

**THE WORLD BANK GROUP ARCHIVES**

**PUBLIC DISCLOSURE AUTHORIZED**

**Folder Title:** Lessons and Practices on Monitoring and Evaluation in the World Bank - Correspondence 01

**Folder ID:** 1573358

**Series:** Special Evaluation Studies

**Dates:** 12/01/1994 - 01/31/1995

**Fonds:** Records of the Office of Operations Evaluation

**ISAD Reference Code:** WB IBRD/IDA OPE-09-02

**Digitized:** 08/04/2023

To cite materials from this archival folder, please follow the following format:  
[Descriptive name of item], [Folder Title], Folder ID [Folder ID], ISAD(G) Reference Code [Reference Code], [Each Level Label as applicable], World Bank Group Archives, Washington, D.C., United States.

The records in this folder were created or received by The World Bank in the course of its business.

The records that were created by the staff of The World Bank are subject to the Bank's copyright.

Please refer to <http://www.worldbank.org/terms-of-use-earchives> for full copyright terms of use and disclaimers.



THE WORLD BANK

Washington, D.C.

© International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / International Development Association or

The World Bank

1818 H Street NW

Washington DC 20433

Telephone: 202-473-1000

Internet: [www.worldbank.org](http://www.worldbank.org)

**PUBLIC DISCLOSURE AUTHORIZED**



1573358

R1999-233 Other #: 52

148784B

Lessons and Practices on Monitoring and Evaluation in the World Bank - Correspondence  
01

**DECLASSIFIED  
WITH RESTRICTIONS**  
WBG Archives

Mr. Roger Slade

Draft for comment: *Lessons & Practices* on Monitoring and Evaluation

The attached draft is agreed between Ted Rice and myself. We would be glad of your comments.


As soon as we have a draft that you approve of, the normal procedure would be for you to send it through FAS to Myrna Alexander, cc Messrs. Picciotto and Malloch Brown, for information, giving them two weeks for any comments.

The timing is tight on this one, because if it is to be part of the FY96 work program, as planned, it needs to go to the typesetter by Friday 24 May.

We look forward to hearing from you.



Rachel Weaving  
April 29, 1996



cc Mr. Rice

29

*McCalla*

**CC:** Messrs./Mmes. Picciotto (DGO); Aguirre-Sacasa, Thumm (OEDDR); Weaving  
(DGO); Malloch Brown (EXTDR); ~~Stout~~ (OEDD1); OEDD1 Files

*Rice*



# OFFICE MEMORANDUM

Helen -  
is this right?

DATE: April 30, 1996

TO: Ms. Myrna Alexander, Director, OPRDR

FROM: Roger Slade, Chief, OEDD1


EXTENSION: 81293

SUBJECT: **Designing Project Monitoring and Evaluation**  
**Draft *Lessons & Practices***

1. The attached draft of *Lessons & Practices* on Designing Project Monitoring and Evaluation is forwarded for your review and comment.
2. Comments or a marked-up copy would be welcome by c.o.b. May 14, 1996.

Attachment

cc: Messrs. Picciotto (DGO)  
Aguirre-Sacasa (OED)  
Malloch Brown (EXTDR)

The uses of the information can be structured and scheduled according to the needs of the participants, 

- Project management will need to monitor expenditure and progress against bar chart schedules, often weekly and at least monthly.
- Outputs are unlikely to be measurable at less than three-monthly intervals, and some may need much longer.
- Consultations with beneficiaries, or surveys of their satisfaction with project services, should be timed to supply information to use in planning project activities.
- The time period for reporting may vary with the level of management: for example, monthly at district level, quarterly at region or state.
- Some flows of information need to be timed to fit into national budget planning activities.
- Annual funding may depend on the results from previous work.
- Periodic and mid-term reviews provide milestones by which information has to be ready.

In projects where operating performance standards are quoted as an objective, or where decentralized processes call for localized capacity to plan and manage work programs and budgets, designers will need to describe how and when M&E findings will be used to shape work plans and contribute to program or policy development.

In Mexico, for example, the Second Decentralization and Regional Development Project plans to incorporate monitoring of implementation into its regular management procedures. Annual plans are to be prepared for each component, including an element of institutional development, and these will form the basis of annual monitoring. The analysis of implementation will depend on the functioning of a central database about sub-projects, created in each state from standardized data sheets. The database will produce the reports required for the project approval procedures, giving an incentive to field staff to use the system. Results from the implementation database will be analyzed in order to target field reviews and a mid-term review.

The project has no specific monitoring and evaluation unit. Instead, each management sub-unit responsible for technical oversight of a component is responsible for ensuring the quality and timeliness of data collection, and for producing and analyzing reports. These reports will be presented by project component and be used to help diagnose technical and institutional implementation issues, propose and conduct studies, and plan institutional development and training.

## **Monitoring and Evaluation in the World Bank: Making Headway**

*A recent OED study\* examines the Bank's record on the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of operations in progress. Despite policy support over the years, Bank guidelines and directives on M&E have been given inadequate attention, both at appraisal and in practice. But this situation has begun to change. Action to incorporate viable performance indicators and other M&E elements into project design has accelerated in response to the recommendations of a 1992 Task Force on Portfolio Management. Other trends—relating to project quality, participation, and the learning culture—suggest that the Bank's growing interest in M&E may be part of a broader shift in behavior, motivated by the reorientation of the Bank's portfolio toward equitable and sustainable development.*

Since the mid-1970s, the Bank has promoted the monitoring and evaluation of operations it supports. The M&E tradition originated in agriculture and rural development, and gradually spread to other sectors with a social dimension. Many of the infrastructure sectors do not use the term M&E, and focus their efforts on monitoring.

### **Project M&E at appraisal**

Plans for M&E are supposed to be included in all Bank-funded projects and analyzed no later than the appraisal stage. Yet in the appraisal records examined, the study found little evidence of plans for monitoring and evaluation. Only 9 percent of "old" projects and 30 percent of "new" projects (see box on sources) displayed adequate or substantial levels of M&E. Interviews confirmed the trend: Bank staff usually have paid little attention to M&E during appraisal.

M&E is more prevalent in some sectors than others. Monitoring and evaluation spread rapidly in agriculture in the early 1980s. But agriculture's lead has begun to slip; M&E activity has caught up in education, population, health, and nutrition, and water supply and sanitation. The infrastructure sectors lag well behind these leaders, although there are some interesting exceptions at the project level.

Sharp regional distinctions in the levels of M&E found in the old set of projects have almost disappeared. Africa was well behind



before—almost no projects had a high M&E content. In the new set of projects, all regions show a better profile.

Bank policy requires projects to identify key performance indicators at appraisal. These indicators are essential to effective monitoring and evaluation; they help measure implementation progress and development impact. Yet their overall use was well below a level of satisfactory compliance with the M&E operational directive. Key performance indicators were used most frequently in education, population, health, and nutrition, urban, and water supply and sanitation, as well as in agriculture. Telecommunications, ports, and highways and pavement operations were especially amenable to the use of physical indicators. The most frequently used indicators, across all sectors, were those reporting on the financial health of project agencies.

Despite low rates of compliance, M&E content in staff appraisal reports (SARs) appears to have increased in the decade between approval of the two sets of projects. Only 10 percent of the old projects, but 36 percent of the new, had substantial M&E content, while those with substantial indicator content rose from 12 percent to 36 percent.

The most important observation from the new set of appraisal reports is that those with the highest M&E and indicator content are the product of spontaneous action by individual Bank staff. Division chiefs appear to have little to do with the *emergence* of this group, though they *encourage* the innovators to continue. This spontaneous action is occurring in all of the social program sectors, and in some of the infrastructure sectors as well.

It is not certain that the more elaborate M&E operations planned in the new set will succeed. Few of the SARs give any sense of government "ownership" of M&E, although interviews reveal a high level of participation by government and beneficiaries in most of the project designs. Bank staff assertions of country ownership are convincing. But considering the very low levels of ownership during the 1980s, the real test will come when present plans are put into action.

### **Project M&E in practice**

The Bank's record on *implementing* M&E is worse than its M&E record at appraisal.

Evidence of monitoring and evaluation activity in the old set of projects was scarce—a mere 28 percent of projects had modest or effective monitoring and evaluation activity. Staff interviews were



again revealing. Staff who had not paid much attention to M&E earlier remembered little later.

Though the study revealed a positive relationship between substantial M&E design at appraisal and good M&E performance, case studies of seven old, continuing agricultural programs with substantial M&E components suggest otherwise. The studies indicated that even with adequate plans for M&E, data quality, useful conclusions, and management impact may still turn out to be disappointing.

Completion reports confirmed a weak but discernable relationship between M&E performance and overall project ratings during supervision and at completion.

The Bank's disappointing record on monitoring and evaluation is consistent with the findings of recent academic literature addressing the problems of M&E. It is also consistent with the experience of the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), another development agency with a long and intense history of trying to establish M&E services at the project level.

#### *Reasons for poor performance*

Three factors seem best to explain poor M&E performance at the project level:

- Governments', and especially project management's, lack of a sense of ownership of M&E programs.
- Lack of sustained attention by the Bank to M&E after appraisal and the initial start-up period.
- Deficient appointment and retention of qualified nationals to M&E units.

The first two of these factors suggest a low demand for information from M&E. IFAD contends that another reason for poor M&E performance is the lack of incentives for all actors—aid agency operators, project managers, and field staff—to concern themselves with errors and lessons, and to expose themselves to the consequences of reporting generally unimpressive project results.

#### **Conclusions**

Though the record on monitoring and evaluation is dismal, encouraging exceptions are emerging in all sectors and regions. Efforts to improve portfolio performance, spurred by the Next Steps

action program (the Bank's response to the Portfolio Management Task Force Report), will accelerate this trend.

The threat to these rising expectations is the lack of institutional capability—within the Bank, borrower countries, and projects—to support M&E with professional advice. M&E is skill intensive and difficult to implement effectively, but task managers who want to strengthen monitoring and evaluation at the appraisal stage, or assess the form and quality of M&E during supervision, have nowhere to turn for guidance or training.

### **Recommendations**

*Provide professional and institutional support for M&E in the Bank.* Good M&E cannot be developed simply by recasting operational directives. Most Bank staff are sensitive to the importance of M&E, but need help in putting it to work. Arrangements are needed to develop, replicate, and sustain the "best practice" M&E designs. Systematic training and advisory services are also needed.

These services should be promoted by the central vice presidencies, although final responsibility for promoting and practicing appropriate M&E would rest with the regions. A temporary center could be created to launch a Bankwide M&E program.

New skills, such as knowledge of statistical methods for surveys and data handling and analysis, need to be brought in to any Bankwide M&E support operation. Individuals with solid experience in managing M&E are needed for such support efforts, and these persons are noticeably missing from the Bank's roster.

The M&E program should especially focus on the social programs, such as education and agriculture. These are the sectors where processes matter, and where reasonable, effective management information systems cannot be taken for granted.

*Involve borrowers.* Building an M&E culture at the country and project levels will take longer. Most government and project staff in borrower countries are not yet "on board." Expectations must be tailored to the reality that M&E is a difficult, unfamiliar, and sometimes unfriendly exercise, and that country project staff are likely to seek to minimize their inputs and hide some of the findings. Requirements for key performance indicators must be modest as well as practical. Rather than engaging project staff in a Bank-imposed M&E system, efforts should concentrate on building self-sustaining monitoring and evaluation habits.

*Make indicators user-friendly.* The Bank's attempts to identify sector-specific indicator lists have tended to emphasize indicators of



particular interest to the Bank. Any performance indicator exercise should bear in mind both the borrower's interests as well as the institutional capacity to undertake the exercise.

*Simplify and shift the responsibilities for formal evaluation.*

M&E efforts to use large-scale statistical surveys, and to assess a project's impact on beneficiary welfare or the regional economy, have been poor. Two ways of handling this problem are to simplify and shift the responsibilities for formal evaluation.

Simplified M&E design reduces the burden on project staff who may not have the capacity to undertake complex evaluation exercises. Formal surveys of large samples and econometric methods should be used sparingly—the tools of rapid appraisal are good enough to handle most questions about outputs and impact. Rapid appraisal does not preclude the use of formal analysis, but recognizes that the potential advantages of formal analysis over informal methods are often lost in practice. The Bank should also accept the fact that impact studies are generally better when conducted outside the project and on a selective basis.

***Institutional response***

*Bank management noted that the Bank's poor record on M&E should be seen against the finding that in recent years, compliance has improved in all sectors and regions. Management agrees that the Next Steps action program will strengthen this trend toward compliance. The challenge is to propagate within the Bank the attitudes and practices that promote a learning culture.*

*Management broadly agrees with the study's recommendations to improve M&E efforts, but believes that the focus should be on careful design of and borrower commitment to M&E before projects enter the portfolio. Efforts should also focus on monitoring expected development results during implementation, as promoted by the action program. Management endorses the recommendation to improve the M&E efforts of borrowing countries.*

*In its discussion of the report, the Joint Audit Committee also stressed the need to promote an M&E learning culture within the Bank, and emphasized the need to enhance the incentives for sound monitoring and evaluation. It indicated that an M&E training program would expedite the support to be provided by the central vice presidencies and regions. A system to develop, replicate, and sustain "best practice" M&E designs of new projects is also necessary. The Committee agreed that measures should be taken to increase borrowers' M&E capacity, and pointed out that these measures should be demand-driven and tailored to specific conditions and requirements. The Committee recommended undertaking research to help Bank staff*

*develop the knowledge, tools, and key performance indicators necessary to design and incorporate better M&E in existing operations. The Committee did not endorse an aggressive use of a proposed linkage between disbursements and performance indicators.*



**Box 1: Definitions**

*What is monitoring and evaluation?*

*Monitoring* is the continuous assessment of project implementation in relation to agreed schedules, and of the use of inputs, infrastructure, and services by project beneficiaries. Monitoring:

- Provides continuous feedback on implementation.
- Identifies actual or potential successes and problems as early as possible to facilitate timely adjustments to project operation.

*Evaluation* is the periodic assessment of a project's relevance, performance, efficiency, and impact (both expected and unexpected) in relation to stated objectives.

- Interim evaluations are undertaken by project management during implementation as a first review of progress and a prognosis of a project's likely effects. They are intended to identify project design problems.
- Terminal evaluations, conducted at the end of a project, are required for project completion reports. They include an assessment of a project's effects and their potential sustainability.

**Box 2: Sources**

For this study, OED analyzed 172 "old" and "new" projects. The 89 "old" projects, approved in the early 1980s, were those most recently *completed*. The 83 "new" projects were those most recently *approved* and still in progress. The sampling gave extra weight to sectors where a prevalence of monitoring and especially evaluation activities was expected, such as agriculture and education. Staff interviews in all sectors, and selected case studies in agriculture, followed the desk review.

The study examined staff appraisal reports to determine the characteristics of M&E design at appraisal. These reports, however, do not always accurately reflect a project's plans for M&E. Several reports in the new set of projects, for example, said little about M&E and the performance indicators to be used, yet subsequent interviews revealed that plans had been discussed and sometimes described in background and other working papers.

**Box 3: New work on performance indicators**

Beyond the efforts of individual projects, a number of forces are paving the way for better monitoring and evaluation. Among these is the Bank's Next Steps action program (the Bank's response to the 1992 Portfolio Management Task Force Report), which calls for the establishment of key performance indicators at both the project and sector levels.

The industry and mining key performance indicator team, for example, has been focusing on the exogenous and policy variables (or risk factors) that establish the environment in which a project must function. These indicators have implications beyond industry and mining projects—they may be the key to better portfolio management.

On the housing front, the joint Bank/United Nations Housing Indicators Program has concentrated on identifying indicators at the sector level, with the goal of establishing a framework for discussing new investments. Meanwhile, the housing team in the Bank's Transport, Water, and Urban Development department has developed indicators to measure both sector and project performance, and to monitor policy and other reforms. [The Transport, Water, and Urban department has also come up with a new twist to an old concept—structured learning—with great potential for improving M&E within the Bank (see box).]

**Box 4: Structured learning**

Structured learning, as promoted by the Bank's Transport, Water, and Urban department, is a process wherein project managers interact with beneficiaries in a continuous process of observations and lessons. The Bank, in theory, learns from the experience of all groups.

Brazil's PROSANEAR project (approved 1988 and reformatted in 1992) was the first working model of structured learning that caught the Bank's attention. This water supply and sanitation project, sponsored in part by Caixa Economica Federal, uses an inexpensive but effective sewage collection strategy. The project boasts a high degree of community participation and shared responsibility. Communities are increasingly involved in monitoring household use and system performance, and in managing their own repairs. The project's most striking feature is Caixa's commitment to adjust design and works according to the lessons of experience.

Through this sort of structured learning, M&E activities become internalized, the monitoring/feedback mechanism becomes routine, and even the term M&E becomes obsolete.




"An Overview of Monitoring and Evaluation in the World Bank,"  
Report No. 13247, June 30, 1994. OED reports are available to Bank  
executive directors and staff from the Internal Documents Unit and  
from Regional Information Services Centers.

word count 2646

# OFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 9, 1995

TO: Distribution

FROM: Graham Donaldson, Chief, OEDD1 

EXTENSION: 31730

SUBJECT: Draft OED Precis - Monitoring and Evaluation in the World Bank

1. The attached draft OED Precis is based on the OED report on this subject soon to be distributed to the Board. The draft is forwarded for your review and comment.
2. Comments or a marked up copy would be welcome by January 24, 1995.

## Attachment

### Distribution:

Messrs./Mmes: Marshall, AF1DR; Colaco, AF2DR; Aguirre-Sacasa, AF3DR; Lafourcade, AF4DR; Sarbib, AF5DR; Cleaver, AFTDR; Madavo, EA1DR; Hope, EA2DR; Haug, EA3DR; Hamilton, SA1DR; Vergin, SA2DR; Isenman, SA3DR; Messenger, ASTDR; Wiehen, EC1DR; Dervis, EC2DR; Huang, EC3DR; Kavalsky, EC4DR; Ritchie, MN1DR; Chopra, MN2DR; Sood, EMTDR; Nankani, LA1DR; Segura, LA2DR; Abe, LA3DR; Aiyer, LATDR; Adams, OPRDR; Cohen, ESDVP; Chaparro, FPDVP; Psacharopoulos, HROVP; Ray, DECVP.

cc: Messrs./Mmes. Picciotto, DGO  
Köpp, OEDDR  
Weaving, DGO  
Blackwell-Gentile, DGO  
Brown, EXTDR  
Rice, OEDD1

The World Bank/IFC/MIGA  
O F F I C E M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: March 11, 1996 08:24am

TO: OEDD1 FILES

( OEDD1 FILES@A1@WBWASH )

FROM: ALAIN MATHYS, TWUWS

( ALAIN MATHYS@A1@BOLVIA )

EXT.:

SUBJECT: OED Publication

Dear Colleagues,

I would be very grateful if you could send to me the following report:

Monitoring and Evaluation Plans in staff Appraisal Reports  
Issued in fiscal Year 1995. Report No. 15222

My address is:

Alain Mathys  
Regional Manager  
Water and Sanitation Program  
World Bank Field Office  
La Paz-Bolivia

Please forward this message to the person in charge of the OED publications.

Thank you for your assistance.

AM

Sent 4/11!

MK

WORLD BANK / IFC  
STATEMENT OF EXPENSES

Date: 3/28/96 10:08

NOTE: This SOE Passed Validations - Can Be Released

Commitment Number: Z41259 Staff/Consultant Number: N5035 Name: CHARLES DEREK POATE  
Departure Date : 03/10/96 Return Date : 03/15/96 Department/Division: 175 / 10  
Marital Status : Married Did Spouse Travel? No Spouse Points applied:  
Personal days(incl. weekends) during the trip:

Task Information (FY Charged: 96 )

Task Id	Product Id	Product Name	Country	Days	MGR	PCT.	SOF	SOF ACCT.
1	EVLV	- EV - 38836	CR. STY UPDATE	US	4	17510	100	BB

Comments to Controllers

I certify that the tickets provided to me by the World Bank/IFC were used as issued, or if transportation, routing, or class of travel or type of fare, was rearranged by me, that an explanation is provided and that I did not receive a refund in connection with any such changes. I certify further that the statements herein set forth correctly reflect available spouse travel points used, leave taken and expenses incurred and that I have not received and will not claim reimbursement from any other source.

Total Advances .....	\$0.00
Total Expenses .....	\$810.64
Due Traveler	\$810.64

Enclose the following original documents:  
Used ticket stubs Exchange rate receipts  
Hotel receipts Any other receipts  
Unused Tickets Unused MCO

Signature of Traveler:  
CHARLES DEREK POATE

Date:

I confirm that the itinerary was undertaken for the purpose of official business, except where noted otherwise, and the expenses claimed (ref: ADM 3.0 P5 & Annex A) and representation claimed are appropriate and that the explanation of any policy deviation is accepted and that any spouse points used were authorized under staff Rule 6.16.

Signature of Approval (Staff member's dept.)  
ROGER SLADE

Date:

Signature of Approval (Sharing dept.)

Date:

Please RELEASE this SOE to controllers option 4 on the SOE data entry menu. Also remember to send a signed copy with the proper documents to the TRAVEL UNIT, E-6042.



TE: This SOE Passed Validations - Can Be Released

Commitment Number: Z41259 Staff/Consultant Number: N5035 Name : CHARLES DEREK POATE  
Departure Date : 03/10/96 Return Date : 03/15/96 Room Number: G7027 Extension: 31751  
Payment Type('1' for wire transfer; '2' for check):..... 1  
Beneficiary Name: ITAD LTD. Payment Address: LION HOUSE  
DITCHLING COMMON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE  
HASSOCKS  
W SUSSEX BN6 9QB, ENGLAND

Account Number (Enter only if wire transfer):..... 12337126  
Vendor ticket amount: 1370.45

Marital Status : Married Did Spouse Travel? No Spouse Points applied:

Did field office provide any tickets? No Any unused MCOs included? No  
Any unused tickets included? No

ADVANCES RECEIVED BY TRAVELER

Currency Code	Received From	TR Number/2	Date Received	Amount Received	Exchange Rate/3	Source Name

ADVANCES GIVEN BY TRAVELER TO OTHERS

Currency Code	Given to Staff Number	Given to TR Number	Date Given	Amount Given	Exchange Rate

ERRORS/WARNINGS

- Notes: 1) Use the following codes for FROM NAME: TAO = Travel Advance Office; CTR = Controllers; OTH = Others; if advance is received from another staff, specify the staff number.  
2) Specify the TR number of the other staff, if advance is received from another staff.  
3) Exchange rate = currency / US\$ equivalent.

T WORLD BANK / IFC  
STATEMENT OF EXPENSES

Date: 3/28/96 10:08

Commitment Number: Z41259

Staff/Consultant Number: N5035

Name : CHARLES DEREK POATE

ITINERARY

Seq	Ctry Code	City Code	City Name	Currency Code	Purpose Code/1	Arrive Date	Depart Date	Seq
1	GB	LON	LONDON	GBP	OP		03/10/96	1
2	US	WAS	WASHINGTON DC	USD	OP	03/10/96	03/14/96	2
3	GB	LON	LONDON	GBP	OP	03/15/96		3

PENSES BY CITY

Seq/2	1	2	3				
Currency Code	GBP	USD	GBP				
City Code	LON	WAS	LON				
City Name	LONDON	WASHINGTON D	LONDON				
Hotel Code		WAS16					
Hotel Name		GEORGETOWN D					
Room Rate		82.00					
Hotel and Tax		382.64					
Meals, Tips & Valet		380.00					
In, Out & Within/3		48.00					
Transportation/4							
Phone, Cable & Fax/4							
Representation/4							
Miscellaneous/4							
Per Diem							
Exchange Rate		1.0000					
TOTAL CURRENCY		810.64					
US EQUIVALENT		810.64					

Notes: 1) Valid purpose codes are: OP = Operational; C = Connection; S = Stop over; P = Annual Leave; SL = Sick leave.

2) Use same sequence number as used in Itinerary Section.

3) IN/OUT/WITHIN is transportation, airport tax, and Baggage handling.

4) Expenses in these categories require explanation.

Commitment Number: Z41259

Staff/Consultant Number: N5035

Name : CHARLES DEREK POATE

EXPLANATIONS FOR OTHER EXPENSES

City	City	Curr	Purpose	Item	Description	Amount
------	------	------	---------	------	-------------	--------



# Record Removal Notice

<b>File Title</b> Lessons and Practices on Monitoring and Evaluation in the World Bank Correspondence 01		<b>Barcode No.</b>  1573358		
<b>Document Date</b> March 18, 1996	<b>Document Type</b> Form			
<b>Correspondents / Participants</b>  C.D. Poate				
<b>Subject / Title</b> Statement of Expenses for Consultants				
<b>Exception(s)</b> Personal Information Financial Information iv				
<b>Additional Comments</b>		<p>The item(s) identified above has/have been removed in accordance with The World Bank Policy on Access to Information or other disclosure policies of the World Bank Group.</p> <table border="1"><tr><td><b>Withdrawn by</b> Kim Brenner-Delp</td><td><b>Date</b> September 28, 2023</td></tr></table>	<b>Withdrawn by</b> Kim Brenner-Delp	<b>Date</b> September 28, 2023
<b>Withdrawn by</b> Kim Brenner-Delp	<b>Date</b> September 28, 2023			



THE WORLD BANK/IFC/MIGA  
**OFFICE MEMORANDUM**

DATE: February 5, 1996

TO: Ms. Myrna Alexander, Director OPR

FROM: Roger Slade, Chief OEDD1 *for him*

EXTENSION: 81293

SUBJECT: Draft Ledger for the M&E Overview Follow-up *Handwritten signature*

1. The *Follow-up* was printed and released on Friday, and a copy is attached. Mr. Rice has delivered 20 additional copies to Mr. Biderman. Also attached is a draft ledger that records the recommendations of this report and unattended recommendations of the original *Overview*. We have extracted them exactly as stated on page 49 of the *Follow-up*, and continue to divide them into Priority and Subordinate lists.

2. According to the established procedure, the draft Ledger should have been sent to OPR during the second, or VP round of commentary, soliciting from you a draft Management Response. That was not done, partly because it was not clear at that juncture whether a Management Response was appropriate for a follow-up study.

3. As you know, Mr. Shilling is considering presenting this report to the Operations Policy Committee. Even if he chooses not to do so, the February 26 date set for discussion by CODE seems precarious.

CC: Messrs. Picciotto, Aguirre-Sacasa, Guerrero, Rice, Biderman, Shilling

DRAFT LEDGER for the M&E Overview Follow-up

- \* Recast OD: resolve ongoing debates and issue the new OD as soon as possible.
- \* Poverty Focus: increase financial support, through lending and other devices, to the poor. This activity should complement, rather than substitute for, lending lines to traditional small and medium scale emerging and commercial farmers.
- \* Targeting: provide guidelines on appropriate circumstances and limits. Initiate pilot operations as appropriate.
- \* Macro-Economic Analysis and Reform: provide guidelines on the depth of analysis and extent of reform required for different levels and types of rural financial interventions, especially for targeted lines of credit. Initiate pilot operations as appropriate.
- \* Objectives: maintain an appropriate balance of financial and real sector objectives.
- \* The Role for Parastatal Banks: provide practical guidelines and conditionalities for working with traditional parastatal partners. Initiate pilot operations as appropriate.
- \* Non-Lending Services: develop a diversified set of instruments, through analysis of experience, networking with other agencies, experimental probes and technical assistance.
- \* Recycling of On-lent Bank Funds: resolve the legal issue and, if possible, secure a role-over of long-term lending on comparable terms.
- \* On-Farm Supervision: demonstrate a recovery of supervision of on-farm activity of sub-borrowers.
- \* Delinquency and Default: through improved reporting on the age structure of arrears, distinguish delinquency due to late payment from willful default. Different responses and guidelines are needed.

OEDD1

February 5, 1996



A L L - I N - 1 N O T E

DATE: 24-Jan-1995 07:37pm EDT

TO: Anil Sood ( ANIL SOOD )

FROM: Barbara Nunberg, EMTPM ( BARBARA NUNBERG )

EXT.: 37487

SUBJECT: Comments on Draft OED Preci-- M&E in the World Bank

Anil,

A few comments on the OED Preci on Monitoring and Evaluation, mainly concerning some opaque points that bear clarifying (not having read the main study, I can't say whether this is a drafting problem or reflects a larger flaw in the original work):

The precis emphasizes the incidence of monitoring and evaluation rather than the quality or effectiveness of M&E. What would characterize successful M&E, and how this would be linked to desired outcomes in project performance or impact? The draft makes repeated reference to "M&E performance" but fails to define what this means. At times M&E performance appears to be almost conflated with overall project performance. And the one explicit reference suggesting that these are indeed two distinct but critically linked phenomena is actually quite troubling, stating (on p. 3) that completion reports confirmed a weak but discernible relationship between M&E performance and project ratings. If M&E doesn't clearly make things work better, why invest further in it?

The draft highlights the study's finding that increased M&E use is mainly a result of spontaneous action by individual staff. It seems unlikely that this is a random spontaneity. If these staff have a particular skill, educational or experiential background that inclines them toward M&E, perhaps this profile should be factored into recruitment and training decisions.

Three familiar explanations are given for poor M&E: lack of ownership, lack of sustained post- start-up attention, and poorly qualified staff. These are standard boilerplate for most project woes. Perhaps the more critical issue to which at least the first two are linked is the lack of incentives -- both in country and in the Bank -- to learn from mistakes and to report bad results. It looks as though a proposal to forge a more explicit connection between disbursements and performance indicators was rejected by the Joint Audit Committee as "aggressive." But some such mechanism which changes the game to reward results-oriented M&E seems essential to promoting the "learning culture."

A finding that perhaps deserves greater salience is that impact studies are generally better when conducted outside the project and on a selective basis. A shift in this direction could radically alter the Bank's self-analysis and perhaps reduce OED's own reliance on project completion reports as the main source of project assessment.

Although there is a cursory allusion to the need to build self-sustaining monitoring and evaluation habits in countries, this gets lost in the sea of references to Bank projects and practice. From the institutional development perspective, we should concentrate a lot more on the former than the latter.

The basic recommendations seem sensible, if uninspired. Recruitment of skilled staff in this area as a resource for task managers is a good idea, though the authors' views on the correct balance that must be struck between highly technical specialists comfortable with sophisticated methodologies and experts with real-life field experience in implementing M&E could be clearer. Probably both are needed. And the proposal to house this expertise temporarily in the Bank's center to develop and disseminate best practice, with ultimate responsibilities in the regions, should be endorsed.

It is also recommended that the Bank concentrate M&E development on social programs. This makes sense. It may even be a good idea to focus on only one sector to pilot some successful M&E approaches with a strategic plan for scaling out to other sectors, as appropriate. Though it would, of course, be inadvisable to squelch ongoing efforts at M&E in other sectors.

Barbara

CC: Rino Schiavo-Campo  
CC: Lynette Alemar

( SALVATORE SCHIAVO-CAMPO )  
( LYNETTE ALEMAR )



The World Bank/IFC/MIGA  
O F F I C E   M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: January 30, 1995 04:43pm

TO: Edward Rice ( EDWARD RICE )

FROM: Graham Donaldson, OEDD1 ( GRAHAM DONALDSON )

EXT.: 31730

SUBJECT: OED Precs - M&E

CC: Silvana Valle ( SILVANA VALLE )  
CC: OEDD1 Files ( OEDD1 FILES )

A L L - I N - 1 N O T E

DATE: 27-Jan-1995 04:20pm EDT

TO: Graham Donaldson ( GRAHAM DONALDSON )

FROM: Anil Sood, EMTDR ( ANIL SOOD )

EXT.: 32580

Sent By: Vorapaktra Yongpradit

SUBJECT: OED Precis - M&E in the World Bank

Please see the attached comments from one of my colleagues.

I would like to add just one suggestion. It would be useful to link this to the earlier effort on Evaluation Capacity Development in our client countries and, emphasize more strongly the importance of building an evaluation culture and capacity in the countries.

Anil

P.S. Sorry for missing the January 24 date.

OFFICIAL FILE COPY

DATE: January 5, 1995  
TO: Distribution  
FROM: Graham Donaldson, Chief, OEDD1  
EXTENSION: 31730  
SUBJECT: Draft OED Precis - Monitoring and Evaluation in the World Bank

1. The attached draft OED Precis is based on the OED report on this subject soon to be distributed to the Board. The draft is forwarded for your review and comment.
2. Comments or a marked up copy would be welcome by January 19, 1995.

Attachment

Distribution:

Messrs./Mmes: Marshall, AF1DR; Colaco, AF2DR; Aguirre-Sacasa, AF3DR; Lafourcade, AF4DR; Sarbib, AF5DR; Cleaver, AFTDR; Madavo, EA1DR; Hope, EA2DR; Haug, EA3DR; Hamilton, SA1DR; Vergin, SA2DR; Isenman, SA3DR; Messenger, ASTDR; Wiehen, EC1DR; Dervis, EC2DR; Huang, EC3DR; Kavalsky, EC4DR; Ritchie, MN1DR; Chopra, MN2DR; Sood, EMTDR; Nankani, LA1DR; Segura, LA2DR; Abe, LA3DR; Aiyer, LATDR; Adams, OPRDR; Cohen, ESDVP; Chaparro, FPDVP; Psacharopoulos, HROVP; Ray, DECVP.

cc: Messrs./Mmes. Picciotto, DGO  
Köpp, OEDDR  
Weaving, DGO  
Blackwell-Gentile, DGO  
Brown, EXTDR  
Rice, OEDD1

E.B. Rice/sv

# OFFICE MEMORANDUM

SV/LEBR  
Please send  
out for Regional  
comment.  
G 12/21

DATE: December 21, 1994

TO: Graham Donaldson, OEDD1

FROM: Angie Gentile-Blackwell, DGO

EXTENSION: 33509

SUBJECT: M&E Precis

Attached for your review is the draft M&E Precis, as agreed to by Ted Rice and myself. Please review the draft and return your comments to me in G-7135. If there are no changes, it can be sent out for regional comment. Many thanks.

cc Ted Rice