

GOOD PRACTICE STANDARDS

Country Strategy and Program Evaluations



European Bank
for Reconstruction and Development



IEO
Independent Evaluation Office
of the International Monetary Fund

IEG WORLD BANK | IFC | MIGA



ECG

EVALUATION COOPERATION GROUP

GOOD PRACTICE STANDARDS

Country Strategy and Program Evaluations

ECG

EVALUATION COOPERATION GROUP

© 2008 Operations Evaluation Department
Asian Development Bank
6 ADB Avenue, Mandaluyong City
1550 Metro Manila, Philippines
evaluation@adb.org
Telephone +63 2 632 4100
Fax +63 2 636 2161
www.ecgnet.org

All rights reserved

This Evaluation Cooperation Group publication is a joint product of the evaluation offices of the African Development Bank (AfDB), Asian Development Bank (AsDB), European Investment Bank (EIB), Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), and World Bank Group (WBG). The study was undertaken by a steering committee comprising representatives from the five participating banks: Herimandimby Razafindramanana (AfDB), Rainer Saerbeck (EIB), Inder Jit Ruprah (IADB), Patrick Grasso (WBG), and Suganya Hutaserani (AsDB), who also led the task assisted by Steven Tabor (Staff Consultant).

The views expressed in this book are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Asian Development Bank or its Board of Governors or the governments they represent.

The Asian Development Bank does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this publication and accepts no responsibility for any consequences of their use. Use of the term “country” does not imply any judgment by the authors or the Asian Development Bank as to the legal or other status of any territorial entity.

This publication was first electronically published as Good Practice Standards 5: “Good Practice Standards for Country Strategy and Program Evaluations” (June 2008).

ADB encourages printing or copying information exclusively for personal and noncommercial use with proper acknowledgement of ADB. Users are restricted from reselling, redistributing, or creating derivative works for commercial purposes without the express, written consent of ADB.

Contents

Background and Context	I
Multilateral Development Bank Evaluation Harmonization	1
Multilateral Development Bank Country-Level Evaluation	3
Purpose, Framework, Application, Benchmarking, and Updating	4
Identification of Good Practice Standards for Independent Country Strategy and Program Evaluations	7
Process-Related Good Practice Standards	7
<i>Goals, Objectives, Client Responsiveness, and Unit of Analysis for Country Strategy and Program Evaluations</i>	7
<i>Country Selection and Mutual Accountability</i>	8
<i>Timing</i>	9
<i>Advance Preparations</i>	9
<i>Coverage</i>	9
<i>Approach Paper for Country Strategy and Program Evaluations</i>	10
<i>Preparation Period</i>	11
<i>Staffing</i>	11
<i>Guidelines</i>	11
Methodology-Related Good Practice Standards	11
<i>Methods and Approaches for Country Strategy and Program Evaluations</i>	11
<i>Evaluation Criteria for Country Strategy and Program Evaluations</i>	15
<i>Performance Rating</i>	19
Reporting-Related Good Practice Standards	20
<i>Findings, Lessons, and Recommendations</i>	20
<i>Reporting and Review</i>	20
<i>Making Findings Accessible</i>	21
<i>Generalizing Findings and Tracking Recommendations</i>	21
Appendixes	
1. Evaluation Cooperation Group Progress Benchmarking Table	23
2. Subcriteria for Evaluating Country Strategies and Programs	36

Abbreviations

AfDB	African Development Bank
AsDB	Asian Development Bank
C-GPS	core good practice standard
CSPE	country strategy and program evaluation
ECG	Evaluation Cooperation Group
EIB	European Investment Bank
GPS	good practice standard
IADB	Inter-American Development Bank
MDB	multilateral development bank
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
OECD–DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development–Development Assistance Committee
O-GPS	optional good practice standard
WBG	World Bank Group

Background and Context

Multilateral Development Bank Evaluation Harmonization

The Harmonization Challenge. In March 1996, the Development Committee Task Force on Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs) issued a report entitled *Serving a Changing World*, which called for harmonization of evaluation methodologies, performance indicators, and criteria by MDBs:

... currently, it is not possible to compare their operational results, or even to describe them in a common language. Many public sector institutions like the MDBs must be able to account for their efforts in readily understood terms. A common methodology for evaluating their portfolios should be developed and kept up to date over time, with best practices in evaluation techniques being identified and disseminated. A determined effort should be made to harmonize performance indicators and evaluation criteria, taking into account the differing circumstances of each institution. The lessons learned from these evaluations should be shared among the MDBs with a view to applying them quickly in new operations.

The heads of the...MDB evaluation units...[should] be charged with elaborating common evaluation standards, including performance indicators; exchange experience with evaluation techniques [and] share results; and become the repository of best evaluation practices. The immediate task would be to develop, within a specified time period, methodology and criteria for assessing and rating the MDB's operational performance and development effectiveness.¹

MDB Response. In response to the task force's recommendations, the Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG) was formed. The ECG consisted initially of the heads of the evaluation units of the five MDBs referred to in the task force's report: the African Development Bank (AfDB), Asian Development Bank (AsDB), European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), and World Bank Group (WBG). The European Investment Bank (EIB) joined in 1998. In March 1998, the original five ECG members reported to the Development Committee:

¹ Development Committee Task Force on MDBs. 1996. *Serving a Changing World*. Washington, DC, p. 18.

The [Evaluation Cooperation] Group will continue its efforts to make evaluation results comparable and to have their findings properly translated into operational standards. Meeting in Hong Kong in October 1997, the MDB presidents ... strongly endorsed further intensification of collaboration among MDB evaluation units in harmonizing evaluation standards and activities, defining more effective linkages between independent and self-evaluation The harmonization dialogue will be extended to *country evaluations*, nonlending services, and evaluation of private sector operations. (italics added for relevance to this paper)²

Moreover, the ECG mandate embodies and endorses MDB evaluation harmonization:

The ECG (i) works to strengthen cooperation among evaluators and (ii) seeks to harmonize evaluation methodology in its member institutions, so as to enable improved comparability of evaluation results while taking into account the differing circumstances of each institution. Harmonization in the ECG includes increased information sharing and improved understanding of commonalities and differences in evaluation policies, procedures, methods and practices and is not interpreted by members as ‘standardization of evaluation policies and practices.’³

To promote evaluation harmonization, the ECG has prepared and implemented good practice standards (GPSs) for several categories of MDB evaluations. Derived from the evaluation principles of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development–Development Assistance Committee (OECD–DAC), these were built on good evaluation practices, and were designed to be consistent with the MDBs’ operational policies. In 2001, the ECG issued a set of GPSs for the evaluation of private sector investment operations. These were subsequently updated in versions issued in 2003 and 2007.⁴ In 2002, the ECG agreed on a set of GPSs for the evaluation of MDB-assisted public sector operations⁵ based on a review of practices relating principally to the evaluation of investment projects. In 2005, an addendum to the GPSs for evaluation of public sector operations was prepared, covering the evaluation of policy-based lending.⁶ In October 2005, as part of their ongoing effort to harmonize MDB evaluations, and consistent with their commitment to the OECD–DAC, ECG members declared their intention to prepare a set of GPSs for the evaluation of country strategies and programs.

² Development Committee Task Force on MDBs. 1998. *Implementation of the Major Recommendations of the MDB Task Force Report*. p. 4.

³ ECG. 2003. *Amended ECG Mandate*.

⁴ ECG. 2007. *GPS for Evaluation of Private Sector Investment Operations*. Third Edition.

⁵ ECG. 2002. *GPS for Evaluation of MDB-Supported Public Sector Operations*.

⁶ ECG. 2005. *Evaluation of Policy-Based Lending: An Addendum to the GPS for the Evaluation of MDB-Supported Public Sector Operations*.

Multilateral Development Bank Country-Level Evaluation

Country strategy and program evaluations (CSPEs) seek to describe and explain the performance of an MDB at the country level. They question whether the country program did the right things, in terms of whether the design and its implementation were right for the circumstances of the country. They ask not just “Did the country program work?” but “What made it work or fail?” and “How can we make it better”? Due to the fact that they usually evaluate both completed and ongoing operations, their forward-looking nature, and the controversy that they may generate, CSPEs tend to engage evaluation clients more than other forms of independent evaluation. Typically, they have been one of the more influential types of evaluation. Consequently, they play an increasingly important role in the work programs of the independent evaluation offices that conduct them.

CSPEs ask not just “Did the country program work?” but “What made it work or fail?” and “How can we make it better?”

CSPEs undertaken by MDBs are major and often costly evaluation exercises. They are classified as higher level evaluations because of their focus on strategic issues and because they build on the findings of evaluations of projects, programs, and sector or thematic issues of concern. A 1999 review of MDB evaluation experience describes the benefits of CSPEs:

(i) CSPEs can identify and assess broad and long-term issues and concerns better than other forms of evaluation; (ii) they provide valuable information about the country strategy process, whether project selection was based on merit, impact of non-project forms of assistance, aggregating results of activities across all sectors and providing input into, and strengthening, subsequent country strategies; (iii) CSPEs are better able to identify overall program and project delivery weaknesses, institutional difficulties, capacity utilisation constraints, borrower’s acceptance, commitment and compliance to conditions and impact of other aid agencies and external factors; (iv) they provide a framework for rating overall performance in meeting development goals and objectives, and better assess impact and sustainability issues for long-term aid effectiveness; and (v) they provide a valuable instrument for improving aid co-ordination among institutions and bilateral agencies and for the broader participation goal of increasing the role of national and local governments, civil society and the private sector in the developmental process.⁷

As the locus of MDB assistance shifts from individual projects toward country-based strategies, programs, and interventions having economy-wide effects, the country becomes the most logical unit of aid management and accountability.

⁷ OECD-DAC. 1999. *Evaluating Country Programmes. Report of the Vienna Workshop*. Paris. p. 115.

Adoption of similar goals for development assistance (e.g., the Millennium Development Goals [MDGs]) and agreements to harmonize and align assistance with national poverty reduction strategies also make country-level evaluation of external assistance imperative.

CSPEs differ by purpose, by depth, and by the entity undertaking the evaluation. Within the MDBs, country assistance is typically evaluated as part of the preparation of new country strategies, both by the operational teams involved in preparing the country strategies and by the independent evaluation offices. Self-evaluation generally takes three main forms:

- brief summaries of lessons identified, which are included in a new country strategy;
- a country strategy completion report; or
- a country strategy progress report or midterm review.

Self-evaluations are generally validated by the independent evaluation offices to ensure consistency and to encourage candid and critical evaluation by the operations departments. Most independent CSPEs undertaken by MDBs would be categorized as in-depth evaluation exercises or full-fledged CSPEs. These are most suitable and rewarding when there is something of value to learn through an in-depth assessment, plus an opportunity to make use of the findings. This would include cases in which

- a diverse portfolio of MDB assistance has been provided over an extended period,
- activities are sufficiently mature to be able to identify and/or anticipate results,
- government external assistance policies or aid agency assistance strategies are being formulated, and/or
- the lessons gleaned from the particular country case are expected to be of interest to other MDB member countries.

Purpose, Framework, Application, Benchmarking, and Updating

Purpose of Good Practice Standards. The standards aim to

- contribute to the ECG objectives of harmonization of evaluation criteria and processes,
- help MDBs link evaluation and operational standards in pursuit of corporate missions and objectives, and
- assist in learning from experience among MDBs for improved results.

Guiding Framework. GPSs have been developed within the general framework of the OECD–DAC evaluation principles, and they draw on the findings of a recent ECG review of CSPEs.⁸ The GPSs also build on the foundation of good evaluation practices that have already been identified and endorsed by the ECG in its GPSs for public sector and GPSs for private sector operations. More specifically, those GPSs established for the organization and governance of the MDB independent evaluation process, as set forth in the 2002 *Good Practice Standards for Evaluation of MDB-Supported Public Sector Operations*, will likewise apply to CSPEs. Consequently, those GPSs are not repeated in this study.

Application. The GPSs pertain to the evaluation of country strategies and programs of both public and private sector-oriented MDBs, since they both strike a balance in their evaluation between “bottom-up” project-level evaluations and “top-down” assessments of business climate quality and the macroenvironment. It is also acknowledged that there are some differences between the CSPEs undertaken by public sector-oriented and by private sector-oriented MDBs. The private sector-oriented MDBs have financial return objectives that must pass the market test; they have far fewer assistance instruments aimed at having country-wide effects; their operations depend largely on market demand; and their corporate and country strategies tend to be illustrative of the range of activities in which their banks wish to engage. Consequently, their evaluations include more analysis of performance determinants, outcomes and impacts of projects, and technical cooperation activities. Moreover, private sector-oriented MDBs are very exposed to market fluctuations, and they maintain a frequent monitoring of the overall project portfolio for accounting and financial reporting purposes. The focus of private sector-oriented MDB CSPEs should therefore be more on lessons identified from strategy impact assessments such as environmental impacts, broader private sector development impacts, transition impacts, and economic/social impacts in the immediate area of the various projects.

Progress Benchmarking. ECG members agree that periodic assessments will be undertaken to assess the extent to which the GPSs are being applied. The GPSs have been summarized in tabular form in Appendix I to assist in progress benchmarking.⁹ Some time will be required to adjust member practices to GPSs, and thereafter to conduct at least one CSPE under the new GPSs regime. Accordingly, the first benchmarking exercise is expected to be scheduled for 2010.

Updating Good Practice Standards. CSPE methods, approaches, rating criteria, and their application will continue to evolve over time. Adoption of

Periodic assessments will assess the extent to which the GPSs are being applied

⁸ Tabor, Steven and Suganya Hutaserani. 2007. *Phase I Background Report for the Preparation of GPS for CSPEs*.

⁹ A baseline of CSPE practices for AfDB, AsDB, IADB, and WBG is included in the self-assessment questionnaires provided in the report cited in footnote 8.

results-based monitoring and evaluation systems in partner countries, and improvements in both the self-evaluation and independent evaluation of MDB operations, sector and thematic studies, special studies, and impact evaluations, will influence the nature of the evaluation database upon which CSPEs are built. It is envisaged, therefore, that the GPSs will require periodic stocktaking and updating. As members reach further agreements on CSPE methods, approaches, criteria, rating standards, and applications to special CSPE cases, they will document them in subsequent refinements of these GPSs.

Identification of Good Practice Standards for Independent Country Strategy and Program Evaluations

“Core” GPSs [**C-GPSs**] and “optional” GPSs [**O-GPSs**] are identified. A core GPS is defined as one that establishes the key principles for CSPEs and is necessary to permit comparability of evaluation results, to the extent possible, among MDBs. While the core GPSs listed in this paper are currently in practice to some extent in all members, institutional differences may affect the pace at which harmonization can be achieved. An optional GPS is defined as one that is not strictly needed for comparability but is nonetheless designed to help improve accountability and learning within each institution.

A core GPS establishes the key principles for CSPEs and is necessary to permit comparability. An optional GPS helps improve accountability and learning

Process-Related Good Practice Standards

Goals, Objectives, Client Responsiveness, and Unit of Analysis for Country Strategy and Program Evaluations

Country Strategy and Program Evaluation Goals. The main goal of an MDB CSPE is to provide information on MDB performance at the country level that is credible and useful and enables the incorporation of lessons and recommendations that can be used to improve the development effectiveness of the MDB’s overall strategy and program of country assistance [**C-GPS**].

Objectives. CSPEs are used for both accountability and lesson-learning purposes in the MDBs [**C-GPS**]. They provide an accounting to the MDB’s board of directors regarding the results achieved from MDB assistance in a country over an extended period of time. CSPEs also serve as an important learning experience by drawing on evaluation results to engage in a constructive dialogue on what could be done to improve the effectiveness of an MDB’s assistance program in the future.

Client Responsiveness. CSPEs are designed to meet the information requirements of the main target clients [**C-GPS**], which would generally be

the board, senior management, and relevant operations personnel within the country department. Identifying the government as the main target client is also a good practice, because the government will need information on past assistance performance if it is to demand better service from the MDB.

Unit of Analysis. CSPEs focus on evaluating the results of MDB assistance. They take the country as the unit of analysis and attempt to evaluate MDB assistance to the country using already prepared country strategy(ies) as a point of reference [**C-GPS**]. They do not evaluate the performance of a government or the progress of a country, although a CSPE may draw on country progress indicators to assess the performance of the assistance program.

Country Selection and Mutual Accountability

It is best to select countries and programs for CSPEs where the findings and lessons will be most beneficial to the MDB and to the country

In practice, certain strategies and programs in some countries warrant more attention than others. Faced with limited evaluation resources, it is best to select those countries and programs for CSPEs where the findings and lessons will be most beneficial to the MDB and to the country [**C-GPS**]. Factors such as portfolio size, country development characteristics, and the likely relevance of the evaluation findings to similar issues in other member countries should be considered in making the selection of countries for which a CSPE is to be undertaken. It is desirable to treat each borrowing member equally, and hence to make an effort to undertake CSPEs for all countries to which an institution provides assistance [**O-GPS**].

Joint Country Strategy and Program Evaluations. To date, the vast majority of CSPEs have been undertaken by individual MDBs. Only a handful have been undertaken jointly by two MDBs, or by MDBs and other development partners. In many cases, joint CSPEs between MDBs have been conducted as parallel exercises, with separate reports. The main benefit of such a joint activity is the reduction in the burden and cost for the recipients. Increasingly, however, evaluation on a broader scale than the traditional project, sector, or thematic levels will be required, not only to assess results at the country level but also to look more closely at the role of the different institutions in the process. Joint or multi-aid agency CSPEs can provide this broader perspective while fostering cross-agency learning and reducing evaluation transaction costs for in-country stakeholders. While the situation varies in each case, MDBs should endeavor to reduce potential bottlenecks by undertaking joint CSPEs within each institution [**C-GPS**]. While some bottlenecks are outside of the control of the evaluators (e.g., different reporting requirements or different country strategy timing), the broader efforts to foster MDB harmonization (e.g., joint MDB country strategies or pooled funding arrangements) are likely to make it more feasible to undertake multipartner CSPEs in the medium term. While multipartner CSPEs are recommended, the decision on whether or not to join forces with partners in a CSPE is best made on a case-by-case basis [**C-GPS**].

Mutual Accountability. There is also a need for multipartner evaluations of country assistance extending beyond MDBs to include all sources of

external assistance, for which the evaluation challenges are significantly greater. Multipartner evaluations of the totality of country assistance should be encouraged. To the extent possible, the GPSs set forth in this report will be applied in such joint evaluation exercises **[O-GPS]**.

Timing

A CSPE should be timed to permit the results, recommendations, and lessons identified to feed into the preparation of the next MDB country strategy and to be available to management and the executive board in time for reviewing or approving the new strategy **[C-GPS]**. Optionally, the results of a CSPE could be provided at a time in which the government is willing to make strategic decisions about the use of external assistance **[O-GPS]**.

A CSPE should feed into the preparation of the next country strategy

Advance Preparations

Preparatory Steps. CSPEs build on the existing stock of MDB self- and independent evaluations. Evaluations of key projects, programs, and technical assistance operations should, if at all possible, be scheduled sufficiently in advance of the preparation of a CSPE **[C-GPS]**. Operations personnel should also be encouraged to prepare self-evaluations in a timely manner.

Sector/Thematic Studies. At the discretion of each evaluation unit, sector or thematic studies, special evaluations, or impact assessments may be undertaken to prepare for a CSPE. If sector or thematic evaluations are undertaken in advance of a CSPE, then it is advisable to issue these as separate reports and to discuss them with the government agencies responsible for the particular sectors or thematic areas **[O-GPS]**. Application of the same evaluation criteria and ratings systems at the sector/thematic level as those to be used for the CSPE facilitates the aggregation of sector/thematic assessments at the country level **[O-GPS]**.

Coverage

Time Period. CSPEs should cover a period of assistance that is long enough to witness development results, while providing more emphasis on evaluating recent performance during the current strategy period to ensure that the findings are operationally relevant **[C-GPS]**. Newly initiated, completed, and ongoing assistance activities will be covered in an MDB CSPE **[C-GPS]**.

Product and Service Coverage. A CSPE will cover the full content of the MDB's program of engagement with the country over the relevant time period **[C-GPS]**. It will cover a series of MDB strategies and assistance in projects, programs, technical assistance, economic and sector work, and knowledge products as well as nonfinancial services—including the role that MDB assistance plays in policy dialogue; processes used in addressing issues in the execution of the program; as well as those used in coordinating, harmonizing,

and catalyzing assistance from other development partners, the private sector, and civil society. By necessity, some areas will be covered in more depth than others. Those areas of focus should be determined based on client needs and on the areas of past programs that can evoke the most important lessons for future strategy **[C-GPS]**. In large-country cases in which there are too many interventions to cover all of them, a CSPE will draw its inferences from a purposeful sample of an MDB's assistance activities that is representative of the main thrusts of the MDB's strategy and program of assistance **[O-GPS]**.

Second- or Third-Generation CSPEs. These CSPEs will summarize the findings from previous CSPEs and take stock of the extent to which the lessons and recommendations of the earlier CSPEs were utilized **[C-GPS]**. Coverage of the second- (or third-) generation CSPE will overlap with the previous CSPE by a period of a few years to validate end-of-period assessments and to provide continuity with the previous evaluation **[C-GPS]**.

Limited-Scope CSPEs. While recognizing that a full performance assessment of a complex assistance program should not be undertaken in a superficial manner, in special cases a limited-scope CSPE may be appropriate. A limited-scope CSPE may be warranted when an MDB's role in the country is quite minor, when there are likely to have been few results achieved during the CSPE period, or when there is little likelihood of findings and lessons from the CSPE going beyond what is already known from existing project and program evaluations **[C-GPS]**. A limited-scope CSPE may also be needed to deliver evaluation findings to meet tight time-sensitive demands **[O-GPS]**.

Validation Reports. A validation report of a self-evaluation report can be treated as a special category of a limited-scope CSPE. If self-evaluation reports (i.e., country strategy completion reports) are properly done and independently validated, this may reduce the need for in-depth independent CSPEs, particularly for smaller borrowers. In addition, validation of a country-level self-evaluation can serve to assess whether or not a full CSPE is required to investigate more deeply issues raised in the completion report. It can be difficult, however, for operations personnel to prepare candid and critical evaluations of country assistance performance, particularly in countries whose development results lag far behind what was expected. Independent validation of the completion reports should be undertaken to encourage internal consistency in the evaluations (often between indicators and evaluative judgments) and can be used to assess the adequacy of the documentation and performance ratings **[C-GPS]**.

Approach Paper for Country Strategy and Program Evaluations

A CSPE approach (or position) paper will be prepared to define the country-specific evaluation approach, to set out the main evaluation parameters, and to brief the evaluation team and stakeholders within the MDB and the government **[C-GPS]**.

Preparation Period

After the CSPE approach/position paper is approved, an in-depth CSPE will generally be implemented over a period of 6–12 months for data collection, analysis, reporting, and review [C-GPS]. This should provide sufficient time for an in-depth review of secondary materials and for field visits, while ensuring that findings are delivered in a timely manner.

Staffing

An MDB CSPE will generally be led by an experienced evaluator with sufficient experience in MDB operations to understand well the processes involved in formulating country strategies and assistance programs [C-GPS]. To the extent that resources permit, a multidisciplinary team will be employed to undertake the CSPE [O-GPS].

Guidelines

CSPE guidelines will be prepared by each MDB. While the guidelines should provide some latitude to tailor CSPE methods, coverage, and approach to diverse country circumstances, a uniform set of guidelines will be used to explain the CSPE, as an evaluation instrument, to stakeholders in the MDB, the country, and elsewhere. The guidelines will serve to establish a core set of CSPE goals and objectives, methods, evaluative criteria, evaluation questions, procedures, reporting formats, quality control processes, and outreach and dissemination arrangements [C-GPS]. If a formal rating is included, then the guidelines should clearly specify the rating criteria and performance assessment methodology. Quality control processes should ensure that the principles set out in the guidelines are strictly adhered to so that performance assessments and other findings will be comparable across CSPEs [C-GPS]. While the principles set out in the CSPE guidelines should be strictly adhered to, the detailed scope, methods, and approach may need to be tailored to diverse country circumstances and to equally diverse assistance roles that the MDBs play [C-GPS].

Detailed scope, methods, and approach may be tailored to diverse country circumstances and to diverse assistance roles that MDBs play

Methodology-Related Good Practice Standards

Methods and Approaches for Country Strategy and Program Evaluations

Overview. A CSPE is premised on the assumption that a series of MDB country strategies and programs can be disaggregated into a contextual diagnosis, strategic and programmatic objectives, and an intervention logic that is amenable to

formal evaluation. A typical MDB CSPE exercise begins with an effort to make explicit the causal model implicit in the design of the assistance program. It includes a contextual analysis to identify program objectives; assess the validity of the MDB's diagnosis (in terms of the relevance of the objectives); and examine the relevance of the MDB's strategy toward meeting the objectives, including the definition and delivery of the lending and nonlending assistance program **[C-GPS]**. Top-down, bottom-up, and attribution-cum-MDB contribution assessments will be used to garner evidence on the extent to which strategic objectives were achieved and to test the consistency of evaluation findings **[C-GPS]**. The evidence base will then be analyzed, using various techniques, to identify performance determinants and to examine the contribution made by the MDB to the achievement of development results **[C-GPS]**. A set of evaluative criteria is applied to the evidence base to rate or otherwise reach an evaluative judgment about the performance of the country assistance in meeting its goals and objectives (see "Evaluation Criteria for CSPes" section on pp. 15–19) **[C-GPS]**. Key findings and lessons are drawn from the performance assessment and provide the foundation for future-oriented recommendations **[C-GPS]**. In MDB CSPE reports, the methodology used is clearly explained to ensure common understanding and to avoid disputes **[C-GPS]**.

Evaluation Questions. A number of fundamental evaluation questions are defined to guide the assessment of country strategy and program performance. These will include both questions that are standard to all CSPes, as well as those defined for the specific country case **[C-GPS]**. The CSPE is expected to provide evidence-based answers to these questions. At the discretion of each evaluation unit, standard questions may be similar to the following:

- Were the MDB's strategy and program relevant to the development challenges facing the country?
- Were suitable instruments of assistance selected to achieve strategic priorities?
- Did the MDB assistance achieve its desired objectives? If so, were they achieved efficiently?
- Are these achievements sustainable over time?
- Was the MDB's assistance effective in producing results, both at the level of individual interventions and at the level of the program as a whole?
- What is the overall impact of the MDB's assistance, for example on the economy, on poverty reduction, and on the MDGs?
- Did the MDB's assistance contribute to outcomes that will improve the country's capacity to manage the economy, combat poverty, and foster sustainable socioeconomic development?
- Was there a suitable division of labor, and were there effective coordination arrangements with other development partners?

Both the general and the evaluation-specific questions that are asked will be documented in the CSPE report for the readers to be able to judge whether the evaluation team has sufficiently assessed them **[C-GPS]**.

Counterfactuals. The most accurate measure of an MDB's contribution is a comparison of the situation prevailing with and without its assistance. In practice, such counterfactuals are difficult to derive and defend for a country program as a whole. These should be used only when they are possible and defensible [**O-GPS**]. In some instances, comparison with similar countries can be used as a counterfactual, although these tend to compare performance across countries and not across assistance program outcomes. It may, however, be possible to derive reasonable counterfactuals for specific components of an assistance program, such as cases in which one region was assisted and others were not, or when formal impact evaluations have been undertaken in advance of the CSPE [**O-GPS**].¹⁰

Attribution and Contribution. Formal attribution (i.e., separating the MDB's role from that of other internal or external players) is extremely difficult in a CSPE because of the multiplicity of factors that affect development outcomes and impacts at the country level. Therefore, the assessment of program results will focus on determining whether the MDB has made a contribution to key results or outcomes that is both plausible and meaningful, and identifying the main drivers of the outcomes [**C-GPS**]. A plausible association of MDB assistance with development results can be assessed by

- characterizing the role played by the MDB in the sector or thematic domain (i.e., lead MDB, main policy interlocutor),
- examining the policies and actions of other major development partners for consistency with those of the MDB, and
- examining evidence that the main outcomes were not achieved primarily due to exogenous events.

In addition, CSPEs will attempt to characterize the nature of the MDB's contribution to results by assessing the extent to which MDB assistance delivered additional value beyond the financing provided [**O-GPS**].

Evaluability. Evaluability, at the country level, is a measure of how well a proposed strategy or program sets out criteria and metrics to be used in its subsequent evaluation. A CSPE will include an assessment of the evaluability of the country strategy(ies) and program(s) of assistance [**C-GPS**]. Various factors influence the evaluability of country assistance, including the quality of the country diagnostic; the link between that diagnostic and the intervention logic; and the degree to which targets and indicators were specified *ex-ante*, baseline information was collected, outcomes were monitored, and results were reported.

Evaluability of country strategies and assistance programs can be a serious problem, especially if country strategies are very broad and have goals and

¹⁰ Separate impact evaluations are generally not conducted as part of a CSPE because of the cost, time required, and limited extent to which the findings can be generalized.

indicators far removed from an MDB's contribution; if the intervention logic is not well defined; or if there are large backlogs of projects that should, but do not, have project completion reports. Evaluability constraints can be overcome by

- reviewing strategy, program, and project documents to reconstruct program objectives, indicators, and/or baselines;
- retrofitting results frameworks from the reconstructed program logic;
- undertaking sector reviews to assess performance of completed and ongoing operations;
- collecting before-and-after performance evidence from executing agencies; project files; and, in selected cases, beneficiary surveys; and
- concentrating the analysis on key trends in assistance performance for which data exist **[C-GPS]**.

CSPEs examine quantitative and qualitative evidence from a wide range of both primary and secondary data sources

Multiple Evidence Sources. CSPEs examine quantitative and qualitative evidence from a wide range of both primary and secondary data sources. Differences in the evidence base need to be carefully reconciled and explained. The aim should be to obtain the widest possible breadth of information, to analyze the evidence carefully, and to base findings on information that has been successfully validated from multiple sources **[C-GPS]**. Secondary data include documentation from the MDB and other development partners, government, research institutions, and other outside sources. Primary data are drawn from various sources, including

- interviews with key stakeholders, which are used to validate the key findings and reveal the reasons for particular patterns of performance;
- focus group discussions, which are used to address specific issues or obtain beneficiary views; and
- field visits to project sites, which are sometimes included to crosscheck information obtained from project files and government reports.

Formal sample surveys, while less common, can also be used to assess project performance, to solicit feedback on the responsiveness of the MDB to key government agencies, and to assess the quality of the MDB's performance as a development partner. Client perception surveys can also be used to provide valuable evidence about MDB performance **[O-GPS]**.

Client Participation. Client participation in the CSPE process encourages respect for the fairness and objectivity of the CSPE, and contributes to early buy-in of the key results and recommendations. MDB CSPEs will endeavor to involve key stakeholders in the CSPE process from the design of the evaluation through its execution to the discussion of its key findings **[C-GPS]**. However, MDB CSPEs are independent evaluations, so they are not conducted jointly with the country.

Disclaimers. Given the breadth and complexity of the task, and the possible weaknesses in the evidence base, there is only so much that any CSPE can conclusively evaluate. Therefore, the limitations of the CSPE methodology, and its application, should be frankly acknowledged in the evaluation report **[C-GPS]**. This would include factors impinging on the accuracy of the performance assessment and the breadth and depth of the evidence base upon which performance assessments are drawn. This also makes it possible for evaluation clients to establish the degree of precision with which CSPE findings can be interpreted.

Evaluation Criteria for Country Strategy and Program Evaluations

The performance of a country assistance strategy and program of assistance should be formally assessed using a set of well-defined evaluation criteria. The standard evaluation criteria that are applied to projects and programs can be interpreted and applied to the evaluation of country assistance. For harmonization purposes, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact are considered mandatory criteria **[C-GPS]**. Positioning, coherence, institutional development, borrower performance, an MDB's performance, and partner coordination are optional criteria **[O-GPS]**.

Relevance. *Relevance refers to the degree to which the design and objectives of an MDB's strategy and program of assistance were consistent with the needs of the country and with the government's development plans and priorities.* A diagnosis of the evolving country context is used to assess the extent to which an MDB's strategic objectives and assistance program were relevant to the critical constraints affecting the country's long-term socioeconomic development and to the government's policies and strategic priorities, in light of other development partners' strategies, and to assess the consistency of its program with its strategy **[C-GPS]**. The processes used to maintain relevance, such as an MDB's research and policy dialogue, may also be assessed **[O-GPS]**.

Positioning. *Positioning is a measure of how well an MDB responded to (or even anticipated) the evolving development challenges and priorities of the government., built on its comparative advantage, and designed the country strategies and programs in a manner that took into consideration the support available from other development partners.* Positioning may be used to evaluate the design of the country assistance strategy and program **[O-GPS]**. Several subcriteria have been used to assess the extent to which an MDB's assistance was positioned appropriately, including the extent to which assistance

- was concentrated in areas of an MDB's evolved comparative advantage;
- built on lessons of past experience; and
- was selective/focused on a few sectors to reduce transaction costs and provided a sufficient quantum of assistance in any one area.

Relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact are mandatory criteria. Positioning, coherence, institutional development, borrower performance, MDB performance, and partner coordination are optional

Relevance refers to the degree to which the MDB strategy and program were consistent with the needs of the country and with the government's plans and priorities

Coherence. *Coherence refers to the extent to which there were measures aimed at fostering internal and external synergies within an MDB's program. This can include complementarity between different program elements, the extent to which policies of an MDB are self-reinforcing, and the extent to which external partnerships promote an efficient and effective division of labor in providing assistance that allows for complementarities and synergies with other development partners' programs. Coherence may be used to evaluate the design of the country assistance strategy and program [O-GPS]. Coherence may be examined along three dimensions:*

- definition of programmatic focus in terms of anticipated results,
- integration across an MDB's instruments in support of program objectives, and
- specification of the division of labor with other development partners.

Efficiency refers to the extent to which the design and delivery of assistance were most cost effective

Efficiency. *Efficiency refers to the extent to which the design and delivery of assistance were most cost effective. Measuring efficiency is difficult at the overall country program level because of the difficulty of estimating the combined benefit flows of various categories of an MDB's assistance (i.e., policy support, capacity building, or aid coordination). Instead, CSPEs typically draw on proxy indicators of the efficiency of an MDB's support in comparison to cost. This may include indicators related to project/program implementation, for example, of planned versus actual commitments, disbursement patterns, project supervision, projects at risk, design and supervision coefficients, monitoring and evaluation arrangements, implementation problems and their resolution, and other factors affecting program implementation [C-GPS]. Ratings accorded to projects, programs, and technical assistance are also used as a proxy for returns-on-investment and timely delivery of services, while economic internal rates of return for major investments may also be reviewed. Various proxies for transaction costs to the government may be assembled and analyzed, including the number of missions per year; the proportion of time that senior government officials devoted to servicing an MDB's missions; and the average amount of time that executing agencies have allocated to the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of MDB-supported assistance activities. Factors affecting the efficiency with which resources are used are identified in an MDB's CSPEs.*

Effectiveness refers to the extent to which the assistance achieved its intentions and objectives

Effectiveness. *Effectiveness refers to the extent to which the assistance instruments achieved the intentions and objectives set. Outcomes are assessed in a CSPE with respect to program objectives at different levels; across similar lending and nonlending projects; within key sectors and/or thematic thrusts; and at broader institutional, macroeconomic, and socioeconomic levels. Drawing primarily on a (bottom-up) analysis of cumulative program performance, CSPEs assess achievement of results both in terms of the extent to which strategic outcomes were achieved, and the extent to which sufficient development progress was made [C-GPS]. Results are generally compared in three ways:*

- before and after the country assistance period being reviewed;
- between the country and similar countries (within the same region or at a similar level of development), as appropriate; or
- benchmarked against any absolute standards (e.g., the MDGs, costs of capital, rates of return).

The determinants of an MDB's performance in attaining strategic objectives are identified in the CSPE report [**C-GPS**].

CSPEs are also uniquely suited to assess the suitability of an MDB's policies in different country contexts, such as compliance and results of safeguard policies, financial management policies, decentralization, human resource policies, relations with civil society, cofinancing policies, adequacy of an MDB's instruments, and responsiveness of an MDB's services to country-specific assistance requirements. Not all an MDB's policies can be assessed in all country cases. In an MDB's CSPEs, a distinction will be drawn between those policies whose coverage is mandatory and those whose coverage is optional [**O-GPS**].

Sustainability. *Sustainability refers to the likelihood that actual and anticipated results will be resilient to risks beyond the program period.* The degree to which the results of an MDB's assistance are likely to be sustained after the conclusion of the program will be covered by examining the degree to which past interventions have been sustained, identifying risks that could affect benefit flows, and assessing the extent to which policies are in place to mitigate such risks [**C-GPS**]. In assessing the sustainability of benefit flows, a key issue is the extent to which adequate institutional arrangements have been established to further the implementation of program-supported measures. Similarly, factors that negatively affect sustainability, such as fiscal distress or insufficient attention to recurrent financing, may also be assessed.

Impact. *Impact refers to an MDB's contribution to long-term changes in development conditions.* Impact is generally assessed with reference to an MDB's contribution to the attainment of specified development goals (i.e., macroeconomic balance, socioeconomic conditions, transition impact, MDGs, or other specified national poverty reduction goals and objectives) and to the contribution of an MDB's assistance individually to the national and/or sector-specific impact objectives established during the programming process [**C-GPS**]. Program impacts will most often be assessed using before-and-after comparisons, and to a lesser extent by comparing performance with similar countries or with internationally accepted standards (e.g., MDGs). Factors exogenous to the program will be examined to distinguish those impacts that can reasonably be associated with the assistance program from those whose proximate determinants lie elsewhere.

Institutional Development. *Institutional development refers to the extent to which an MDB's assistance improved or weakened the ability of the country to make more efficient, equitable, and sustainable use of its human, financial, and natural resources, for example through better definition, stability, transparency, enforceability,*

Sustainability refers to the likelihood that actual and anticipated results will be resilient to risks beyond the program period

Impact refers to an MDB's contribution to long-term changes in development conditions

and predictability of institutional arrangements; and/or better alignment of missions and capacities of organizations with their respective mandates. The extent to which an MDB's support has helped to develop institutional capacity may be separately assessed (if not part of impact assessment) by examining changes in the performance and governance of public institutions, nongovernment organizations, the private sector, and civil society **[O-GPS]**. Institutional development is more frequently assessed as part of an overall assessment of effectiveness and impact, since capacity building has come to be treated as an integral crosscutting objective of most MDB programs.

Borrower Performance. *Borrower performance focuses on the processes that underlie the borrower's effectiveness in discharging its responsibilities, with specific focus on the extent to which the government exhibited ownership of the assistance strategy and program.* Borrower performance may be assessed by examining the degree of client ownership of international development priorities, such as MDGs and an MDB's corporate advocacy priorities; the quality of policy dialogue; and the extent to which the government provided consistent support for MDB-assisted programs **[O-GPS]**. However, borrower performance should not be formally rated.

Multilateral Development Bank Performance. *An MDB's performance focuses on the processes that underlie its effectiveness in discharging its responsibilities as a development partner, including compliance with basic corporate operating principles; consistency with furtherance of its corporate, country, and sector strategies; and its client service satisfaction.* An assessment of an MDB's performance typically considers

- the relevance and implementation of the strategy, and the design and supervision of its lending interventions;
- the scope, quality, and follow-up of diagnostic work and other analytical activities;
- the consistency of its lending with its nonlending work and with its safeguard policies; and
- its partnership activities **[O-GPS]**.

It may also include the extent to which the MDB was sensitive and responsive to client needs and fostered client ownership. The views of operational personnel, the borrower, executing agencies, and other development partners are also typically considered in assessing the MDB's performance.

Partnership and Harmonization. *Partner coordination refers to the contribution made by an MDB to coordinating external assistance and to building government and country ownership of external assistance processes.* Robust partnerships are required to address complex development challenges. In recognition of this, CSPEs examine the extent to which an MDB has been an effective partner in a multistakeholder development assistance effort **[O-GPS]**. This may include an assessment, but not a formal rating, of the MDB's participation in aid agency/partner groups, the extent to which its activities

were well coordinated with those of other aid agencies, the degree to which it helped improve the government's capacity for mobilizing and utilizing external assistance, and the manner in which it fostered involvement of all stakeholders (e.g., government, private sector, civil society, nongovernment organizations, and other development partners) in the development process. The degree to which the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness principles (i.e., government ownership, alignment with government strategies, results orientation, program approaches, use of country systems, tracking results, and mutual accountability) have been promoted should be covered in the assessment of the MDB's contribution to building robust development partnerships.

Performance Rating

Rating Principles and Comparability. A quantitative rating system is generally viewed as a useful component to a CSPE, because it can help to organize and discipline the evaluation and can make the assessment process transparent and uniform across countries [**O-GPS**].

If a quantitative rating is undertaken, then the rating system should use well-defined criteria and be kept as simple as possible [**C-GPS**], because ratings that are too numerous or too detailed may confuse the user. Moreover, discussion of the ratings should not distract from the main messages. For those MDBs that wish to include ratings, the manner in which the ratings are derived should be clearly stated in MDB CSPE reports, and the summary evidence upon which they were made should be presented along with the rating itself [**C-GPS**]. The limitations of the CSPE rating system should also be frankly acknowledged [**C-GPS**]. Ensuring that CSPE ratings are comparable across CSPEs implies the need for a rating system that is uniform, both in its definitions and in its application in different country cases [**C-GPS**]. While there will always be some element of evaluator judgment, strict adherence to CSPE rating guidelines and careful quality control can help to promote ratings that are comparable across CSPEs in those evaluations that include a quantitative rating.

Rating Criteria. If a quantitative rating is undertaken, the ratings of the mandatory criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact) are considered to be a **C-GPS**. The ratings of the additional criteria (positioning, coherence, institutional development, borrower performance, an MDB's performance, and partner coordination) are considered to be an **O-GPS**. The ratings for each criterion that is employed should be presented separately so that the results of the performance assessment are fully transparent to the evaluation users [**C-GPS**].

Rating Subcriteria. For those MDBs that quantitatively rate performance, defining subcriteria, if any, in a way that is applicable to specific country cases can help to provide an evaluative framework for more uniform, systematic, and comparable assessment [**O-GPS**]. MDB evaluators have drawn on a decade of experience in undertaking CSPEs to evolve a set of evaluative subcriteria suitable for assessing country assistance performance in different country

A quantitative rating system can help organize and discipline the evaluation and can make assessment transparent and uniform across countries

settings. A list of CSPE-specific subcriteria for each of the criteria indicated above is provided in Appendix 2. This list is not meant to be either exhaustive or minimal; it reflects many of the factors found to be important determinants of country assistance performance, a subset of which is likely to be suitable in varied settings. An evaluative judgment is required to assess the degree to which chosen subcriteria have been achieved in a particular evaluation.

Weighting Criteria. If overall performance ratings (or headline ratings) are generated—as an optional good practice—then more emphasis should be accorded in the weighting to the results (i.e., effectiveness and impact) of the assistance program and to the sustainability of the net benefits [**O-GPS**].

Reporting-Related Good Practice Standards

Findings, Lessons, and Recommendations

CSPEs identify a few lessons that are unambiguously rooted in the evaluation evidence and have clear operational implications

Findings and Lessons. CSPE reports will include evaluation findings that are country specific, follow logically from the main evaluation questions and analysis of data, and show a clear line of evidence to support the conclusions drawn [**C-GPS**]. CSPEs will identify a few lessons that are unambiguously rooted in the evaluation evidence and have clear operational implications [**C-GPS**].

CSPE Recommendations. CSPE recommendations will be conveyed constructively in the form of proposals that are actionable within the responsibilities of the users, few in number, country specific, strategic, operational, and (ideally) not obvious [**C-GPS**].

Reporting and Review

Reporting. Standard CSPE reporting formats will be used to foster uniformity in coverage and presentation while providing sufficient latitude to tailor the reports to the needs of a particular country case [**C-GPS**]. The report should include coverage of the country context, country strategy and program, program implementation, program outcomes and impacts, partnerships, thematic issues, lessons, and recommendations [**C-GPS**]. The CSPE report will be presented in plain language. It will be evidence and analysis based, and will focus on those key issues that could be evaluated conclusively, rather than on all issues that have been examined [**C-GPS**].

Country Strategy and Program Evaluation Review. For quality control purposes, the draft CSPE will be rigorously reviewed internally by the staff and management of the independent evaluation office, and externally by MDB

operations personnel; government stakeholders; and, optionally, by external reviewers **[C-GPS]**. The CSPE review process should also extend to parallel or supporting studies to ensure that they are contextually correct and consistent with the CSPE process. The revised CSPE report will reflect these comments and acknowledge any substantive disagreements. In cases in which there are such disagreements, the formal views of management, government, external reviewers, and/or the board will be reflected in the final CSPE report **[O-GPS]**.

Making Findings Accessible

Disclosure. It is recommended to publish the findings of CSPEs **[C-GPS]**. Publishing the CSPE findings helps to foster learning beyond the immediate client groups and also helps to promote transparency in the evaluation process. To spotlight the diversity with which CSPE findings can be interpreted, CSPE publications will generally include the formal views of management, government, and the board **[C-GPS]**.

Dissemination. It often requires considerable effort to ensure that the CSPE findings are disseminated beyond a small group of senior MDB and government officials. Presentations to parliament, public seminars, consultation workshops, and press briefings are some of the ways in which CSPE findings can be more widely disseminated **[O-GPS]**. Summarizing the CSPE in a readily accessible form (such as an evaluation précis) and translation of CSPE findings into the local language can contribute to wider dissemination of findings and results **[O-GPS]**.

Generalizing Findings and Tracking Recommendations

Generalizing Country Strategy and Program Evaluation Findings. The findings from CSPEs will be summarized and used for comparative purposes in the annual and/or biannual reviews of evaluation findings prepared by the independent evaluation offices **[C-GPS]**. Using CSPEs for comparative purposes helps foster a more general understanding of the factors that influence country assistance performance.

Tracking Recommendations. Tracking and reporting on the progress by which CSPE findings, lessons, and recommendations are actually utilized by the MDB helps to facilitate institutional learning practices. This can be accomplished through either recommendation tracking systems or periodic reviews of the utilization of CSPE findings and recommendations **[O-GPS]**.

CSPE publications generally include the formal views of management, government, and the board

The findings from CSPEs will be summarized in annual and/or biannual reviews. Tracking the progress by which CSPE findings, lessons, and recommendations are utilized by the MDB facilitates institutional learning

Appendix 1 Evaluation Cooperation Group Progress Benchmarking Table

(to be completed by each participating multilateral development bank in 2010)

GPS Category	Core GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment ^a	Optional GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment	Remarks ^b
A. Process-Related GPSs					
A.1. CSPE Goals, Objectives, Client Responsiveness, and Unit of Analysis	<p>(a) Provide credible and useful information on the MDB's performance at the country level</p> <p>(b) Used for both accountability and lesson-learning purposes</p> <p>(c) Designed to meet information requirements of main target clients</p> <p>(d) Focus on evaluating the results of the MDB's assistance, with the country strategy(ies) as the main reference point</p>				
A.2. Country Selection and Mutual Accountability	<p>(a) Countries selected are those in which the findings and lessons will be most beneficial to the MDB and the country.</p> <p>(b) Efforts made to reduce potential bottlenecks in undertaking joint MDB CSPEs</p> <p>(c) Decision to pursue a multipartner CSPE made on a case-by-case basis</p>		<p>(a) Covering all countries and treating all borrowers equally</p> <p>(b) Multipartner CSPEs extending beyond the MDBs to include all sources of external assistance to a country encouraged</p>		

GPS Category	Core GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment ^a	Optional GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment	Remarks ^b
A.3. Timing	(a) CSPE timed to feed into the preparation and review of the MDB's new country strategy	(a)	Could also be timed to contribute to strategic decision making of the government		
A.4. Preparatory Steps	(a) Evaluations of key projects, programs, and technical assistance scheduled to precede the CSPE	(a)	Sector/thematic studies or impact assessments scheduled to precede a CSPE.		
		(b)	Application of the same evaluation criteria in sector/thematic studies as in the CSPE facilitates their use.		
A.5. Coverage	(a) Coverage long enough to see results, but more emphasis put on the current strategy period	(a)	In large country cases, a representative sample of assistance activities assessed		
	(b) Newly initiated, completed, and ongoing operations covered	(b)	A limited-scope CSPE may also be needed to deliver evaluation findings to meet tight time-sensitive demands.		
	(c) Full content of the MDB's assistance covered				
	(d) Depth of coverage depends on client needs and those areas most likely to evoke lessons for future strategy				

GPS Category	Core GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment ^a	Optional GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment	Remarks ^b
	<p>(e) For second- or third-generation CSPEs, previous CSPE findings summarized, and use of previous CSPE lessons and recommendations assessed</p> <p>(f) Subsequent CSPEs will have an overlap in the period covered of a few years.</p> <p>(g) CSPEs may have limited scope if the MDB's role is minor; if there were few results, or if there is little likelihood of findings and lessons of broader impact.</p> <p>(h) Completion reports of country strategies independently validated; if the completion and validation reports are comprehensive and apply CSPE criteria, they may serve as a limited-scope CSPE.</p>				
A.6. CSPE Approach Paper	(a) A CSPE approach (or position) paper prepared for each CSPE				
A.7. CSPE Preparation Period	(a) A full CSPE implemented over 6–12 months				
A.8. Staffing	(a) CSPE teams headed by an experienced evaluator with sufficient experience in MDB operations		(a) A multidisciplinary team engaged to undertake the CSPE		

GPS Category	Core GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment ^a	Optional GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment	Remarks ^b
A.9. Guidelines	<p>(a) Each MDB will have CSPE guidelines that set out CSPE goals and objectives, methods, evaluative criteria, evaluation questions, procedures, reporting formats, quality control processes, and outreach and dissemination arrangements.</p> <p>(b) Quality control procedures will ensure that guidelines are followed.</p> <p>(c) While guidelines will be adhered to, the actual methods, scope, and approach may be tailored to the country setting.</p>				
B. Methodology-Related GPSs					
<i>CSPE Methods and Approaches</i>					
B.1. Overview	<p>(a) CSPE methods include steps to make the causal model explicit in the country strategy, analysis of country context, assessment of the validity of the MDB's diagnosis, and analysis of the strategy and program relevance in design and delivery.</p>				

GPS Category	Core GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment ^a	Optional GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment	Remarks ^b
	<p>(b) Top-down, bottom-up, and attribution-cum-contribution assessments used to assemble information on performance in achieving strategic objectives</p> <p>(c) Evidence base analyzed to identify performance determinants</p> <p>(d) Evaluation criteria applied to assess performance in multiple dimensions</p> <p>(e) Findings and lessons drawn, and future-oriented recommendations provided</p> <p>(f) Methods explained in the CSPE report</p>				
B.2. Evaluation Questions	<p>(a) General and country-specific evaluation questions posed to guide the assessment</p> <p>(b) Evaluation questions documented in the CSPE report</p>				
B.3. Counterfactuals			(a) Counterfactuals should be used only when they are possible and defensible.		

GPS Category	Core GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment ^a	Optional GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment	Remarks ^b
B.4. Attribution and Contribution	(a) Since formal attribution is difficult to determine, assessment of program results will focus on determining whether the MDB has made a contribution to key results or outcomes, and identifying the main drivers of the outcomes.		b) Counterfactuals can be proxied through comparisons with similar countries, examination of those parts of the program for which a counterfactual can be more clearly identified, or for those parts of the program for which prior impact evaluations have been conducted.	(a) To characterize the nature of the MDB's contribution to results, the extent to which its assistance delivered additional value beyond the financing provided will be assessed.	

GPS Category	Core GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment ^a	Optional GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment	Remarks ^b
B.5. Evaluability	<p>(a) CSPE includes an assessment of the evaluability of the MDB's strategy and program of assistance.</p> <p>(b) Evaluability constraints overcome by reconstructing the program logic, retrofitting results frameworks, drawing on available information sources, and collecting performance information</p>				
B.6. Multiple Evidence Sources	<p>(a) CSPE draws on the widest possible breadth of primary and secondary sources of information, and bases findings on information that has been successfully validated from multiple sources.</p>		<p>(a) Use of client perception surveys can provide evidence about the MDB's performance.</p>		
B.7. Client Participation	<p>(a) Participation of key stakeholders in the CSPE process encouraged</p>				
B.8. Disclaimers	<p>(a) Limitations of the methodology and its application frankly acknowledged in the CSPE report</p>				

GPS Category	Core GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment ^a	Optional GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment	Remarks ^b
B.9. CSPE Evaluation Criteria	(a) Relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact considered mandatory criteria	(a)	Positioning, coherence, institutional development, borrower and MDB performance, and partner coordination considered optional criteria		
B.10. Relevance, Coherence, and Positioning	(a) Relevance examined by assessing if the MDB's strategy and assistance program were consistent with the country context and the government's strategic priorities	(a)	The MDB's processes used to maintain relevance assessed		
			(b) Criteria such as positioning and coherence used to assess the degree to which the design of the strategy and program harnesses positive synergies and builds on the MDB's core competence		
B.11. Efficiency	(a) Efficiency assessed using indicators affecting cost-effectiveness, transaction costs, portfolio performance, monitoring and evaluation arrangements, and other project/program implementation	(a)			

GPS Category	Core GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment ^a	Optional GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment	Remarks ^b
B.12. Effectiveness	<p>(a) Extent to which strategic outcomes were achieved and sufficient development progress was made used to assess program effectiveness</p> <p>(b) Determinants of performance in achieving the MDB's objectives identified</p>	(a)	The MDB's contribution to broader corporate objectives assessed, but distinction drawn between those thematic issues whose coverage is mandatory and those whose coverage is optional		
B.13. Sustainability	<p>(a) The degree to which the results of the MDB's assistance are likely to be sustained after the conclusion of the program assessed</p>				
B.14. Impact and Institutional Development	<p>(a) Impact assessed relative to national goals and to program-specific goals and targets</p>	(a)	Extent to which the MDB has helped to develop institutional capacity separately assessed if not part of impact assessment		

GPS Category	Core GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment ^a	Optional GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment	Remarks ^b
B.15. Borrower Performance		(a) Borrower performance, particularly the degree of program ownership, assessed but not formally rated			
B.16. MDB Performance		(a) The MDB's performance formally assessed, including its responsiveness to client needs			
B.17. Partnership and Harmonization		(a) CSPE examines the extent to which the MDB has been an effective partner in a multistakeholder development assistance effort.			
<i>Performance Rating</i>					
B.18. Ratings Principles and Comparability	(a) If quantitative rating is undertaken, the rating system should use well-defined criteria and be as simple as possible. (b) The manner in which ratings are derived is stated in the report. (c) Limitations of the rating system are acknowledged. (d) Rating system is uniform.	(a) A quantitative rating system is used to make the assessment process transparent and uniform across countries.			

GPS Category	Core GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment ^a	Optional GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment	Remarks ^b
B.19. Rating Criteria	<p>(a) If a quantitative rating is undertaken, ratings of the mandatory evaluation criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact) needed</p> <p>(b) If a quantitative rating is undertaken, ratings accorded for each criterion presented separately to make the performance assessment transparent</p>	(a)	If a quantitative rating is undertaken, ratings of the additional evaluation criteria (positioning, coherence, institutional development, borrower and MDB performance, and partner coordination) considered optional		
B.20. Rating Subcriteria		(a)	Defining subcriteria, if any, in a way that is applicable to specific country cases can help to provide an evaluative framework for more uniform, systematic, and comparable assessments.		

GPS Category	Core GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment ^a	Optional GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment	Remarks ^b
B.21. Weighting Criteria			(a) If an overall rating is generated, more weight accorded to effectiveness, impact, and sustainability		
C. Reporting-Related GPSs					
C.1. Findings, Lessons, and Recommendations	<p>(a) Evaluation findings are country-specific, evidence-based, and follow from the evaluation questions.</p> <p>(b) Lessons are few in number and evidence-rooted, and have operational implications.</p> <p>(c) Recommendations are few in number; constructive, actionable, strategic, operational, and not obvious.</p>				
C.2. Reporting and Review	<p>(a) Uniform formats followed with latitude to tailor to the country case</p> <p>(b) Report covers country context, country strategy, program implementation, program outcomes and impacts, partnerships, thematic issues, lessons, and recommendations.</p> <p>(c) Report presented in plain language and covers those issues that could be conclusively evaluated.</p> <p>(d) Draft report and supporting studies rigorously reviewed internally and externally.</p>		(a) Where there are substantive disagreements during the review process, these will be reflected in the final CSPE report.		

GPS Category	Core GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment ^a	Optional GPS Description	Degree of MDB Alignment	Remarks ^b
C.3. Making Findings Accessible	(a) CSPE findings published (b) To spotlight the diversity with which CSPE findings can be interpreted, CSPE publications will include formal views of management, government, and the board.	(a) (b)	Outreach events may be held to boost the dissemination of CSPE findings. A précis or other summary publication may be issued and findings translated into the local language to make CSPE findings more accessible.		
C.4. Generalizing Findings and Tracking Recommendations	(a) Annual and/or biannual reviews of evaluation findings summarize and compare CSPE findings	(a)	Recommendation tracking systems or periodic reviews of the utilization of CSPE findings and recommendations prepared to track CSPE use		

CSPE = country strategy and program evaluation, GPS = good practice standard, MDB = multilateral development bank.

^a Alignment refers to the extent to which the MDB evaluation practice is fully, partly, or not harmonized with the relevant GPSs.

^b The remarks section may be used to explain the reasons for divergence between the GPSs and MDB practice.

Appendix 2

Subcriteria for Evaluating Country Strategies and Programs

What follows is a suggested list of possible subcriteria that multilateral development bank (MDB) evaluators can draw from in tailoring the interpretation of evaluation criteria to the circumstances merited by each particular country case. This is neither a comprehensive nor a minimal checklist. The subcriteria listed here have been found to be important determinants of country assistance performance in MDB evaluations. They can be used to select and define the subcriteria employed in evaluating specific country cases. This is aimed at providing the flexibility required in a country evaluation so that the evaluative criteria are interpreted in a way that is most suitable, given varying country contexts, assistance roles, and data availability.

These subcriteria are divided into two groups. The first group belongs to standard evaluation criteria that can be applied to the program as a whole, or to particular components (e.g., sectors or themes). The second group belongs to additional evaluation criteria. For each, an evaluative judgment is required to assess the degree to which each chosen subcriterion has been achieved.

Standard Evaluation Criteria

A. Relevance: *the degree to which the design and objectives of the MDB's strategy and program of assistance were consistent with the needs of the country and with the government's development plans and priorities.*

- Based on a valid diagnosis of the context for external assistance
 - development context thoroughly reviewed
 - adequate assessments of key sectors and thematic areas of the MDB's proposed intervention
 - candid review and assessment of government policies and strategies
 - robust consultative process to identify and validate priorities
 - careful assessment of feasibility of using country systems
 - careful review of lessons of past experience
 - informed understanding of factors driving aid effectiveness
- Consistency with country's long-term development requirements (for each major objective)
- Consistency (i.e., alignment) with government's development (or poverty) strategy and priorities (for each major objective)
- Designed in a manner consistent with government's institutional capacity to absorb external assistance
- Consistency with global agreements (e.g., Millennium Development Goals [MDGs], Paris Declaration commitments, or World Trade Organization regulations) for each major strategic objective

- Consistency with the MDB's corporate policy and strategy (for each major objective)
- Importance of program objectives addressed to meet critical development constraints (by category, such as macroeconomic management, structural reform, sector reform, private sector development, institutional development, human development, environmental reform, and infrastructure development)
- Any important objectives that, in hindsight, should have been pursued, but, in the end, were not (i.e., were any important development issues omitted or ignored in the diagnosis?)
- Program formulation and design were relevant to achieving objectives
 - adequacy of external financing for program operation
 - extent and appropriateness of medium-term framework
 - consistency and coherence of the program logic (e.g., identification of goals to be achieved; specific purpose[s] of the MDB's assistance; and program measures, their expected outputs, outcomes, and impacts, together with key assumptions and risks to performance all identified)
 - appropriate assistance instruments selected (e.g., assistance properly sequenced to reach targets, internally consistent, realistic/feasible, manageable, and with clearly defined targets and objectives)
 - social consequences assessed, and suitable mitigation measures incorporated in overall program design
 - performance risks (both internal and external) adequately identified, and suitable strategies for managing risk incorporated
 - realistic time frame for results to be delivered, given institutional and other constraints
- Extent to which sector and thematic objectives were sufficient to achieve a level of critical mass, balanced among objectives, selective, and focused
- Extent to which dialogue and consultation ensured effective ownership of the program by government and by society at large
- Degree to which the MDB's program was built on lessons of past experience, was sufficiently focused and selective, and drew on areas of its core competency
- The MDB's program took into consideration, and was harmonized with, assistance provided by other development partners
- The MDB's responsiveness in designing and then adapting the assistance strategy to fundamental changes in client circumstances throughout the implementation period
- Extent to which the assistance strategy and program maintained relevance to the client's development constraints and priorities over time
- Assistance strategy and program could be readily evaluated

- targets well defined, links traced, baseline values provided, and performance targets specified
- reporting, monitoring, and evaluation responsibilities assigned, and funding provided
- knowledge gaps identified, and actions identified for securing information needed for decision making included

B. Efficiency: *the extent to which the design and delivery of assistance were most cost-effective.*

- Readiness for implementation of all products and services was secured
- Products and services were delivered in a timely manner
- Extent to which strategic objectives were achieved on time
- Were benefits gained from early completion of assistance (or costs incurred from late completion)?
- Benefits of major interventions are, or are expected to be, substantial, as demonstrated by
 - positive economic rates of return for major investments
 - positive financial rates of return and/or return on equity for MDB-supported private investments
 - major policy or institutional reforms were undertaken that did ease critical constraints to improved socioeconomic performance and poverty reduction
 - unambiguous evidence that benefits reached the poor
- Debt assumed and adjustment costs from MDB-supported reforms were relatively low compared with value arising from achievement of socioeconomic objectives (i.e., social benefits likely to exceed social costs)
- Overall program financing was provided in a timely manner through
 - financing provided in sync with external financing requirements
 - reasonable time for project design, negotiation, and effectiveness
 - disbursements took place according to plan
- Costs of providing assistance were similar or less than those in comparator country programs and were kept in line with the MDB's norms
- Unit costs were reasonable for major investments
- Transaction costs of providing assistance were modest (in terms of time spent preparing projects, number of missions undertaken, extent to which efforts were made to combine or hold joint missions with other development partners, and time spent by key government officials in design and oversight of the MDB's program)
- Public expenditures made adequate provision to meet government's portion of program counterpart costs, and sufficient financing was provided for future recurrent cost requirements

C. Effectiveness: *the extent to which the assistance instruments achieved the intentions and objectives set.*

- Degree to which activities anticipated in strategy and program were actually undertaken
- Sufficient interventions were undertaken to generate outputs and outcomes identified in country strategy and/or program
- Performance of portfolio as a whole was satisfactory in comparison with MDB-wide averages
- Extent to which major issues arose during execution and were (or were not) resolved
- Extent to which main assistance program objectives achieved progress toward each of their stated objectives
- Extent to which results defined under country assistance program were actually achieved
- Extent to which there were major shortcomings, such as unintended social costs or environmental damage, in achieving program objectives
- Performance as assessed by rating of the MDB's projects (both self- and independent ratings) in terms of achievement of major objectives
- Project evaluation judgments regarding achievement of development objectives have verifiable claims
- Extent to which achievement of program objectives demonstrated best practices in some areas
- Extent to which factors beyond government's control influenced the outcome of program (including changes in world markets, natural calamities, war/civil disturbance)
- Were other performance assessments reviewed and presented for major components of the MDB's assistance (including those whose findings contradict the evaluation)?
- Extent to which actual performance met or surpassed benchmarks for financial performance of similar categories of private investment (for private sector operations)

D. Sustainability: *the likelihood that actual and anticipated results will be resilient to risks beyond the program period.*

- Absence of major policy reversals
- Continued borrower commitment to assistance program objectives demonstrated through postprogram implementation of related measures
- Sociopolitical support for main objectives of assistance program
- Adequacy of institutional arrangements for implementing agreed upon reforms and program measures
- Conducive macroeconomic and political setting (i.e., stable and supportive)
- Continued need for (i.e., ongoing relevance and value of) the results and benefits

- Ownership by government and other key stakeholders
- Financial capacity to address recurrent costs
- Degree of resilience to risk of development benefits of country assistance program over time, taking into account:
 - technical resilience
 - financial resilience (including policies on cost recovery)
 - economic resilience
 - social support (including conditions subject to safeguard policies)
 - environmental resilience
 - ownership by government and other key stakeholders
 - institutional support (including a supportive legal/regulatory framework and organizational and management effectiveness)
 - resilience to exogenous effects such as international economic shocks or changes in political and security environments

E. Impacts: *the MDB's contribution to long-term changes in development conditions.*

- Anticipated and unanticipated (positive and negative) impacts identified and adjusted to take into consideration unexpected shocks or other factors beyond program's control, such as
 - country's macroeconomic balance
 - country's economic performance
 - poverty reduction
 - social development
 - governance
 - environmental sustainability
 - gender equality
 - regional cooperation
 - transition from central planning to market economy
 - other major social, political, or institutional changes in context
- Extent to which the program has improved the government's capacity, in key sectors and thematic areas, to make effective and efficient use of its human, financial, and natural resources
- Commercial performance of the MDB's private sector operations, i.e., degree to which these have had wider impacts on private sector development and extent to which these have catalyzed private sector investment in the country
- Anticipated and unanticipated impacts from major projects or programs identified for illustration of magnitude and pattern of intervention effects (e.g., from impact studies or beneficiary surveys)
- Evidence that impacts attributable to country program have been, to the extent feasible, isolated from those caused by other factors
- The program's additional contribution to development impacts (e.g., delivering relevant knowledge or advice, catalyzing change, and fostering more effective use of external resources)

- Degree to which the MDB's assistance makes a meaningful contribution to the government's efforts to foster achievement of the following MDGs:
 - reduce the proportion of people living in extreme poverty by half between 1990 and 2015
 - enroll all children in primary school by 2015
 - make progress toward gender equality and empowering women by eliminating gender disparities in primary and secondary education by 2015
 - reduce infant and child mortality rates by two thirds between 1990 and 2015
 - reduce maternal mortality ratios by three quarters between 1990 and 2015
 - provide access for all who need reproductive health services by 2015
 - implement national strategies for sustainable development by 2005 so as to reverse the loss of environmental resources by 2015

Additional Criteria

A. Positioning: *a measure of how well the MDB responded to (or even anticipated) the evolving development challenges and priorities of the government, built on its comparative advantage, and designed the country strategies and programs in a manner that took into consideration the support available from other development partners.*

- Country priorities and the MDB's corporate priorities were aligned
 - country goals and the MDB's corporate goals were aligned
 - strategic pillars were aligned to contribute to country strategic objectives
 - strategic gaps and risks were identified and agreed upon with the government
- Timing and scope of the MDB's engagement were in what turned out to be major development priorities of country
- Program was results-oriented, coherent, and translated strategy into appropriate operations, which collectively addressed critical development constraints
- Strategic focus was appropriate by sector, target group, and geographic area
- Program provided critical mass of assistance, sufficient to generate sustained results
- Mix of lending and nonlending services, as well as operational approaches, were tailored to the particular conditions of the country
- Productive relationships were forged with other development partners within the wider framework of development cooperation in the country

- The MDB was well positioned to respond effectively to country priorities
 - the MDB was structured, staffed, and managed to respond effectively to client requests
 - institutional arrangements fostered the generation and use of new knowledge to spur innovation
 - assistance was managed for delivery of development results
 - corporate safeguards were adhered to
- Results were delivered, and the most strategic opportunities for assistance were exploited effectively

B. Coherence:¹ *the extent to which there were measures aimed at fostering internal and external synergies within the MDB's program; this can include complementarity between different program elements, the extent to which the MDB's policies are self-reinforcing, and the extent to which external partnerships promote an efficient and effective division of labor in providing assistance that allows for complementarities and synergies with other development partners' programs.*

- Country priorities served to establish main development objectives
- Country strategies were realistic for forging progress toward selected development objectives and were aligned with, and supportive of, implementation of national development strategies and policies
- Country assistance program was designed to make a substantial contribution to achievement of defined objectives
- Choice of assistance, across objective area, included measures that would be innovative and have positive synergies and demonstration spillovers and foster complementary activities, so that value of program as a whole would be greater than sum of its individual parts
- Strategies and assistance choices were aligned with and supportive of assistance provided by other development partners in an effective division of labor
- Assistance instruments were chosen, and effectively integrated, to ensure that response to development challenges was sufficient, complete, and cohesive
- Choice of sectors, regions, and target groups was consistent with needs identified to meet program objectives

C. Institutional Development: *the extent to which the MDB's assistance improved or weakened the ability of the country to make more efficient, equitable, and sustainable use of its human, financial, and natural resources, for example through better definition, stability, transparency, enforceability, and predictability*

¹ Coherence is a separate evaluative criterion used by the Office of Evaluation and Oversight of the Inter-American Development Bank. It is assessed as part of positioning by the Operations Evaluation Department of the Asian Development Bank.

of institutional arrangements; and/or better alignment of missions and capacities of organizations with their respective mandates.

- Contribution toward improving/strengthening capacity of public institutions to ensure stable, transparent, enforceable, and predictable execution of their mandates:
 - soundness of economic management
 - structure of public sector, and, in particular, civil service
 - institutional soundness of financial sector
 - soundness of legal, regulatory, and judicial systems
 - extent of monitoring and evaluation systems
 - effectiveness of aid coordination
 - degree of financial accountability
 - informal norms and practices that govern social and economic interactions
 - extent of building nongovernment organization capacity
 - level of social and environmental capital
- Contribution toward improving organizational capacity (in planning, policy analysis, skills upgrading, public awareness building and consultation, management, restructuring, decentralization, management of information systems, financial controls, financial restructuring, regulatory enforcement, and agency governance)
- Contribution toward improving private sector capacity (i.e., improving rules of the game for efficient, broad-based private sector development)
- Contribution to improving stability, diversity, and growth potential of financial sector services
- Contribution to improving nongovernment organization and civil society capacity
- Contribution toward improving governance of public sector (i.e., transparency, checks and balances, public participation, improved fiduciary policies and practices, and accountability in discharge of public duties)
- Extent to which capacity has been developed within the government to manage formulation and implementation of suitable public policies and programs

D. Borrower Performance: *focuses on the processes that underlie the borrower's effectiveness in discharging its responsibilities, with specific focus on the extent to which the government exhibited ownership of the assistance strategy and program.*

- Shared ownership of the MDB's country strategy and program
- Maintained high-level dialogue with the MDB's personnel and management
- Consulted with civil society and other stakeholders on program implementation
- Supported high-quality preparation of MDB-assisted projects:

- degree of ownership and involvement in identification and design
- political support for project-related reforms secured
- adequate institutional arrangements for program implementation
- Provided sufficient counterpart funds and project personnel
- Followed procurement and safeguard (i.e., resettlement, environmental, indigenous peoples, and fiduciary) guidelines
- Carefully supervised project implementation
- Engaged in high-quality dialogue on policy matters with the MDB
- Implemented policy reforms, agreed upon between the MDB and government, in a timely manner
- Provided policy framework supportive of effective aid utilization (i.e., supportive macroeconomic policies and complementary structural and sector policies)
- Fostered public outreach, disclosure, and awareness building throughout program implementation
- Provided results-based monitoring, evaluation, and reporting

E. MDB Performance: *focuses on the processes that underlie the MDB's effectiveness in discharging its responsibilities as a development partner, including compliance with basic corporate operating principles; consistency with furtherance of the MDB's corporate, country, and sector strategies; and its client service satisfaction.*

- Quality of strategy and program at entry:
 - appropriate degree of selectivity
 - grounding in recent economic and sector work
 - adequate economic and financial rationale
 - adequate risk assessment
 - realistic assessment of financial requirements and borrowing capacity
 - incorporation of lessons identified in past evaluations
 - adequate institutional analysis
 - adequate poverty, social (including gender), environmental, and stakeholder analysis
 - incorporation of monitoring and evaluation indicators and reporting procedures
 - focus on areas of MDB comparative advantage
 - appropriate mix of assistance instruments selected
 - assistance strategy and program was suitable, given country context and institutional capacity of the government
- Quality of the MDB's supervision:
 - degree to which supervision focused on achieving objectives
 - degree to which civil society participation was fostered in program implementation
 - problems identified during implementation were expeditiously assessed and resolved

- adequate resources devoted by the MDB to supervision
- attention paid to monitoring and evaluation data and processes
- quality and timeliness of self-assessment (i.e., country strategy completion reporting)
- Quality of other services:
 - built client ownership of the assistance program
 - built strong links between strategy and analytical and advisory services
 - provided high-quality knowledge products
 - maintained high-quality dialogue with government and civil society
 - maintained high quality at entry for new projects
 - explained and provided training in its policies, safeguards, and procedures
 - provided personnel with appropriate skills mix to develop strategy and program
 - strengthened the government's capacity for financial management and accountability
 - enforced compliance with procurement guidelines, audit requirements, and other project cost controls
 - managed portfolio effectively
 - provided timely notice to the board of fundamental changes in its strategy
 - solicited feedback on, and was responsive to, requests for ways of improving its performance
 - provision of necessary long-term financing
 - provision of suitable risk mitigation services

F. Partner Coordination: *the contribution made by the MDB to coordinating external assistance and to building government and country ownership of external assistance processes.*

- Degree to which assistance fostered government leadership of aid coordination
- Degree to which assistance built the government's capacity to plan its public investment and to mobilize and manage external assistance (including debt management) effectively
- Degree to which the MDB played a role in catalyzing or otherwise inspiring other stakeholders to cooperate toward achieving common development results
- Degree to which policies and strategies pursued by other partners were consistent with those pursued by the MDB (i.e., if there were major conflicts or inconsistencies, were steps taken to resolve these?)
- Extent to which assistance effort played catalytic role in resource mobilization

- Degree to which the MDB coordinated and mobilized aid resources effectively
- Degree to which the MDB served as an effective aid partner in terms of knowledge sharing, support for and participation in multipartner initiatives, design of complementary assistance initiatives, assistance provided to other partners to resolve problems of wider concern, and active participation in aid coordination arrangements

Sources: African Development Bank. 2004. *Guidelines for Country Assistance Evaluation* (prepared by O. Ojo). Tunis; Asian Development Bank. 2006. *Guidelines for the Preparation of Country Assistance Program Evaluation Reports*. Manila; Inter-American Development Bank. 2003. *Protocol for the Conduct of Country Program Evaluations*, Revised Version, Report RE-271-I. Washington, DC; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development–Development Assistance Committee. 1999. *Evaluating Country Programmes. Report of the Vienna Workshop*. Paris; World Bank. 2003. *Country Evaluation Guidelines* (Internet version) and *Country Questionnaire*. Washington, DC; and 2005. *Country Assistance Evaluation Retrospective: An OED Self-Evaluation*. Washington, DC.

Harmonizing Evaluation Work

The Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG) works to strengthen cooperation among evaluators and promote harmonization of evaluation approaches among its member institutions.

Established in October 1995 by the heads of the evaluation departments of major development finance institutions, the ECG comprises the African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, European Investment Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, International Monetary Fund, and World Bank Group

ECG Secretariat
Operations Evaluation Department
Asian Development Bank
6 ADB Avenue, Mandaluyong City
1550 Metro Manila, Philippines
<http://www.ecgnet.org>
Publication Stock No. BBK201208
ISBN 978-971-561-748-2