IEGWB[1] Guidelines for Global Program Reviews

February 27, 2006

BACKGROUND

1. OED's Phase 2 Report of the Bank's involvement in global programs recommended, among other things, that:

> **OED should include global programs in its standard evaluation and reporting processes to the Board. This includes:**
>
> - Reviewing selected program-level evaluations conducted by Bank-supported global programs (both internally and externally managed) much as OED reviews other external-evaluations at the project and country levels.
> - Working with the Bank's global partners to develop international standards for the evaluation of global programs.[2]

2. Global programs and partnerships (GPPs) are an important and growing line of business of the World Bank. Bank Management now defines GPPs as satisfying the following four criteria:

- Are global, regional or multi-country (not single country) in scope,
- Commit Bank resources (financial, technical, staff, Bank name, or reputation),
- Involve activities coordinated with one or more non-Bank entities, and
- Are part of a formal relationship that aims to achieve development objectives over time.

The Bank is currently involved in 153 global and regional programs, 60 institutional collaborations, and 11 programmatic trust funds, according to the most recent inventory of GPPs (Table 1).

3. Starting in November 2000, all new GPPs had to be approved at the initial concept stage by the managing director responsible for the Vice Presidential Unit (VPU) advocating the Bank's involvement. Such approval then authorized the respective VPU to enter into agreements with partners and to mobilize resources for the program – whether from the Development Grant Facility (DGF), trust funds, or the Bank's administrative budget. Under the new GPP business processes introduced in 2005, global and regional partnership programs can now be approved by the responsible Vice President, unless they present complex issues or risks, in which case they must still be approved by the responsible Managing Director.

---

1. The Independent Evaluation Group of the World Bank (IEGWB) formally changed its name from the Operations Evaluation Department (OED) of the World Bank in November 2005. Earlier publications and reports by OED are cited in the present document by their original author and title.

2. Operations Evaluation Department, *Addressing Challenges of Globalization : An Independent Evaluation of the World Bank's Approach to Global Programs,* Phase 2 Report, 2004, p. xxx.

Table 1. Bank's Involvement in Global and Regional Partnerships by Bank Network and Regional VPU and by Type of Partnership

	Global and Regional Programs					Institutional Collaboration /1	Programmatic Trust Fund /2	**Grand Total**
	Housed in the World Bank	Housed in Partner Organization	Independent Legal Entity	Other	Total			
Network VPU	**Global Programs**							
ESSD	13	7	5	11	36	7	2	45
HDN	4	7	14	3	28	4	1	33
INF	10	3	1	2	16		1	17
WBI	2	2	5		9			9
PREM	1	2	3		6	10	1	17
FSE		2	2	1	5	6		11
DEC	1	3	1		5	2	2	9
CFP			1		1	1		2
ISG			1		1	1		2
EXT		1			1			1
LEG			1		1			1
OPCS			1		1			1
PSD	1				1			1
CTR					0	1		1
HDN/EXT					0	1		1
Subtotal	32	27	35	17	111	33	7	151
Regional VPU	**Regional Programs**							
AFR	5	6	8	2	21	12	2	35
LCR	4		4		8			8
MNA	2	3	1	1	7	1		8
ECA	3	1			4	11		15
EAP		1	1		2	3	2	7
Subtotal	14	11	14	3	42	27	4	73
Grand Total	46	38	49	20	153	60	11	224

/1 Institutional collaborations are simple partnerships in which there is no shared financing or formal shared decision making.

/2 These are trust funds without shared governance arrangements and in which decision-making power is delegated to the Bank.

Source: World Bank, "A Strategic Framework for the World Bank's Global Programs and Partnerships" (SecM2005-0250), May 3, 2005, Annex 5.

4. Once programs have been approved, the Network and Regional vice presidencies are responsible for their oversight, management, and quality assurance. This includes establishing priorities among programs, ensuring their coherence with the Bank's sector strategies, sponsoring applications for DGF grants, managing programs that are housed in the Bank, fostering links to the Bank's country operations, and promoting synergy among programs internally and externally.

5. Bank Management established the Global Programs and Partnership (GPP) Council and GPP Group in FY04 in response to one of the recommendations contained in OED's Phase 1 Report. The GPP Council, which consolidates and expands the functions of the former Partnership Council and DGF Council, is now the management committee responsible for overseeing the strategic framework and operational policies for GPPs. Composed of key Regional, Network, and Central vice presidents and co-chaired by two Managing Directors, its current terms of reference are:

- To set the Bank's vision and priorities for its engagement in GPPs
- To review VPU portfolios and the Bank's institutional partnerships
- To set and oversee criteria for selection and evaluation of GPPs, including governance structures, risk management, exit strategies, and best practice.

6. The GPP Group in the reconfigured Concessional Financing and Partnerships Vice Presidency supports the GPP Council in providing a strategic approach to global programs and partnerships. The Group also encompasses the DGF Secretariat (which manages the annual process of allocating DGF grants) and provides guidance to the Networks and Regions on partnership arrangements and financing options for GPPs. In response to the first recommendation in OED's Phase 2 Report, the GPP Group prepared a "Strategic Framework for the World Bank's Global Programs and Partnerships" (SecM2005-0250), which was discussed at an informal meeting of the Bank's Executive Board on June 14, 2005.

7. Roughly two-thirds of the global programs in which the Bank is involved receive grants from the DGF. The DGF requires programs seeking DGF funding of $300,000 or more to incorporate into their grant application a plan for an independent evaluation to be conducted every 3-5 years. The DGF has prepared an Evaluation and Learning Note that explains the objectives of independent evaluations and how these might be carried out.[3] Independent evaluations of DGF-supported programs are now expected to follow these guidelines. (These guidelines have not yet been formally extended to non-DGF programs.)

OBJECTIVES OF GLOBAL PROGRAM REVIEWS

8. IEG reviews of global programs (GPRs) are regarded as parallel to existing review processes for the evaluation of investment projects and country programs and therefore build upon precedents – in terms of both objectives and processes – that have been established for ICR Reviews/PPARs for investment projects and CAS Completion Report Reviews/CAEs for country programs.[4] GPRs will be based upon a prior external evaluation of the global program, typically commissioned by the governing body of the global program.

---

3. World Bank Development Grant Facility "Independent Evaluation: Principles, Guidelines and Good Practice," November 2003, which can be downloaded at http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTDGF/Resources/Evaluation&LearningNote.pdf . This draws heavily upon the evaluation framework for the case studies in OED's Phase 2 Report.

4. The Bank's Regional Management are responsible for preparing Implementation Completion Reports (ICRs) and Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) Completion Reports at the end of each completed project and each CAS. IEG is responsible for preparing ICR Reviews, Project Performance Assessment Reports (PPARs), CAS Completion Report Reviews, and Country Assistance Evaluations (CAEs).

9. A principal difference between GPRs on the one hand and those for investment projects and country programs on the other is that global programs are partnership programs, in which the Bank is only one partner. Instead of being the responsibility of a Bank operational region or network, global programs are the responsibility of the governing body of the program, of which the Bank is only one member. While ICRs and CAS Completion Reports are properties of the Bank, global program evaluations are the property of the global program. Another difference from investment projects is that most global programs are ongoing, rather than completed.

10. IEG has now completed two pilot GPRs. The current guidelines incorporate lessons derived from the experience of these two pilots, as well as reflecting the Bank's new Strategic Framework for Global Programs and Partnerships prepared by the GPP Group. IEG plans to complete 4 to 6 GPRs during each of next 2-3 fiscal years. Then, at a later date (tentatively scheduled for FY08), IEG will conduct a stocktaking of its experiences with this new product, similar to the recently completed *CAE Retrospective* of country assistance evaluations.[5]

11. GPRs are similar in scope to a PPAR. These will involve an average of 4-6 staff weeks as well as mission travel to the secretariat of the program if this is located outside Washington, D.C. Like PPARs, GPRs will be "below-the-line" products that will conclude with "lessons learned" as opposed to recommendations.[6] Also like PPARs, each review will be peer-reviewed and panel-reviewed within IEG, before being circulated elsewhere in the Bank and to external partners, and before being finalized and disclosed.

12. IEG's purpose in conducting GPRs is to contribute to improving both the performance of global programs themselves and the Bank's participation in the programs. In common with all of IEG's evaluation products, the two overarching objectives of GPRs will be accountability and learning lessons:

- **Accountability:** To provide accountability in the achievement of the program's objectives by providing an independent opinion of the program's performance
- **Learning lessons:** To identify and disseminate lessons learned from experience – in this case, from the experience of individual global programs.

13. The first objective includes validating the findings of the global program evaluation with respect to the performance of the program, and assessing the Bank's performance as a partner in the program. The evaluation of the global program will not likely have done the latter since these evaluations do not normally assess the performance of individual partners in the program.[7]

---

5. Operations Evaluation Department, *Country Assistance Evaluation Retrospective: An OED Self-Evaluation*, 2005.

6. However, IEG always reserves the right to elevate any evaluation study to an "above-the-line" product with recommendations, if IEG judges that the circumstances warrant.

7. This aspect of global program reviews therefore provides much opportunity for IEG to add value to the global program evaluations. Every partner clearly has the legitimacy to assess its own role and its continuing participation in each program.

14. The second objective includes assessing the quality and independence of the global program evaluation itself as well as drawing implications for the Bank's continued involvement in the program – both of which represent additional value added of the GPR relative to the global program evaluation itself. Assessing the quality of global program evaluations is a particularly important aspect of global program reviews, since promoting more consistent evaluation methodologies across Bank-supported global programs and raising the quality of global program evaluations are important reasons why IEG is embarking on this new product.

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

15. This builds upon the evaluation framework that was developed for OED's Phase 2 Report of the Bank's involvement in global programs and on the Bank's new strategic framework for global programs. Each GPR will consist of three substantive parts:

- Assessing the independence and quality of the global program evaluation that has been conducted
- Providing an independent opinion on the relevance, efficacy, and efficiency of the program
- Assessing the Bank's performance as a partner in the program.

(See Annex Tables 1, 2, and 3 for the key evaluation issues and questions to be addressed under each part.) IEG will not formally rate these various attributes of the program for the time being. The two pilot GPRs found that it was premature to do so, given the current state of evaluations of global programs,[8] and that attempting to do so detracted from the more important lessons arising from these reviews – both for the programs themselves and for other global programs in which the Bank is involved.

16. IEG reviewers have the flexibility to apply this framework as appropriate for each program. To provide context, each GPR should start with a brief description of the history of the program, the objectives, strategies and activities, the principal partners, and the governance and financing arrangements. Where the objectives and strategies of the program are implicit or not well articulated, IEG reviewers should attempt to construct a log-frame for the program in consultation with the program secretariat in order to facilitate the subsequent assessment of the relevance, efficacy, and efficiency of the program. This section should also conclude with a factual description of the evaluation being reviewed (such as who conducted it and when) and a brief summary of its major findings and recommendations.[9]

17. The **independence and quality of the global program evaluation** will be assessed in terms of the evaluation process, instruments, approach, scope, and feedback (see Annex Table 1). To what extent was the evaluation independent of the management of program as measured by four criteria: organizational independence, behavioral independence, protection from

8. So far, there is no agreed-upon methodology for the evaluation of global programs among the major partners in global programs. However, IEG and the GPP Group are raising this issue with the OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation, United Nations Evaluation Group, and the Evaluation Cooperation Group of the Multilateral Development Banks. So far, most global program evaluations do not contain explicit ratings with regard to relevance, efficacy, or efficiency.

9. This factual description and summary could also appear at the beginning of the next section.

external influence, and avoidance of conflicts of interest.[10] In the case of smaller programs in which the governing body lacks the capacity to manage an evaluation itself, the review should note what steps were taken to ensure the independence of the evaluators. This section of the GPR might also include a box on the overall monitoring framework of the program, including the clarity of the program's objectives and strategies, the use of a results-based framework, and data collection processes. OED's Phase 2 Report found out that the ability to evaluate a global program depends, among other things, on the extent to which the program is results-oriented (with monitorable indicators) and has put in place regular monitoring processes to assess results.[11]

18. The **relevance** of a global program arises from the interplay between global challenges and concerns on the one hand and developing country needs and priorities on the other. Assessing relevance can be a challenging task when global and country priorities, benefits and costs do not coincide. Indeed the divergence of benefits and costs between the global level and the country level is often a principal reason for deciding to finance the provision of global public goods. Relevance will be measured against the international consensus for the program (question 1 in Annex Table 2), consistency with the Bank's development objectives (question 2), and the principle of subsidiarity (question 3). An international consensus that global collective action is required to address particular global challenges and concerns can be articulated in a variety of ways such as formal international conventions to which developing countries are signatories; less formal international agreements reached at major international meetings and conferences; or formal and informal standards and protocols promoted by international organizations, NGOs, and others. While sponsorship of a program by a number of significant international organizations generally enhances the relevance of a global program, this is by no means a sufficient condition for developing country ownership, which is more assured when developing countries actually demand the program. On the other hand, some "supply-driven" programs may also acquire ownership over time by demonstrating substantial impacts, as in the case of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) and the Special Programme for Research and Training on Tropical Diseases (TDR). The subsidiarity principle addresses the most appropriate level at which activities should be carried out. Bank Management has stated this principle for global programs as "whether an activity should be carried out by a global program rather than, as the preferred option, implemented through country operations."

19. **Efficacy** refers to the outcomes and impacts of the program in relation to its objectives and strategies. The material in this section will depend on the quality of the evaluation that is being reviewed and on the quality of monitoring framework of the program itself, including the articulation of its objectives, strategies, and intended results-chains from inputs and outputs to outcomes and impacts. This section should include a classification of the major activities of the global program – whether the program is providing primarily global public goods or national public goods, and whether it is financing investments or technical assistance. (See Box 1, question 4 in Annex Table 2, and Annex Table 7.) Verifying outcomes and impacts has so far

---

10. For more information on these criteria, see OED Reach, "Independence of OED," February 24, 2003, which can be downloaded at http://www.worldbank.org/oed/intro/ .

11. In some cases, the monitoring framework might also be discussed under the subject of efficacy below. IEG's global program reviews are not intended to substitute for the lack of monitoring system where this does not presently exist. Rather, they will point out such deficiencies as the case may be.

Box 1. What are global public goods?

Public goods produce benefits that are non-rival (many people can consume, use, or enjoy the good at the same time) and non-excludable (it is difficult to prevent people who do not pay for the good from consuming it). If the benefits of a particular good accrue across all or many countries, then this is deemed a global or international public good.

In their pure form, true global public goods are rare. Therefore, Bank Management adopted a more operational definition in 2000: "Global public goods are defined as commodities, resources, services – and also systems of rules or policy regimes – with substantial cross-border spillover effects that are important for development and poverty reduction, and that can be produced in sufficient supply only through cooperation and collective action by developed and developing countries."

The International Task Force on Global Public Goods has also adopted a similar approach. "International public goods, global and regional, address issues that: (i) are deemed to be important to the international community, to both developed and developing countries; (ii) typically cannot, or will not, be adequately addressed by individual countries or entities acting alone, and, in such cases (iii) are best addressed collectively on a multilateral basis."

These two definitions imply that information and knowledge about development – an output of many global programs – is not necessarily a global public good. There is, for instance, no shortage of knowledge now being disseminated globally on the internet. Useful knowledge also tends to be contextual, and its global public goods characteristics must be verified through empirical research.

proven easier for investment programs providing global public goods compared to technical assistance programs supporting national public goods, since the outcomes of the latter (such as studies, capacity building, and policy or institutional reforms) have been more difficult to track and more costly to monitor and attribute to program activities. This section should also assess the linkages between global program activities and country-level activities (question 5). With the rare exception of programs like the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol, positive outcomes and impacts are generally a joint product of both global and country level activities (whether associated with the Bank's country operations or not). Programs seeking outcomes and impacts on the ground in developing countries require the inclusion of their priorities in country development strategies (such as Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers and CASs), as well as complementary or follow-on investments. Verifying outcomes and impacts may also be challenged by the diversity of program objectives, levels and interconnectedness of activities, externalities and cross-border spillovers. Verifying impacts on the ground in developing countries (as opposed to outcomes), as well as their sustainability over time, may only be possible for those global programs that have a good results-framework or have been operating for some time.

20. Since global programs are partnerships, assessing **efficiency** focuses on the collective organizational, management and financing arrangements of the program. It is concerned with the effectiveness not only of the formal partnership (among those involved in the governance of the program) but also of the participation of other stakeholders (involved in the activities of the program). The formal partnership includes scientific and technical advisory committees where these exist. The broader partnership includes developing country clients who are not represented on the governing body, implementers of various kinds, and the ultimate beneficiaries. Because global programs employ a wide range of governance models to provide strategic direction and oversight of the program, assessing the quality of the collective governance and management arrangements focuses on compliance with four principles of good governance – clear roles and responsibilities, transparency, fairness, and clear accountability (see question 8 in Annex Table 2). In most cases, these issues will be inextricably connected to

partnerships and participation (question 9). Assessment of financing (question 10) should include how the financing arrangements are affecting, positively or negatively, the strategic focus of the program, the governance and management of the program, and the sustainability of the program. The bottom line (question 11) is the extent to which programs are enhancing their legitimacy from the point of view of developing countries while also achieving benefits more cost-effectively than if the individual contributors to the program acted alone.

21. The Bank plays varied roles in global programs such as a convener, trustee, donor, and host organization. Consistent with that for investment projects, **Bank performance** as a partner in global programs assesses the Bank's contribution from the initial inception and design of the program, through oversight of program implementation, to ultimate disengagement. As the only global financial institution with a multisectoral capacity, the Bank typically brings comparative advantages at both the global and country levels to a global program (see questions 1 and 2 in Annex Table 3). Of particular interest is the extent to which the Bank's country operations have established linkages to the global program, where appropriate, to enhance the effectiveness of both.[12] Most global program evaluations do not address such issues of partner performance. Nonetheless, the reviewer must do so by means such as consultations with other partners and interviews with Bank staff. The reviewer's assessment of Bank performance should also recognize that the breadth and depth of the Bank's role differs from program to program and that its performance should therefore be reviewed in relation to the roles which the Bank is actually playing and in the context of the entire governance structure of the program. The IEG reviewer also needs to be cognizant of who is responsible for the different aspects of the Bank's engagement with each program. Oversight of each program of behalf of the Bank is generally conducted by the global program task manager[13] in the sponsoring Network or Region with the administrative support of the GPP Group, the DGF Secretariat, and TFO. OED's Phase 2 Report found that oversight (question 3) was often weak because of poorly defined expectations with respect to the roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities of Bank staff who are overseeing individual programs; that undermanaged partnerships were posing some reputational risks to the Bank (question 4); and that the Bank's disengagement from some programs (question 5) was not well managed, which threatened the future viability of these programs. Bank Management has now acknowledged that enhancing its oversight of individual global programs is a vital aspect of the Bank's strategic and programmatic management of its entire portfolio of global programs.

---

12. There is admittedly some overlap between question 5 in Annex Table 2 on "linkages to country-level activities" with question 2 in Annex Table 3 on "comparative advantage at the country level." In the prior question 5, the onus was on the global program to establish effective linkages to country-level activities, whether associated with Bank operations or not. In the current question 2, the onus is on the Bank's country operations to establish such linkages to global programs for the benefit of both.

13. Global program "task manager" refers to the Bank staff member who has been assigned overall responsibility for oversight of the program from the Bank's point of view, and who is typically the Bank's representative on the governing body of the program. This is distinguished from "program manager" who is typically the head of the program management unit (or secretariat) that is managing the program, whether this is located inside or outside the Bank.

PROCESS AND PROCEDURES

Initiation of Global Program Reviews

22. After consultations with the GPP Group, DGF, and TFO, the IEGSG global program coordinator will recommend to the IEGSG Manager which programs to review in each fiscal year. The global program coordinator will also keep abreast of which global programs are scheduling and conducting evaluations at any given time.

23. The sample of GPRs to be conducted in any given year will be a purposive sample of the global programs for which evaluations have been conducted during the past year or two. The selection will also take into account the existence of other IEG reviews of global programs that are underway or planned (such as the evaluation of the Financial Sector Assistance Program in FY06), in order to minimize any duplication or overlap. Where possible, IEG will also consider reviewing a cluster of global program evaluations in a specific sector or thematic area, if two or more global programs in a specific sector or thematic area have recently conducted evaluations.[14]

24. The IEGSG Manager will formally assign the task team leadership of individual GPRs to regular IEGSG staff, and the global program coordinator will inform the GPP Group, DGF, and TFO of which program evaluations are being reviewed and by whom.

25. IEG and Bank Management will need to agree on arrangements to ensure that IEG routinely receives copies of external evaluations of global programs as soon as these are completed, as is currently the case for Implementation Completion Reports and CAS Completion Reports. IEG and Bank Management will also need to agree on processes for informing both the governance partners and the program management that IEG is going to be doing a review of their recent evaluation – but only after, not before an evaluation of the program has been completed.

26. With the agreement of the IEGSG Manager, IEG task team leaders may contract with qualified consultants to undertake global program reviews under their supervision.

Collecting Documents to Review

27. Among other things, these would include:

- The global program evaluation being reviewed, and other evaluative material (if any)
- Documents associated with the establishment of the program or the Bank's participation in the program – program charter, incorporation documents (if any), initiating concept note, Partnership Approval and Tracking System (PATS) forms, DGF applications, trust fund agreements, Board documents (if any)
- Annual reports, including financial reports and audits
- Reports of scientific and technical advisory committees
- Minutes of annual meetings
- Relevant academic literature on the program (if any)

14. This follows IEG's current practice for PPARs, in which IEG often reviews a cluster of recently completed projects in a given country at the same time, and reports its findings in one document.

Many of these can now be downloaded from program web-sites or the Bank's operations portal. Others will have to be obtained from the Bank's representative on the governing body of the program, or from the program secretariats.

Consultations

28. This will vary, depending on whether the program is housed in the Bank or externally managed. At a minimum, the IEG reviewer will consult with the Bank's representative on the Board of the program, the program chair, and the head of the secretariat. If the secretariat is not located in the Bank, then this will normally involve a mission to the secretariat. In addition, it will be important to consult with other key partners – either by phone, e-mail, or in person – and with other Bank operational staff involved with the program. As a general rule, it would also be appropriate to consult with the person(s) who conducted the evaluation of the global program.

Suggested Outline

29. Each review would include a preface, a summary, three substantive sections (corresponding to the quality of the global program evaluation, the performance of the program, and Bank performance as a partner in the program), a concluding section on lessons learned, and annexes. The main body of the report, not including the annexes, should be about 20 pages. The lessons should be stated in a generic way that can be applied more broadly to other programs, and illustrated with specific findings from the GPR.

30. The preface should indicate the basic information about the establishment, objectives, and age of the program, the reasons for selecting the program for review, the basic facts about the review process (including any mission travel), and any limitations of the review process.

31. The annexes should include:

- Basic information about the program, including start date, location, chair, program manager, Bank oversight, and financing
- Current goals, objectives, strategies, and activities (organized, if appropriate, as a log-frame)
- Genesis and evolution of the program
- Stated exit strategies (if any)
- Members of the governing and executive bodies
- Financial data, including sources and uses of funds
- Persons consulted

Review

32. Like each PPAR, each GPR will be peer-reviewed by one person at the request of the task team leader[15] and then sent to the panel chair, who will assign a member of the IEG panel to review it formally.

15. As is currently the case with PPARs, IEG's task team leaders could peer review reports that are written by

33. Next, the GPR will be sent for comments to the Bank's representative on the governing body of the program (and the person formally responsible for oversight of the program from the Bank's point of view). If the program is housed inside the Bank, then the GPR will also be sent to the program manager at the same time.

34. Then the GPR will be distributed to other partners for their comments, and in the case of externally managed programs, to the program manager. The way in which and the extent to which this is done will depend on the program and on the consultations that were conducted during the process of preparing the GPR. Like the case with PPARs, comments received from the program being reviewed will be appended as an annex to the final report (maximum 3 pages).

Publication, Disclosure, and Dissemination

35. Like the case with PPARs, GPRs will be published and disclosed to the public, and be covered by an IEG précis if warranted.

---

consultants.

Annex: Evaluation Framework for Global Program Reviews

Annex Table 1. Assessing the Independence and Quality of the Global Program Evaluation

Evaluation Questions
1. Evaluation process. To what extent was the global program evaluation independent of the management of the program, according to the following criteria: /1 • Organizational independence, • Behavioral independence, • Protection from external influence, and • Avoidance of conflicts of interest Factors to take into account in answering these questions include: • Who commissioned and managed the evaluation? • To whom did the evaluators report, and how was the evaluation reviewed and distributed? • How much did the evaluation cost?
2. Evaluation instruments. To what extent did the evaluation utilize the following instruments: • Desk and document review • Literature review • Consultations, and with whom • Surveys, and of whom • Site visits • Impact studies
3. Evaluation approach and scope. To what extent did the evaluation utilize a results-based framework? To what extent did the evaluation address: • Global relevance of the objectives and activities of the program • Achievement of outputs, outcomes and impacts in relation to the objectives and indicators • Governance, management, and financing • Partner performance
4. Monitoring framework. To what extent was the quality of the evaluation hindered by an inadequate monitoring framework for the program: • Clear and coherent program objectives and strategies that give focus and direction to the program, that are measurable, and that provide a basis for evaluating the performance of the program • The use of a results-based management framework with a structured set of (quantitative or qualitative) output, outcome, and impact indicators • Systematic and regular processes for data collection and management?
5. Evaluation feedback. To what extent have the findings of the evaluation been reflected in: • The strategic focus of the program • The organization, management, and financing of the program

/1 For more information on these criteria, see OED Reach, "Independence of OED," February 24, 2003, which can be downloaded at http://www.worldbank.org/oed/intro/ . See also World Bank Development Grant Facility, "Independent Evaluation: Principles, Guidelines and Good Practice," November 2003, which can be downloaded at http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTDGF/Resources/Evaluation&LearningNote.pdf .

Annex Table 2. Assessing the Performance of the Program

Note: This evaluation framework is a general framework that has been designed to cover the wide range of global programs in which the Bank is involved, encompassing both large and small programs and both investment programs and technical assistance programs, etc. It is not expected that every global program review will address every question in this table in detail. These are based upon OED's standard evaluation criteria (Annex Table 4), appropriately adapted for global programs by drawing upon the Bank's selectivity and oversight criteria for global programs (Annex Tables 5 and 6) as indicated in the right-hand "reference" column of this table.

Evaluation Issues and Questions	Reference
Relevance: The overarching global relevance of the program	
1. International consensus that global action is required. To what extent does the program reflect an international consensus: • Concerning the main global challenges and concerns in the sector • That global collective action is required to address these challenges and concerns? What is the origin of the program: • Is it formally responsible for implementing an international convention • Did it arise out of an international conference • Is it facilitating the implementation of formal standards and approaches • Did donor partners collectively agree to establish the program • Did the World Bank seek other partners after initially founding the program? To what extent is the voice of developing and transition countries reflected in the program's consensus?	Selectivity criterion #1 (Annex Table 5).
2. Consistency with the Bank's development objectives. To what extent is the program coherent with the Bank's mission, global public goods priorities, and sectoral and country assistance strategies?	Selectivity criterion #2 and approval criterion #1 (Annex Table 5).
3. Subsidiarity. To what extent do the activities of the programs complement, substitute for, or compete with regular Bank instruments? To what extent should the activities of the program be carried out by the global program rather than, as the preferred option, implemented through the Bank's country operations. Do the benefits of collective action relative to the transactions costs of the global partnership exceed the net benefits from the Bank's using its normal instruments.	DGF eligibility criterion #1 (Annex Table 6). Management update, March 5, 2003.
Efficacy: Outcomes, impacts, and their sustainability	
4. Strategic focus. What are the principal objectives and strategies of the program? To what extent is the program providing: • Global and regional public goods • Supporting international advocacy to improve policies at the national level • Producing and delivering cross-country lessons of relevance to client countries • Mobilizing substantial incremental resources?	The four bullets correspond to the Bank's four strategic foci for oversight of global programs (Annex Table 5). See also Annex Table 7 for subcategories under each of these bullets.

Evaluation Issues and Questions	Reference
5. Linkages to country-level activities. To what extent has the program established effective linkages with country-level activities, taking into account that: • The desired nature of these linkages will vary according to the objectives, design, and implementation of each program. • Adding value on the ground in client countries is generally a joint product of both global and county-level activities	Selectivity criterion #4 (Annex Table 5).
6. Value added. To what extent is the program adding value to: • What developing and transition countries are doing in the sector in accordance with their own priorities? • What the Bank and other partners are doing in the sector to achieve sustainable development and poverty alleviation?	Selectivity criterion #4 (Annex Table 5).
7. Risk to development outcome. What is the risk, at the time of evaluation, that development outcomes (or expected outcomes) will not be maintained (or realized)?	IEG criterion (Annex Table 4).
Efficiency: Organization, management, and financing of the program	
8. Governance and management. To what extent does the governance and management of the program exhibit: • Clear roles and responsibilities – of the officers and bodies that govern and manage the program and of the mechanisms to modify and amend the governance and management of the program in a dynamic context. • Transparency – the program provides both shareholders and stakeholders with the information they need in an open and transparent manner (such as decision-making responsibilities, accountabilities and processes, accounting, audit, and material non-financial issues). • Fairness – the program does not favor some immediate clients over others (such as Bank staff, participating agencies or program secretariats, specific countries or their agencies, municipal agencies, local authorities, private service providers, NGOs, and community organizations). • Clear accountability – of the program for the exercise of power over resources to the program's stakeholders, including international organizations, donors, developing countries, the private sector, and NGOs?	Selectivity criterion #5, approval criterion #5 (Annex Table 5) and DGF eligibility criterion #5 (Annex Table 6).
9. Partnerships and participation. To what extent do developing and transition country partners, clients, and beneficiaries participate and exercise effective voice in the various aspects of the program: • Design • Governance • Implementation • Monitoring and evaluation?	Definition of a GPP (paragraph 2). DGF eligibility criterion #8 (Annex Table 6).
10. Financing. To what extent is the program succeeding in raising financial resources commensurate with its objectives? And from what sources – the Bank, bilateral donors, foundations, etc.? To what extent has the program succeeded in diversifying its funding beyond a small number of donors? To what extent are the sources of funding for the program affecting, positively or negatively: • The strategic focus of the program • The governance and management of the program • The sustainability of the program and the development outcomes of the program?	Approval criterion #4. (Annex Table 5). DGF eligibility criteria #4 (Annex Table 6). The third bullet also relates to IEG's risk to development outcome criterion (Annex Table 4).

Evaluation Issues and Questions	Reference
11. Legitimacy and efficiency. To what extent is the authorizing environment for the program effectively derived from those with a legitimate interest in the program (including donors, developing and transition countries, clients, and other stakeholders), taking into account their relative importance. To what extent has the program achieved, or is expected to achieve: • Benefits more cost-effectively than providing the same service on a country-by-country basis • Benefits more cost-effectively than if the individual contributors to the program acted alone? To what extent are the overhead costs of governing and managing the program reasonable and appropriate in relation to the objectives and activities of the program?	A modification of IEG's efficiency criterion for the purpose of global programs (Annex Table 4). The first bullet also relates to strategic focus #3 (Annex Table 5) and DGF eligibility criterion #3 (Annex Table 6).

Annex Table 3. Assessing the Bank's Performance as a Partner in the Program.

Evaluation Questions	Reference
1. Comparative advantage at the global level. To what extent is the Bank playing up to its comparative advantages at the global level – its global mandate and reach and convening power? To what extent is the Bank's presence as a partner in the program catalyzing other resources and partners for the program?	Selectivity criterion #3, approval criterion #2 (Annex Table 5), and DGF eligibility criteria #2 and #4 (Annex Table 6).
2. Comparative advantage at the country level. To what extent is the Bank contributing multi-sector capacity, analytical expertise, country-level knowledge to the program? To what extent has the Bank's country operations established linkages to the global program, where appropriate, to enhance the effectiveness of both?	Approval criterion #1 (Annex Table 5) regarding "linkages to the Bank's country operational work."
3. Oversight. To what extent is the Bank exercising effective and independent oversight of its involvement in the program, as appropriate, whether the program is housed in the Bank or externally managed? To what extent is the Bank's oversight independent of the management of the program? To what extent does the Bank's representative on the governing body have a clear terms of reference?	Both questions 3 and 5 relate to IEG's Bank performance criterion (Annex Table 4). This also relates to DGF eligibility criterion #6 on "arm's length relationship" (Annex Table 6).
4. Risks and risk management. To what extent have the risks associated with the program been identified and are being effectively managed? For example, OED identified the following risks in its global review: • Bank bears a disproportionate share of responsibility for governing and managing in-house programs • Confusion at the country level between global program activities, Bank activities, and Borrower activities • Representation of NGOs and the commercial private sector on program governing bodies • Unclear role and application of Bank's safeguards • Trust-funded consultants and secondees representing the Bank on some program governing bodies.	Approval criterion #3 (Annex Table 5).
5. Disengagement strategy. To what extent is the Bank engaged at the appropriate level in relation to the Bank's new strategic framework? • Watching brief • Research and knowledge exchange • Policy or advocacy network • Operational platform? To what extent is the Bank facilitating an effective, flexible, and transparent disengagement strategy for the program, in relation to the Bank's objectives for its involvement in the program: • The program declares "mission accomplished" and closes, • The program continues and the Bank withdraws from all aspects of its participation, or • The program continues and the Bank remains engaged, but the degree of the Bank's engagement in some or all aspects (such as financing) declines over time?	Levels of Bank engagement (Table 5) and DGF eligibility criterion #7 (Annex Table 6). See also the definitions of DGF Windows 1 and 2 – for long-term development and "venture capital" programs respectively.

Annex Table 4. Standard IEG/OPCS Evaluation Criteria for Investment Projects /1

Criterion	Standard Definitions for Lending Operations
Relevance	The extent to which the project's objectives are consistent (1) with the country's current development priorities and (2) with current Bank country and sectoral assistance strategies and corporate goals (expressed in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers, Country Assistance Strategies, Sector Strategy Papers, Operational Policies).
Efficacy	The extent to which the project's objectives were achieved, or expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.
Efficiency	The extent to which the project achieved, or is expected to achieve, a return higher than the opportunity cost of capital and benefits at least cost compared to alternatives.
Outcome	The extent to which the project's major relevant objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, efficiently.
Risk to Development Outcome	The risk, at the time of the evaluation, that development outcomes (or expected outcomes) will not be maintained (or realized).
Bank Performance	The extent to which services provided by the Bank ensured quality at entry of the operation and supported implementation through appropriate supervision (including ensuring adequate transition arrangements for regular operation of the supported activities after loan/credit closing) towards the achievement of development outcomes.
Borrower Performance	The extent to which the borrower (including the government and implementing agency or agencies) ensured quality of preparation and implementation, and complied with covenants and agreements, towards the achievement of development objectives and sustainability.
/1 These are the most recent harmonized evaluation criteria for ICR and OED evaluations which will become effective on July 1, 2006. These apply to both investment and development policy lending.	

Annex Table 5. Selectivity and Oversight of Global Programs

Selectivity Criteria for Bank Engagement in Global Programs and Partnerships (May 2005) /1

1. International consensus that global action is required
2. Consistency with the Bank's development objectives
3. Need for Bank action to catalyze other resources and partners
4. Disproportionate benefits for client countries, and likelihood of results at the country level
5. Quality of partnerships

Approval Criteria for Bank Involvement in Partnership Initiatives Beyond the Country Level: Established by Bank Management (November 2000) /2

1. A clear linkage to the Bank's core institutional objectives and, above all, to the Bank's country operational work
2. A strong case for Bank participation based on comparative advantage
3. A clear assessment of the financial and reputational risks to the Bank and how these will be managed
4. A thorough analysis of the expected level of Bank resources required, both money and time, as well as the contribution of other partners
5. A clear delineation of how the new commitment will be implemented, managed, and assessed
6. A clear plan for communicating with and involving key stakeholders, and for informing and consulting the Executive Directors.

Levels of Bank Engagement (May 2005) /3

- **Watching brief** – keeping abreast of significant global and regional issues
- **Research and knowledge exchange** – deepening global understanding of issues that are perceived to be important to Bank members
- **Policy or advocacy networks** – helping to create policies, advocate for initiatives, promote good practices, or improve governance
- **Operational platform** – advocating for global or regional collective action to help establish partnership programs, offer to take leadership, help mobilize and manage resources

Priority Global Public Goods Issues for Bank Engagement (May 2005) /4

Control of communicable diseases
- HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria and childhood communicable diseases, including the relevant link to education
- Vaccines and drug development for major communicable diseases in developing countries

Preservation of environmental commons
- Climate change
- Water
- Forests
- Biodiversity, ozone depletion and land degradation
- Promoting agricultural research

Development knowledge
- Understanding development and poverty reduction

Labor mobility, migration, and remittances
- Migration flows and their determinants, remittances, brain drain, temporary movement of persons, trade, and foreign direct investment

Peace and security
- In particular, links between peace and development

Strategic Focus for Oversight of Global Programs (March 2003) /5

1. Provide global public goods
2. Support international advocacy for reform agendas which in a significant way address policy framework conditions for developing countries
3. Are multi-country programs which crucially depend on highly coordinated approaches
4. Mobilize substantial incremental resources that can be effectively used for development

/1 From the Development Committee Communiqué issued on September 25, 2000. Revised in "A Strategic Framework for the World Bank's Global Programs and Partnerships" (SecM2005-0250), May 3, 2005.

/2 From the Board paper, "Partnership Oversight and Selectivity," April 28, 2000, and an internal memorandum from Sven Sandstrom to all vice presidents, dated November 6, 2000. Global programs are expected to meet all six approval criteria.

/3 From "A Strategic Framework for the World Bank's Global Programs and Partnerships" (SecM2005-0250), May 3, 2005.

/4 From the *Strategic Directions Paper for FY02-04*, March 28, 2001. Revised in "A Strategic Framework for the World Bank's Global Programs and Partnerships" (SecM2005-0250), May 3, 2005.

/5 From the "Update on Management of Global Programs and Partnerships," memorandum to the Executive Directors, March 5, 2003. This Board update on the management of global programs and partnerships in the Bank also stated that "the principle of subsidiarity would be more rigorously applied when deciding whether a global program should be established and whether an activity should be carried out by the global program rather than, as the preferred option, implemented through country operations."

Annex Table 6. Eligibility Criteria for Grant Support from the Development Grant Facility

1. Subsidiarity	The program contributes to furthering the Bank's development and resource mobilization objectives in fields basic to its operations, but it does not compete with or substitute for regular Bank instruments. Grants should address new or critical development problems, and should be clearly distinguishable from the Bank's regular programs.
2. Comparative advantage	The Bank has a distinct comparative advantage in being associated with the program; it does not replicate the role of other donors. The relevant operational strengths of the Bank are in economic, policy, sector and project analysis, and management of development activities. In administering grants, the Bank has expertise in donor coordination, fund raising, and fund management.
3. Multi-country benefits	The program encompasses multi-country benefits or activities which it would not be efficient, practical or appropriate to undertake at the country level. For example, informational economies of scale are important for research and technology work, and operations to control diseases or address environmental concerns (such as protect fragile ecosystems) might require a regional or global scope to be effective. In the case of grants directed to a single country, the program will encompass capacity-building activities where this is a significant part of the Country Assistance Strategy and cannot be supported by other Bank instruments or by other donors. This will include, in particular, programs funded under the Institutional Development Fund, and programs related to initial post-conflict reconstruction efforts (e.g., in countries or territories emerging from internal strife or instability).
4. Leverage	The Bank's presence provides significant leverage for generating financial support from other donors. Bank involvement should provide assurance to other donors of program effectiveness, as well as sound financial management and administration. Grants should generally not exceed 15 percent of expected funding over the life of Bank funding to a given program, or over the rolling 3-year plan period, whichever is shorter. Where grant programs belong to new areas of activities (involving, e.g., innovations, pilot projects, or seed-capital) some flexibility is allowed for the Bank's financial leverage to build over time, and the target for the Bank grant not to exceed 15 percent of total expected funding will be pursued after allowing for an initial start-up phase (maximum 3 years).
5. Managerial competence	The grant is normally given to an institution with a record of achievement in the program area and financial probity. A new institution may have to be created where no suitable institution exists. The quality of the activities implemented by the recipient institution (existing or new) and the competence of its management are important considerations.
6. Arm's length relationship	The management of the recipient institution is independent of the Bank Group. While quality an arm's length relationship with the Bank's regular programs is essential, the Bank may have a role in the governance of the institution through membership in its governing board or oversight committee. In cases of highly innovative or experimental programs, Bank involvement in supporting the recipient to execute the program will be allowed. This will provide the Bank with an opportunity to benefit from the learning experience, and to build operational links to increase its capacity to deliver more efficient services to client countries.
7. Disengage-ment strategy	Programs are expected to have an explicit disengagement strategy. In the proposal, monitorable action steps should be outlined indicating milestones and targets for disengagement. The Bank's withdrawal should cause minimal disruption to an ongoing program or activity.
8. Promoting partnerships	Programs and activities should promote and reinforce partnerships with key players in the development arena, e.g., multilateral development banks, UN agencies, foundations, bilateral donors, professional associations, research institutions, private sector corporations, NGOs, and civil society organizations.

Source: World Bank, The Development Grant Facility: FY98 Annual Review and Proposed FY99 DGF Budgets, Oct. 28, 1998.

Annex Table 7. Common Global Program Activities, Classified According to Bank Management's Four Strategic Foci for Global Programs /1

Providing global public goods	
1. Implementing conventions, rules, or formal and informal standards and norms	Rules are generally formal. Standards can be formal or informal, and binding or nonbinding, but implementing standards involves more than simply advocating an approach to development in a sector. In general, there should be some costs associated with noncompliance. Costs can come in many forms, including exposure to financial contagion, bad financial ratings by the IMF and other rating agencies, with consequent impacts on access to private finance; lack of access to OECD markets for failing to meet food safety standards, or even the consequences of failing to be seen as progressive in international circles.
2. Financing R&D for new products and technologies	New products and technologies are generally physical products or processes—the hardware as opposed to the software of development.
3. Financing country-level investments to deliver global public goods	This refers primarily to physical and institutional investments of the type found in Bank loans and credits (not the financing of studies) to deliver public goods such as conserving biodiversity of global value and reducing emissions of ozone-depleting substances and carbon dioxide, the benefits of which accrue globally.
4. Promoting common approaches to mitigating communicable diseases.	This may involve a range of activities intended to develop approaches to containing communicable diseases with widespread application and to provide this specialized information and knowledge to developing countries.
Supporting international advocacy for reform agendas to improve national-level policies	
5. Advocacy	Advocacy comprises proactive interaction with policymakers and decisionmakers concerning approaches to development in a sector, commonly in the context of global, regional, or country-level forums. Intended to create reform conditions in developing countries, as distinct from physical and institutional investments in public goods, this is more proactive than generating and disseminating information and knowledge.
6. Supporting national-level policy, institutional, and technical reforms	This is more directed to specific tasks than advocacy. This represents concrete involvement in specific and ongoing policy, institutional, and technical reform processes in a sector, from deciding on a reform strategy to implementation of new policies and regulations in a sector. It is more than just conducting studies.
7. Financing country-level investments to deliver national public goods	This refers primarily to physical and institutional investments of the type found in Bank loans and credits (not the financing of studies), the benefits of which accrue primarily at the national level.
Coordinated multi-country programs	
8. Generation and dissemination of information and knowledge	This comprises two related activities. The first is gathering, analyzing and disseminating information, for example, on the evolving HIV/AIDS epidemic and responses to it, including epidemiological data collection and analysis, needs assessment, resource flows, and country readiness. The second is the systematic assembling and dissemination of knowledge (not merely information) with respect to best practices in a sector on a global basis.
9. Capacity building and training	This refers to building the capacity of human resources through proactive training (in courses or on-the-job), as well as collaborative work with the active involvement of developing country partners.
10. Improving donor coordination	This should be an active process, not just the side effect of other program activities. This may involve resolving thorny interagency issues that need addressing.
Mobilizing substantial incremental resources	
11. Directly	Mobilizing substantial incremental resources represents substantial resources (in absolute size) from diverse and novel sources that have been or appear to be sustainable over the long term. Direct resources are those that are mobilized for, and managed by, the program itself.
12. Indirectly	Indirect resources are those that are mobilized as a result of the program's advocacy, but are managed and spent by others (such as the World Bank and bilateral donors) outside the framework of the global program itself.

/1 From the "Update on Management of Global Programs and Partnerships," memorandum to the Executive Directors, March 5, 2003. IEG has added the 12 subcategories.