011), further articulated how principles of M4R (Figure 1) could be operationalized in the context of international development, thereby emphasizing that the ultimate results are for and of the client countries (and not those of the development agencies') and are driven through client countries' M4R (see, for example <http://www.oecd.org/development/effectiveness/49650173.pdf>).

8. In parallel, and in keeping with the evolving thinking in international development, the WBG successively refined its approach to the various elements of M4R. The World Bank's results agenda began explicitly in 2003, with an action plan outlined in *Better Measuring, Monitoring, and Managing for Development Results: Implementation Action Plan (2003)*, discussed with the Committee for Development Effectiveness in December 2002. Recognizing that the principles of M4R in the context of international development should be applied to its work as well, the plan focused on enhancing countries' statistical systems, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) capacity, and knowledge base to manage for results. Internally, it focused on designing and piloting results-based Country Assistance Strategies (CASs), improving results reporting, and enhancing staff learning and incentives. The *Accelerating the Results Agenda: Progress and Next Steps (2006)* report to the Committee on Development Effectiveness (CODE) outlined further actions along similar dimensions. Aspects of the agenda continued through 2013.
9. With the new strategy in 2013, the WBG developed also developed its first institution-wide scorecard in 2014 to serve as a key instrument in M4R, clearly articulating its goals and results.<sup>1, 2</sup>
  - Tier 1 results – long term outcomes to which countries and development partners contribute.
  - Tier 2 results – achieved and reported by clients on operations supported by the WBG.
  - Tier 3 indicators – operational and organizational effectiveness measures that are hypothesized to affect and contribute to the achievement of results that the WBG seeks to accomplish, including independently validated ratings by IEG of development outcomes supported through WBG operations.
10. Separately, IFC, whose investment and advisory services clients are in both private sector and public sectors (including sub-nationals, municipalities), acknowledged that “a strong focus on managing results will be important, and IFC will continue to strengthen and expand its results measurement system” in the IFC Roadmap, FY14-FY16. One aspect of IFC's results system is IFC Development Goals (IDGs), which are a subset of the WBG Scorecard and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). In addition to tracking the development goals, IFC has in place processes to monitor the portfolio performance and management dashboards, project pipeline monitoring, analytical reporting

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.worldbank.org/en/about/results/corporatescorecard>

1. <sup>2</sup> The current reporting cycle is finishing at the end of FY17 for both the WBG scorecard and IDA RMS; both tools are being revised to reflect new global and corporate priorities beginning in FY18.

and supporting/back office reporting systems. The second subset of the IFC results is laid out in IFC's Corporate Performance indicators and the potential linkage to client results. IFC clients' results could be influenced through standardized approaches and instruments such as IFC Performance Standards, Corporate Governance Advisory, to name a few, and other mechanisms that capture private sector development results, such as indicators of reach

11. Similarly, in June 2010, MIGA instituted a standardized approach to collecting development outcome information from clients, an initiative called the Development Effectiveness Indicators System. For private sector interventions through MIGA, adaptive management could contribute to its own results as well as client results during underwriting, assessment and monitoring (including Environmental and Social aspects) of the projects supported. Some of the key MIGA adaptive management measures, including external triggers are as follows: (a) Pre-Claims from Guarantee Holder clients (b) Guarantee Cancellation management (c) Sovereign Risk Downgrades and exogenous shocks (such as the Financial Crisis) (d) Re-insurance policies and (e) Innovation through new products (for e.g. Non Honoring of Sovereign Financial Obligations).
12. Yet, as noted above, M4R poses special challenges in the context of international development, where the outcomes are "joint" and typically jointly determined by the client and the development agency involved. These challenges are interrelated and may include differences between the clients and various development agencies involved in: M4R orientation and capacity; need for attribution of, versus contribution to, results; and incentives to achieve sustainable results. .
13. This review will thus explore briefly how the WBG is working with its clients to address some of these issues as part of the M4R agenda, and what avenues it may need to consider going forward.

## Objectives and Audience

14. The overarching purpose of RAP 2016 is to provide an enhanced understanding of areas of relative strength and areas requiring attention in the WBG approach to M4R, as well as to report on WBG performance. The specific objectives are to: (i) develop a consolidated overview of the WBG efforts aimed at M4R, defined against the M4R framework developed for the report; (ii) provide an assessment, based on IEG's evaluation evidence and select other sources (e.g., Internal Audit Department reports, DEC research), of the status and effectiveness of its efforts related to M4R; (iii) report on the results and performance of the WBG's country- and project-level work, as captured in recent validation reports, evaluations, and other analytic work; (iv) distill lessons from evaluations to support efforts to enhance the WBG's effectiveness with respect to M4R; and (v) analyze and report on the management actions in response to recommendations of previous IEG evaluations. In addition to these broad objectives, the RAP will also report on the extent to which gender is addressed in the WBG operations, continuing the trend reported in RAP 2015.
15. As part of this work, the M4R framework will be further articulated using the two key principles for M4R (measurement and management) highlighted in paragraph 6. This framework will encompass efforts related to data, data systems, monitoring, evaluation, and using evidence for different types of decision-making.
16. The primary audience of RAP 2016 are the World Bank Group's Board of Directors and the CODE. Other important stakeholders include WBG's senior management; the OPCS Vice Presidency; management of the Global Practices and Regions; IFC and MIGA Directors and Senior Managers; Country Directors and Representatives; and Task Teams of operational projects. WBG clients also constitute an important audience for this report, as it will include a preliminary view of WBG's approach to M4R with its clients. RAP 2016 will be released publicly, and therefore the external stakeholder groups, including other development agencies and non-government organizations are important stakeholders. A preliminary stakeholder analysis, based on document review and some discussions with management, is attached as Appendix F.

## Scope and Key Questions

17. RAP 2016 will comprise three distinct but interrelated chapters. Chapter 1 will focus on the special theme, M4R, to provide an overview of the WBG's approach. . . .
18. The main question to be addressed is as follow: *how, and how effectively, did the WBG approach M4R?* Specifically:
  - How and how effectively did the WBG measure development results?
  - 
  - How, and how effectively, did the WBG engage in and support adaptive management and learning to achieve the results?
19. In addition to reviewing and summarizing available IEG evidence (and a few external evidence-based documents, such as IAD and DEC reports) on the WBG's approach to M4R, the current report will explore briefly WBG's work on strengthening and institutionalizing clients' M4R systems and capacity through projects, country programs, and instruments, as an integral foundation of WBG's

M4R. Because the report is based primarily on existing evidence, this chapter will provide only a preliminary view on WBG's work with clients, and not a comprehensive review of the initiatives and processes that focus on client M4R outside of the portfolio routinely evaluated by IEG.

20. Chapter 2 will comprise the standard part of the report and examine trends in country- and project-level outcomes, based on IEG's validations of country and project completion reports, as well as country case studies completed for thematic studies. In contrast with RAP 2015, which analyzed in detail the factors associated with project-level performance, RAP 2016 will provide analysis of results at the country level. The specific questions to be addressed are as follows:

- What are the patterns in the performance of the WBG country strategies/frameworks? What factors are associated with these patterns?
- What are the patterns of WBG performance with respect to the country strategies/frameworks? What factors are associated with these patterns?
- Are there discernible differences across countries in project-level performance, and what factors explain those differences?
- Is the WBG supporting country (organizational and public-sector clients in the case of IFC/MIGA) capacity and systems for managing for results? How?

21. At the project level, RAP 2016 will present trends in performance ratings from IEG reviews of the WBG's self-assessments of its projects and financing interventions (including IFC advisory services and MIGA guarantees). The analysis will be organized in line with the WBG's new structure (as at the end of FY16), providing information specific to Global Practice groups, regions, and IFC's new categorization for industries.

22. Chapter 3 will report on the Management Action Record (MAR) and the influence of IEG's recommendations on changes in the WBG's work. MAR serves a record of how the WBG responds to and acts upon the recommendations of IEG revaluations. It is a tool for accountability by keeping the WBG Board of Directors and the general public informed about the progress of Management's implementation of their action plans prepared in response to the recommendations from IEG's evaluations. It also serves as a tool for learning. The chapter will outline the implementation status of Management's action plans in FY15 and provide an analysis of historical trends of both the implementation ratings and Management's actions. Specifically, this section will examine the following key questions:

- What is the progress on the implementation of the agreed Management Action Plans?
- What are the trends in the adoption of IEG's recommendations?
- What are the trends in the adoption of IEG's recommendations specifically related to the theme of M4R?

## **Approach and Methodology**

23. Consistent with previous years' approach, RAP 2016 will synthesize findings from existing IEG project, country-level, corporate, and thematic evaluations and learning products, analyze existing IEG data, conduct desk reviews to draw information from WBG documents, and refer to other relevant research and information (e.g., literature on M4R), as needed. Additional data may be collected through select interviews with key WBG staff (e.g., OPCS). Where there are evidence gaps

or information regarding WBG M4R are not clear, the report will so acknowledge and suggest areas for future studies to the WBG. More detailed information on methodology is attached at Appendix D.

24. Chapter 1 will build on five approaches, leveraging on IEG available sources and resources (see Appendices B and C): (i) review and synthesis of existing IEG evaluation findings as they pertain to M4R; (ii) a review of a sample from the portfolio of projects validated by IEG in FY16 to assess the focus on M4R, specifically: development of clients' institutional M4R systems and capacity; (iii) a review of country assistance strategy (CAS) reviews and completion and learning report (CLR) reviews in FY16 to assess the focus on M4R; (iv) interviews with select WBG staff regarding key initiatives to support adaptive management and results focus for clients and staff; and (v) review of relevant WBG documents (e.g., the WBG Board papers regarding M4R).
25. Chapter 2 of RAP 2016 will analyze performance of country strategies and country partnership frameworks and examine the relationship between performance and other key country-level and WBG-related factors (e.g., country income, CPIA scores, Bank performance). Where possible, it will also present analysis over a two or three strategy periods.
26. In addition, the report will present performance information on WBG operations by reviewing operationally mature projects for IFC and MIGA and recently closed operations for the World Bank, based on a three-year rolling average of IEG's ratings (for projects existing FY13-15). For IFC, the report will also attempt to present predictive analysis regarding the development outcomes of more recent projects, based on IEG's established methodology and access to relevant portfolio. Depending on the data availability (at the project / industry / country level), IEG will consider analysis on relatively newer corporate results indicators such as Mandate-to-Disbursements.<sup>3</sup> The information will be disaggregated by several variables (e.g., country income, lending instruments, country characteristics, such as Fragile and Conflict status).
27. To provide sector-specific or theme-specific insights, recently completed IEG evaluations (FY14-16) will be used to identify findings applicable to the current WBG portfolio. The list of recently completed evaluations is attached at Appendix C.
28. In the case of MIGA, IEG will assess both, general and sector-specific indicators at the portfolio aggregate level, as well as the adaptive measures in place for new product lines with MIGA support for sovereign financial obligations, sub-national financial obligations, and state-owned enterprises
29. Chapter 3 will provide an update and analysis on IEG Recommendations to WBG Management and follow-up on those recommendations.
30. Following the practice in previous RAPs, the regional and GP updates will be presented in an online Appendix to the RAP 2016.

## **Communication and Dissemination**

31. The preliminary stakeholder analysis, attached as Appendix F, will be updated as and when new information from the stakeholders is collected. This analysis will provide the foundation for the

---

<sup>3</sup> The time taken between the day when the IFC mandate letter is signed by the IFC prospective client and the day the project's financing-related disbursements are executed by IFC, treated as a measure of internal efficiency.

development of a communication strategy for the RAP. Initial dissemination ideas include presentations at international platforms for M4R, such as the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation, and at brown bag lunches and knowledge sharing events with OPCS (e.g., at the Results and Measurement and Evaluation Stream).

32. As a complement to the narrative RAP report, an interactive dashboard will be created to enable users to view results and trends and do their own analysis. Variables and information related to the analysis for this RAP will be included in the dashboard, as appropriate. Thus dissemination and communication of this interactive dashboard will be considered for clients in collaboration with regional VPUs.

## **Team and Budget**

33. Nick York (Director, IEGHE) and Marie Gaarder (Manager, IEGHC) will provide overall direction and guidance for RAP 2016, and Nidhi Khattri (IEGHE) and Raghavan Narayanan (IEGFP) will serve as co-Task Team Leaders. A collaborative team drawn from across all IEG departments will include: Joy Behrens, Unurjargal Demberel, Katsumasa Hamaguchi, Yun Sun Li, Eduardo Maldonado, Bahar Salimova, Anthony Tyrrell, and Yoshine Uchimura. Marie Charles will provide administrative support. The team will be supported by short-term consultants and by IEG staff responsible for maintaining the Management Action Record. The team will seek inputs from other IEG staff and consultants across the VPU on specific aspects of the report preparation and dissemination.
34. The peer reviewers for the report are Karen Jorgensen (Head, Division of Peer Review and Evaluation, OECD), Margaret Kakande (Head, Budget Monitoring and Accountability, Ugandan Ministry of Finance), and Oscar Garcia (Head, Evaluation, IFAD). Consultations with relevant Bank Group management and staff will be conducted following the usual practice of IEG's large-scale evaluations.
35. RAP 2016 report will be prepared with an estimated budget of \$680,000 (TBC) of which approximately 15 percent was spent in FY16. An additional \$80,000 (TBC) will be budgeted for the regional updates, Summary Sector Highlights and Top Lessons for IFC and World Bank. These budget items are comparable to the cost of RAP 2015. Wider outreach and dissemination activities upon completion of the report will require an estimated \$20,000. The report will be finalized and presented to the Board in the third quarter of FY17.



## Appendix A: Summary of Key Differences between RAP15 and RAP16, and between ROSES and RAP16

<b>Chapters</b>	<b>RAP15</b>	<b>RAP16</b>
Chapter 1: Theme	Gender	Managing for Results
Chapter 2: Performance	Analysis of factors associated with project-level performance	Analysis of factors associated with country-level performance
Chapter 3: MAR	Analysis by type of recommendation: strategy, policy, program/project, knowledge, M&E, and other operational	Analysis by whether the recommendations targeted M4R issues  Greater emphasis on a qualitative assessment of whether and how IEG's recommendations facilitate change in the WBG

### ROSES and RAP16

<b>Chapters</b>	<b>ROSES</b>	<b>RAP16</b>
Chapter 1: Theme	Self-evaluation Systems	Findings from ROSES  Review of broader M4R efforts, in addition to the focus on self-evaluation systems  Exploratory review of how clients M4R is supported  Summary of M4R-related recommendations and the WBG progress along those recommendations

## **Appendix B: Principal Sources of Data to be used for RAP 2016**

***Project evaluations and validations.*** These products include Project Performance Assessment Reports (PPARs) for both World Bank-financed and IFC projects; Implementation Completion Report Reviews (ICRRs) for World Bank-financed projects; Expanded Project Supervision Reports (XPSRs), IEG sector highlights, and IEG cluster notes for mature IFC investments; Project Completion Reports (PCRs) for IFC Advisory Services; and MIGA Project Evaluation Reports (PERs). Specifically, the portfolio review analyses for the World Bank within RAP 2016 will be based primarily on ICRRs for projects exiting the portfolio in FY13-15 and PPARs prepared in FY14-16; XPSRs for IFC investments reaching early operational maturity in FY2010-15; PCRs for IFC advisory services operations closed in FY2010-15; and MIGA PERs for guarantees reaching early maturity by FY2010-15.

***Country evaluations,*** including both Country Strategy and Completion and Learning Report Reviews (prepared for 54 countries during FY13-15) and more detailed Country Program Evaluations (16 prepared during FY11-15).

***Sector, Global Practice, and thematic studies*** produced by IEG since FY15, including some reports that are expected to be completed by the second quarter of FY 2017 (see Appendix C).

***Learning products*** produced by IEG since FY15, including some studies that are expected to be completed by fall 2016 (see Appendix C).

***Management Action Records*** to capture the progress and gaps identified in degree of adoption of past IEG recommendations and to assess ongoing efforts.

***Databases*** that include IEG's ICR-R, XPSR-EvNote, PCR-EvNote, PER-EvNote, and CASCR-R databases, as well as the World Bank's Business Intelligence data warehouse.

***Documents and records*** on relevant corporate strategies, initiatives, programs, and evaluations, including the World Bank's Scorecard, the Country Opinion Surveys, IFC's Development Goals and institutional reforms, presentations to CODE on the results framework systems and evaluation strategy, policy documents and MIGA's self-evaluation and monitoring initiatives, policies and procedures. Other, external research will be drawn on as relevant / appropriate.

## Appendix C: Major IEG Evaluations and Learning Products Recently Completed or Expected to Be Completed (FY15-FY17)

### Main IEG Evaluations Recently Completed or Expected to Be Completed in FY15-FY17

Fiscal Year	Evaluation
FY 15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="#">Results and Performance of the World Bank Group 2014 (RAP 2014: Achieving MDGs) (WB, IFC, MIGA)</a></li> <li>2. <a href="#">The Poverty Focus of Country Programs: Lessons from World Bank Experience</a></li> <li>3. <a href="#">Later Impacts of Early Childhood Interventions: A Systematic Review</a></li> <li>4. <a href="#">Financial Inclusion: A Foothold on the Ladder toward Prosperity? An Evaluation of World Bank Group Support for Financial Inclusion for Low-Income Households and Microenterprises</a></li> <li>5. <a href="#">World Bank Group Support to Electricity Access, FY2000-2014 (IFC, MIGA, WB)</a></li> <li>6. <a href="#">Learning and Results in World Bank Operations: Toward a New Learning Strategy – Evaluation 2</a></li> <li>7. <a href="#">World Bank Group Engagement in Resource-Rich Developing Countries: The cases of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Kazakhstan, Mongolia, and Zambia (Cluster CPE: Resource Rich Countries)</a></li> <li>8. <a href="#">World Bank Support to Early Childhood Development</a></li> </ol>
FY 16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Results and Performance of the World Bank Group 2015 (RAP 2015 - Gender Equality) (WB, IFC, MIGA)</li> <li>2. Accelerating Growth through Skills and Knowledge: An Evaluation of the World Bank Group’s Support for Higher Education</li> <li>3. Evaluation of the World Bank Group’s Support for Capital Market Development (IFC, MIGA, WB)</li> <li>4. World Bank Group Industry-Specific Support to Promote Industrial Competitiveness and Its Implications for Jobs</li> <li>5. Behind the Mirror: A Report on the Self-Evaluation Systems of the World Bank Group (ROSES)</li> <li>6. Program-for-Results: An Early-Stage Assessment of the Process and Effects of a New Lending Instrument</li> <li>7. World Bank Group Activities in Situations of Conflict and Violence (Fragile Situations in Non-Fragile Countries)</li> <li>8. Clustered Country Program Evaluation on Small States</li> </ol>
FY 17	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Shared Prosperity in Country Programs (WBG) [AP in April; report in June 2017]</li> <li>2. Growing the Rural Non-Farm Economy to Alleviate Poverty: An IEG Evaluation of World Bank Group Support 2004-2014 [Report to management Nov. 2016]</li> <li>3. Process Evaluation of Systematic Country Diagnostic and Country Partnership Framework [September 2016 to CODE]</li> <li>4. Evaluation of the World Bank Group’s Support for Water Supply and Sanitation Services, FY2007-2016 [Late FY17]</li> <li>5. Mobile Metropolises: An IEG Evaluation of the World Bank Group’s Support for Urban Transport [Late FY17]</li> <li>6. Environmental Management of Air &amp; Water Resources [Late FY17]</li> <li>7. Data for Development [Late FY17]</li> <li>8. IFC Client Engagement Model [Late FY17]</li> <li>9. Clustered CPE on Dynamic MICs [Late FY17]</li> </ol>

## IEG Learning Products Recently Completed or Expected to Be Completed in FY15-FY16

	<b>Category I</b>	<b>Category II</b>
FY15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="#">Opportunities and Challenges from Working in Partnerships</a></li> <li>2. Bank-IFC Cooperation at the Country Strategy Level</li> <li>3. <a href="#">Selectivity in Country Strategies</a></li> <li>4. <a href="#">Results Frameworks in Country Strategies</a></li> <li>5. <a href="#">Additional Financing for Transport and Information &amp; Communication Technology</a></li> <li>6. Renewable Energy</li> <li>7. Microfinance in Africa</li> <li>8. Job's in IFCs Manufacturing Projects: Lessons from Project Evaluation</li> <li>9. IFC Additionality</li> <li>10. DPO: Public Expenditure (LP I)</li> <li>11. <a href="#">Quality of Macro-Fiscal Frameworks in Development Policy Operations</a> (DPO: Macro Fiscal Framework) (LP I)</li> <li>12. Quality of Results Frameworks in Development Policy Operations (DPO: Results Framework and Conditionality)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>13. <a href="#">DPO: Environment and Social Risk Management</a></li> </ol>
FY16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lessons from Joint WBG Projects</li> <li>2. Domestic Resource Mobilization in WBG Instruments</li> <li>3. Mobilizing Private Capital for Development</li> <li>4. Financial Viability of Infrastructure Delivery</li> <li>5. Gender Impacts of CDD</li> <li>6. Land Administration</li> <li>7. World Bank Group Support for Housing Finance</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Maximizing Development Impact in IDA</li> <li>9. WBG Transformational Engagements</li> <li>10. DPO: Political Economy Analysis</li> <li>11. Off-Grid Electricity Access</li> <li>12. DPO: Poverty and Social Impact Analysis</li> <li>13. DPO: Environment Sector</li> </ol>

**Other Products Completed or Expected to Be Completed in FY15-FY17**

	<b>PPARs</b>	<b>Validation Products</b>	<b>Systematic Reviews</b>
FY15	Total (World Bank and IFC): 39	IFC Expanded Project Supervision Reports (XPSRs): 78  MIGA PER: 16  WB Implementation Completion and Results Report Reviews (ICRRs): 392  IEG Reviews of Completion and Learning Reviews (or of Country Assistance Strategy Completion Reports) (CLRs/CASCRs): 12  IFC Project Completion Reviews (PCRs): 72	Electricity Access  Impacts of Interventions during Early Childhood on Later Outcomes
FY16	World Bank: 50  IFC: 8	IFC Expanded Project Supervision Reports (XPSRs): 40% coverage (103 projects expected)  MIGA PER: (25 expected)  WB Implementation Completion and Results Report Reviews (ICRRs): 100% coverage (340 projects expected)  IEG Reviews of Completion and Learning Reviews (or of Country Assistance Strategy Completion Reports) (CLRs/CASCRs): 22 expected  IFC PCR: 51% coverage (102 projects expected)	
FY 17	World Bank: 55  IFC: 8		

## Appendix D: Detailed Methodology

Chapter 1 methodology will be tailored to the questions posed regarding WBG's approach to M4R, the framework for which will be defined as part of the RAP.

- How and how effectively did the WBG measure development results?

This question will be addressed by synthesizing information from IEG evaluations.

- How, and how effectively, did the WBG engage in and support adaptive management and learning to achieve the results?

This question will be answered through synthesizing findings from IEG major evaluations and learning products regarding the WBG's M4R. Two additional sets of exploratory analyses will be conducted on existing data regarding how the WBG is working with clients on M4R: a) an identification of projects that have enhancing clients' institutional M4R capacity (e.g., statistical systems; government-wide M&E systems; results-focused reforms) as their main objective and a review of their effectiveness; and b) an exploratory qualitative review of CAS/CLR reviews and a sample (size to be determined) of ICRRs conducted in FY16 (total expected to be 340) regarding the degree to which they incorporate strengthening institutional M4R capacity (results measurement, evaluation, evidence-based decision-making) as a sub-objective or component, and the evidence regarding the effectiveness of the interventions to address these sub-objectives or components. The qualitative methodology will comprise developing search terms and a series of questions related to the M4R framework (as further developed for the review), conducting text analytics regarding these terms, and classifying the type of M4R supported in country programs and projects. Next, the review will search for evidence in the CASCR/CLRR/ICRRs regarding the effectiveness of these interventions. The qualitative analysis will rely on existing evidence; no new data will be collected. The full methodology will be included in the report.

Information on IFC will be drawn from an upcoming learning product. This will be an exploratory study to provide preliminary information to the WBG regarding this topic and any limitations will be noted clearly.

In addition, the report will provide a broad overview of the (new) instruments and approaches (i.e., .g., P4Rand IFC's Corporate Governance instrument) and major initiatives (e.g., Results Measurement and Evaluation Stream, MIGA's Environmental and Social Performance Standards), and any evidence regarding the effectiveness of these approaches.

Chapter 2 of RAP 2016 will analyze performance of country strategies over a two or three strategy periods. It will also examine the relationship between performance and other key country-level and WBG-related factors, including:

- a. Country income/IBRD/Blend
- b. CPIA scores
- c. Aggregated project performance within the CAS/CLR period
- d. Bank performance

In addition, the report will develop a framework for a qualitative assessment of the factors associated with country strategy performance. (See the paragraph above on the approach to the qualitative assessment.)

Two major caveats should be noted regarding this analysis. First, the number of reviews of country strategies is small (since 2003, 27 countries with 3 CAS /CLR reviews, 47 countries with 2 CAS/CLR

reviews, and 23 countries with 1 CAS/CLR reviews), and second, the new Country Partnership Framework was introduced in 2013 and the methodology for review and rating was revised accordingly. Both factors limit quantitative and longitudinal analyses, and will be taken into consideration in presenting the findings. The focus therefore will be on developing qualitative assessments, with areas identified for future studies.

Chapter 3 of RAP 2016 will provide an update on IEG Recommendations to WBG Management and follow-up on those recommendations. The study will look into trends of the adoption ratings and analyze the relationship between the degree of Management's acceptance of recommendations and implementation ratings, based on classifying ratings into two groups: those that are targeted at a particular organizational unit versus those that are institutionally cross-cutting. In addition, the chapter will consider specifically the adoption of M4R-related recommendations.

IEG will also conduct in-depth analysis of recommendations from evaluations exiting the MAR follow-up cycle in FY 2016 (World Bank Country-level Engagement on Governance and Anti-corruption, World Bank Group Impact Evaluations: Relevance and Effectiveness, and Assessing International Finance Corporation's Poverty Focus and Results) to assess whether the recommendations facilitated change and dialogue in the targeted sectors/areas. It will look within and beyond the MAR process to understand the degree to which IEG's recommendations contribute to change. For this purpose, IEG will conduct a series of interviews and focus groups with a select group of stakeholders, including Bank Group's operational staff and IEG's evaluators who are experts in the subject matter. IEG will also take stock of Bank literature referencing IEG's studies.

MAR data and analysis will be also presented in the regional and GP updates, as relevant.

## Appendix E: References

- Andrews, M., Pritchett, L., & Woolcock, M. (2016). *Scaling PDIA Solutions through Broad Agency, and Your Role*. Center for International Development, Harvard University.
- Argyris, C., and Schön, D. (1974). *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Argyris, C., and Schön, D. (1978). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*, Reading, Mass: Addison Wesley.
- Asian Development Bank. (2011). *Framework for Results-based Public Sector Management and Country Cases*. Asia Pacific Community of Practice on Managing for Development Results. Manila: Asian Development Bank
- COMPAS. 2011 COMPAS Report: Multilateral Development Banks' Common Performance Assessment System: COMPAS.
- D.C. Department of State, Office of U.S. Foreign Assistance Resources. (2015). *Evaluation of the Office of U.S. Foreign Assistance Resources' Implementation of the Managing for Results Framework*. Washington, D.C.: Department of State, Office of U.S. Foreign Assistance Resources.
- Drucker, Peter F. (1964). *Managing for Results: Economic Tasks and Risk-taking Decisions*. New York: Harper & Row.
- . (1954). *The Practice of Management*. New York: Harper & Row.
- (1989). "What Business Can Learn from Nonprofits." *Harvard Business Review* 67.4, 88-93.
- Gaarder, M. & Bartsch, U. (2015). *Creating a Market for Outcomes: Shopping for Solutions*. Washington D.C.: World Bank
- Garvin, D. A. (2000). *Learning in Action – A Guide to Putting the Learning Organization to Work*, Harvard: Harvard Business School Press.
- Gigler, B. and Bailur, S. (2014). *Closing the Feedback Loop: Can Technology Bridge the Accountability Gap?* Washington D.C.: World Bank
- Government Accountability Office (2015). *Managing for Results: Practices for Effective Agency Strategic Reviews*. United States Government Accountability Office: Washington DC.
- Hatry, Harry P., et al. (DATE)...*How Federal Programs Use Outcome Information: Opportunities for Federal Managers*. Washington, D. C.:
- Independent Evaluation Group, World Bank. 2013. *Results and Performance of the World Bank Group 2012*.
- Independent Evaluation Group (IEG), World Bank. 2014. *Results and Performance of the World Bank Group 2013*.
- Independent Evaluation Group (IEG), World Bank. 2015. *Results and Performance of the World Bank Group 2014*.
- National Academy of Public Administration. (2003). *Managing for Results Series*.
- Kang, Young Cheoul. (2005). "Strategic Management in the Public Sector." *Public Performance and Management Review* 29.1 (2005): 85-92.
- Kiechel, Walter. (2012). "The Management Century." *Harvard Business Review* November
- Lee, Mordecai. (2004). *E-Reporting: Strengthening Democratic Accountability*. Washington, D.C.: IBM Center for the Business of Government. E-Government Series.



- MacKenzie, Alexander. (2008). *Results Based Management at Country Level: Systemic Issues that Prevent Good UNDAF Results and the use of UNDAF Results Information*. New York: UNDAF.
- Meier, Werner. (2003). *Results-Based Management: Towards a Common Understanding Among Development Cooperation Agencies*. N.p.: Canadian International Development Agency.
- Nutt, Paul C. (2005). "Comparing Public and Private Sector Decision-Making Practices." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 16.2 (2005): 289-318.
- OECD. (2009). *Managing for Development Results*. Paris: OECD.
- UNDP. (2011). *Results-Based Management Handbook*. New York: United Nations Development Group.
- Schön, D. (1973). *Beyond the Stable State. Public and private learning in a changing society*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday Currency.
- Sourcebook on Emerging Good Practice in Managing for Development Results*. Washington, D.C.: OECD-DAC Joint Venture on MfDR, 2008.
- UNDP. (2007). *Evaluation of Results-Based Management at UNDP*. New York: UNDP
- United States General Accounting Office. (2002). *Managing for Results: Challenges Agencies Face in Producing Credible Performance Information*. Rept. no. GAO/GGD\_00-52. Washington, D.C.: GAO,. Performance Information Challenges.
- United States General Accounting Office. (1998). *Managing for Results: Measuring Program Results that are Under Limited Federal Control*. Washington, D.C.: GAO. GAO/GGD-99-16.
- Wholey, Joseph S. "Managing for Results: Roles for Evaluators in a New Management Era." *American Journal of Evaluation* 22.3 (2001): 343-47.
- World Bank Corporate Scorecard. October 2015. Accessed April 5, 2016.
- World Bank Group Strategy*. (2013). Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group, 2013.

## Appendix F: Preliminary Stakeholder Analysis (ongoing)

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

Stakeholder Group	Stakeholder (or stakeholder Group)	Their interests (what they want from RAP2016)	Types of decisions this stakeholder Makes (that RAP2016 could feed)
<b>Board</b>	1 WBG Board (as a whole)	<input type="checkbox"/> Information on how the WBG is performing – timely feedback <input type="checkbox"/> Project performance in countries <input type="checkbox"/> The WBG’s results focus <input type="checkbox"/> Inform “Forward Look”	⇒ Project results’ focus ⇒ Institutional focus on Results and Managing for Results
	2 WBG Board, CODE	<input type="checkbox"/> What works (what contributes to development results?) <input type="checkbox"/> Factors related to the performance of country programs	⇒ Board on the types of issues to consider in approving project/country programs ⇒ Topics for future IEG evaluations ⇒ Priorities for OPCS
<b>WBG Senior Management</b>	3 WBG Senior Management	<input type="checkbox"/> Twin goals: Eliminating poverty, Boosting shared prosperity <input type="checkbox"/> Enhancing development effectiveness of the WBG	⇒ WBG strategy, priorities ⇒ Enhancing results focus
	4 GP Senior Management	<input type="checkbox"/> How this GP is doing vs other GPs	⇒ GP strategy, priorities ⇒ Enhancing results focus
	5 Region Senior Management	<input type="checkbox"/> What results are being achieved in this Region? <input type="checkbox"/> What results are being achieved in particular countries? <input type="checkbox"/> What factors to consider to enhance countries’ results’ focus?	⇒ Region priorities ⇒ Relationships with country clients ⇒ Design of country programs, projects

<b>Stakeholder Group</b>	<b>Stakeholder</b> (or stakeholder Group)	<b>Their interests</b> (what they want from RAP2016)	<b>Types of decisions this stakeholder Makes</b> (that RAP2016 could feed)
	7 Country Directors	<input type="checkbox"/> Factors that affect country performance <input type="checkbox"/> Attention to results	⇒ Content of country portfolio
	9 IFC Senior Management	<input type="checkbox"/> Factors that affect performance <input type="checkbox"/> Attention to results	⇒ Content of portfolio
	MIGA Senior Management	<input type="checkbox"/> Factors that affect development effectiveness <input type="checkbox"/> Attention to results	⇒ Prioritization of new product Lines and projects by sector
<b>OPCS and other WBG stakeholders</b>	10 OPCS	<input type="checkbox"/> Reporting on portfolio (e.g. at ABCDQ meetings) <input type="checkbox"/> Reporting on corporate performance (Corporate Scorecard), including for indicators related to gender integration <input type="checkbox"/> Management of results	⇒ Content of operational policies and guidance ⇒ Improvements to systems, tools; simplification
	11 IEG Senior Management	<input type="checkbox"/> High quality, credible work <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence understandable to stakeholders <input type="checkbox"/> Ability to provide a timely messages <input type="checkbox"/> Enhancing WBG's effectiveness	⇒ Focus of future IEG evaluations ⇒ Prioritization around communication of evaluation results
<b>Clients</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> WBG work on strengthening client capacity for M4R	⇒ Improving country M4R systems; ⇒ Deciding on WBG support for M4R systems