

**AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK GROUP**



**2000 ANNUAL REPORT**

**OPERATIONS EVALUATION DEPARTMENT  
(OPEV)**

**NOVEMBER 2001**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE YEAR 2000 WORK PROGRAMME	1
2.1 Post-Evaluation of Project and Programme Performances	1
2.2 Thematic, Sector Policy and Impact Evaluation Studies	4
2.3 Review of Operating and Portfolio Management Procedures	5
2.4 Evaluation of Country Assistance Strategies	5
2.5 Development Effectiveness Activities	6
2.6 Other Post-Evaluation Activities	6
2.7 Results of, and Constraints on the Implementation of OPEV Activities in the year 2000	7
3. FEEDBACK AND UTILIZATION OF EVALUATION RESULTS	8
3.1 Towards an Integrated System for Evaluation and Monitoring of Development Effectiveness	8
3.2 Dissemination of Evaluation Results	9
3.3 Results of the Activities of the Evaluation Cooperation Group of the Multilateral Development Banks	10
3.4 Other Activities relating to the Dissemination and Utilization of Evaluation Results	10
4. DEVELOPMENT OF EVALUATION CAPACITIES	11
4.1 Regional Seminar and Workshop on Monitoring/Evaluation Capacity Development in Africa	11
4.2 Cooperation in Support of the Establishment of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems	12
5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	13
5.1 Conclusions	13
5.2 Recommendations	14

### Annexes

### Number of Pages

1-	List of PPER and PCR prepared during the year 2000	1
2-	Quality of PCR considered in 1999-2000	2

### Boxes

- A- Towards an Integrated System for Evaluation of Development Effectiveness:  
    Results-based Management
- B- Quality of the Active Projects Supervision Procedure: Some Areas for Improvement
- C- Outcome of the Regional Development Seminar on Monitoring –Evaluation Capacities  
    (Johannesburg, 25-29 September 2000)

## 1. **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 OPEV's 2000 activities formed an integral part of the 1999-2001 Three-Year Rolling Programme<sup>1</sup>, discussed by the Committee of Operations and Development Effectiveness (CODE) and submitted to the Boards of Directors for approval. This Work Programme took these recommendations into consideration, as well as some new aspects under the replenishment of ADF-VIII and the implications of the development of harmonization and coordination activities among the different Multilateral Development Banks (MDB).
- 1.2 OPEV's strategic guidelines for the 1999-2001 period were to devote a significant share of its activities to the gradual introduction of new evaluation concepts and practices which are common to all the Multilateral Development Banks (MDB), and to the conduct of thematic, sector and impact evaluation studies, as well as evaluations of assistance to regional member countries. Post-evaluations (the preparation of project/programme performance evaluation reports) were only to comprise approximately 45% of OPEV's activities, which would enable it to cover new areas of evaluation such as the Bank's operation strategies in regional member countries.
- 1.3 OPEV was to focus on development effectiveness aspects and move towards an integrated performance evaluation system based on an assessment of the relevance of the goals and objectives pursued, the efficacy of the implementation of economic, social and institutional development activities, as well as on long-term sustainability factors.
- 1.4 OPEV was also to work closely, through cooperation and partnership agreements, with the other socio-economic development and research institutions and contribute towards the development and building of institutional evaluation capacities in regional member countries.

## 2. **STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2000 WORK PROGRAMME**

### 2.1 **Post Evaluation of Project and Programme Performances**

- 2.1.1 In the year 2000, OPEV prepared 14 project and programme evaluation reports (PPER) out of the estimated 15<sup>2</sup> and 12 evaluation notes on completion reports (PCR) out of the estimated 20. 37 Project completion reports were received in the year 2000.
- 2.1.2 A sampling of the review notes (a total of 17) prepared between 1999 and 2001 (refer to Annex 2), shows that 88.2% of the PCR (i.e. 15 reports) were considered satisfactory overall, 23.5% of which (i.e. 4 PCR) were highly satisfactory. This satisfactory quality of the PCR is mainly due to the application of the new guidelines for the preparation of completion reports contained in the Operations Manual which entered into force in June 1999. However, it conceals disparities with regard to the quality of the different chapters of the completion reports. In fact, the chapters concerning the implementation of the project, the conclusions and lessons learned are considered to be of satisfactory quality, whereas the chapters on performance evaluation (institutional, economic and financial performances) and on social and environmental impacts which require further analysis, were deemed to be unsatisfactory.

---

<sup>1</sup> Doc. ADB/BD/WP/99/133-ADF/BD/WP/99/125

<sup>2</sup> Revised Budget as at 30/06/2000

2.1.3 The PCRs reviewed led to the preparation of post-evaluation performance reports (PPER) in 76.5% of cases (i.e. 13 projects). This high rate is chiefly justified by the selection of post-evaluation themes retained in the OPEV work programme, but also by the need to deepen the analysis of performances, sustainability factors and the overall evaluation of development results on the basis of existing information gathered in the field. Efforts are thus expected to improve the analytical quality of the completion reports and the relevance of the lessons learned and recommendations for the design and implementation of future operations.

2.1.4 With regard to the preparation of performance evaluation reports, the sector breakdown of PPERs, initiated and finalized in 2000 is as follows:

**Table 2.1: Sector Breakdown of PPERs finalized in the Year 2000**

Sector Code	Sector of Intervention	Number of PPER	Number of Projects	%
A	Agriculture and Rural Development (including rural poverty reduction projects)	5	7	36
B-H	Industry (including lines of credit)	-	-	-
D	Transport	-	-	-
E	Water Supply and Sanitation	2	2	14
F	Energy	-	-	-
G	Communications	1	1	7
I	Social (Education & Health)	2	5	14
K	Multisector & Policy-based Operations	4	4	28
	Total	14	19	100

Source : OPEV

2.1.5 The above table shows the predominance of project post evaluations in the agriculture and rural development sectors, and in respect of multisector projects, and the small number of post evaluations in the industry, transport and communications, and energy sectors. This was influenced by the themes selected in the OPEV Work Programme, but also by a reduction in OPEV's staffing of three professionals (refer to section 2.7).

2.1.6 The coverage rate of completed projects, for which PCRs were prepared, by performance evaluation reports for the 1998-2000 period<sup>3</sup> is as follows:

<sup>3</sup> In view of the time lag between the reception date of PCRs and their consideration by OPEV up to the preparation of PPERs, it was deemed more important to determine a moving average coverage rate over a three-year period.

**Table 2.2 : Coverage Rate of Completed Projects by a PCR/PPER**  
**(Basis: Documents Distributed to the Boards over the 1998-2000 Period)**

Sector Code	Sector of Intervention	Number of PCR received	Number of Projects covered by PPER	Coverage Rate (%)
A	Agriculture and Rural Development (including Rural Poverty Reduction Projects)	23	12	52
B-H	Industry (including Lines of Credit)	19	5	26
C	Environment	1	-	-
D	Transport	18	12	67
E	Water Supply and Sanitation	10	4	40
F	Energy	8	2	25
G	Communications	4	4	100
I	Social (Education & Health)	16	6	37
K	Multisector and Policy-based Operations	29	10	34
	Total	129	55	43

Source : Documents distributed to the Boards (SEGL)

2.1.7 The above table shows that the rate of coverage of completed projects, which were the subject of a completion report (PCR), by a post evaluation (PPER) is 43%. However, this rate will differ from the coverage rate of completed projects by year of approval. In fact, the latter provides more information on the minimum percentage of evaluations to be conducted every year with a view to an objective assessment for each fiscal year of the quality of completed projects at the portfolio exit point (refer to Table 2.4).

2.1.8 Since OPEV's establishment in 1987, 320 projects have been the subject of post-evaluation reports. The sector distribution of these projects is as follows :

**Table 2.3 : Sector Distribution of Post-Evaluated Projects as at 31/12/2000**

Sector Code	Sector of Intervention	Number of Projects	%
A	Agriculture and Rural Development (including Agricultural Lines of Credit)	74	23.3
B-H	Banks and Industry (including lines of credit)	48	15.1
D	Transport	54	17.0
E	Water Supply and Sanitation	26	8.2
F	Energy	26	8.2
G	Communications	17	5.3
I	Social (Education, Health)	39	12.2
K	Multisector & Policy-based operations	34	10.7
	Total	318	100.0

Source : OPEV

2.1.9 This table shows that the sector distribution of post-evaluated projects closely follows that of Bank Group activities (in terms of the number of operations). From 1999-2000 efforts were, therefore, made with regard to the evaluation of social projects and multisector programmes.

2.1.10 The post-evaluated projects are broken down as follows by year of approval:

**Table 2.4 : Breakdown of Post-evaluated Projects as at 31/12/2000**

Year	Approvals (*)			Evaluations (PPER)			Coverage Rate as a %		
	ADB	ADF	Total	ADB	ADF	Total	ADB	ADF	Total
1982-86	438	373	811	140	106	246	32	28	30
1987	24	48	72	9	6	15	37	13	21
1988	27	43	70	11	7	18	40	16	26
1989	36	51	87	4	5	9	11	10	10
1990	31	53	84	5	4	9	16	7	11
1991	41	67	108	3	6	9	7	10	6
1992	36	57	93	3	2	5	8	3	5
1993	28	41	69	1	1	2	3	2	3
1994	27	-	27	1	-	1	3	-	4
1995	11	-	11	-	-	-	-	-	-
1996	11	19	30	-	1	1	-	5	3
1997	17	58	75	-	2	2	12	3	3
1998	13	41	54	-	1	1	7	2	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>740</b>	<b>851</b>	<b>1591</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>20</b>

Source: Compendium of Statistics (Project database)

(\*) Project Loans and Policy-based Loans

2.1.11 The table shows that the overall coverage rate is an average of approximately 20% (24% for ADB projects and only 17% for ADF projects). This rate fluctuates between 28% and 32% for projects approved between 1982 and 1986, but only 2-11% for those approved after 1988. On the basis of an optimum rate of coverage of completed projects by a completion report of approximately 90% and by a post evaluation report of 30% per year of approval, the scale of the efforts to be deployed over the next three years may be assessed, with a view to ensuring an objective and relevant evaluation of the quality of completed projects (at the portfolio exit point) especially for the 1987 – 1998 approval period. In fact, on the basis of an average project implementation period over the 1996-1998 period of approximately five (5) years, completion and post-evaluation reports should number 53 and 16 respectively per year over the next three years, not taking into consideration the cumulative slippage since 1990 on the production of completion and post-evaluation reports.

2.1.12 In order to speed up the completion report preparation process and to attain the optimum rate of coverage of completed projects, OPEV will have to annually indicate to the Operations Departments the sectors, as well as the priority countries, for which an in-depth and comprehensive review of results and development impacts of operations financed (projects, policy reform programmes and technical assistance operations) should be carried out.

## **2.2 Thematic, Sector Policy and Impact Evaluation Studies**

2.2.1 As decided by the members of CODE, OPEV submits reviews of the Bank's experience with regard to the themes or sectors retained on the basis of the results of recent evaluations in the sector or country concerned. This new product has the advantage of providing a summary of the results of experiences in the sectors or countries and focusing discussion on the most relevant lessons with a view to enhancing the quality of ongoing and future operations. Thus, four review notes were prepared and submitted to CODE members in the year 2000. These

review notes of the Bank's experience concerned projects in the following sectors or subsectors:

- Rural Development and Poverty Reduction
- Education (Botswana)
- Scientific, Technical and Vocational Education

2.2.2 Other reviews are being prepared and, in particular, concern:

- Capacity Building of Public Utilities
- Critical Factors of Satisfactory Structural and Sector Adjustment Programmes.

2.2.3 At the level of the Bank's sector policy review, OPEV completed preparation of the evaluation study on the experience and lessons learned from transport projects and programmes, as well as the Bank's environmental protection policy, in cooperation with OESU (on Canadian bilateral financing). Furthermore, OPEV submitted two reviews of the Bank's experience in the water supply and sanitation sector (in urban and rural areas) and submitted a Synthesis Report as part of the evaluation of the Bank's policy in the sector. The following reviews are under preparation in 2000 :

- Telecommunications projects
- Rural Finance
- Agricultural Sector Adjustment Programmes

2.2.4 As part of the ADF VIII mid-term review, OPEV coordinated the mid-term review of the AMINA programme which was conducted by a consultancy firm. The results of the review were discussed by CODE members and submitted to the ADF plenipotentiaries.

### 2.3 **Review of Operating and Portfolio Management Procedures**

The studies relating to the review of project cycle management and portfolio quality enhancement procedures, were conducted in conformity with the estimates. They included, in particular, the study on the efficacy of the supervision process and the review of the process of preparation of the annual portfolio performance report for 1998 which was submitted to CODE at the same time as the discussion of the 1999 annual portfolio performance report.

### 2.4 **Evaluation of Country Assistance Strategies**

In the year 2000, OPEV completed the preparation of two evaluations of assistance strategies for regional member countries (Burkina Faso and Lesotho). The principal objective of such evaluations was to review the relevance, efficacy and efficiency of the Bank's operation strategies, and to improve the design and implementation framework of the new strategies for these countries, in order to ensure that the cumulative experience in the country culminates in more realistic approaches, in conformity with the development objectives and national priorities of these countries. OPEV prioritizes cooperation with partner institutions such as the World Bank for the conduct of this type of evaluation. This was made possible in the case of Lesotho, under the strategic partnership with the World Bank.

## 2.5 **Development Effectiveness Activities**

- 2.5.1 In view of the importance of the development effectiveness concept, and the need to procure methodological tools to assess the Bank's overall strategy and to see to the monitoring of activities aimed at improving the management of its portfolio, it was deemed important to include under this heading activities relating to the design and implementation of the integrated system for evaluation of development effectiveness and preparation of the related methodological notes, the preparation of annual or bi-annual reports on the results of performance and development impact evaluations, as well as the preparation of the performance evaluation framework.
- 2.5.2 In that context, OPEV presented a concept paper on the integrated system for monitoring and evaluation of development effectiveness with a results-based management approach. The CODE members approved the initiative and recommended the formation of a task force to be responsible for implementing these systems. OPEV will have to play a resource and support role for the different stages of implementation of the system until the permanent monitoring system is operational in the form of a computerized management information system incorporated in the Project Africa.
- 2.5.3 The other development effectiveness activities concerned the preparation of documents on sector performance indicators (transport, water supply and sanitation) which were widely disseminated within the Bank. Furthermore, OPEV revised the Evaluation Guidelines and Methods (effective 2001) by introducing recommendations stemming from the discussions of the Evaluation Cooperation Group of the Multilateral Development Banks, the objective of which was to ensure the comparability and transparency of evaluation results, the dissemination of best practices in respect of evaluation techniques and the harmonization of performance indicators and evaluation criteria, without losing sight of the different circumstances of each institution.
- 2.5.4 With regard to the preparation of periodic reports, in 2000 OPEV submitted the 2001-2003 three-year rolling programme, as well as the mid-term review report on the year 2000 budget. Measures were also taken to prepare the synthesis review of the evaluation results for 1996-1998 and 1999-2000.

## 2.6 **Other Post-Evaluation Activities**

### a) **Building the Bank's Internal Capacity**

- 2.6.1 Building the Bank's internal evaluation capacities over the period focused mainly on OPEV's participation in a conference on the evaluation and reduction of poverty, participatory evaluation methods and seminars on country assistance strategy evaluation. OPEV staff also participated in the preparation of operational guidelines for the economic analysis and financial management of projects.
- 2.6.2 OPEV also participated in task forces with a view to preparing new procedures for the design and implementation of technical assistance projects on the basis of recommendations stemming from a review of the evaluation of the efficacy and efficiency of ADF Technical Assistance Fund operations, carried out by OPEV in 1998.

b) Evaluation Cooperation

2.6.3 This activity primarily concerned OPEV's participation in the half yearly meetings of the OCDE Development Assistance Committee Working Party on Aid Evaluation, and the meetings of the Evaluation Cooperation Committee of the Multilateral Development Banks.

2.6.4 In the year 2000, OPEV participated in the discussions on harmonization of the evaluation procedures and methods for private sector investment operations, as well as of evaluation criteria for public sector investments. These two activities fall within the framework of the monitoring of the implementation of the recommendations of the Development Assistance Working Party on enhancement of the efficacy of Multilateral Development Bank operations.

c) Post-Evaluation Computer System

2.6.5 The year 2000 saw the start up of the design of the SAP module (Project Africa) on the management of projects within the Bank. OPEV contributed to this phase in so far as the principal technical logical support of the integrated monitoring-evaluation system will stem from the SAP system which entered into force in 2001. OPEV also participated in the design of the new electronic page and the Bank's Internet/Intranet sites.

2.6.6 OPEV's electronic page will be available in 2001. It will be located in the Bank's Internet site in its new dynamic presentation.

2.7 **Results of, and Constraints on OPEV Activities in the Year 2000**

2.7.1 Under the early retirement operation concerning a number of Bank staff, OPEV lost two professionals. A third professional was appointed to act as Division Manager of the Administration Department (CADM). This had an impact on the volume of the Department's activities, which was adjusted under the annual budget mid-term review. However, and overall, the composition and number of OPEV professional staff, which was inadequate and unevenly distributed among the Bank's sectors of operation, especially in the social sectors and in terms of working language, make it necessary to use consultancy services to make up the shortfalls noted. The level of attainment of objectives was consequently affected, and is as follows for the different activities of OPEV:

**Table 2.5 : Status of OPEV activities as at 31/12/2000**

Activity	Objectives (*) (Number of Products)	Outputs as at 31/12/2000	Implementation Rate (as a percentage)
PCR Review Notes	20	12	60
PPER	15	14	93
Experience Review Notes	6	6	100
Study on Review Procedures	3	3	100
Thematic Studies	6	6(**)	100
Country Assistance Review	3	2	66
Evaluation Capacity Building	1	1	100
Development Effectiveness	5	3	60
Dissemination Activities and Feedback	1	1	100

(\*) 2000 Revised Programme

(\*\*) Three reviews are being finalized

- 2.7.2 This table shows that, overall, the revised objectives have been achieved especially in respect of studies, which represented almost 30% of OPEV professionals' time in the year 2000. The performance evaluation activity objectives (55% of available time) were not fully attained, especially with regard to completion report reviews. Their small number is primarily due to the retirement of two professionals in charge of the social and public utilities sectors.
- 2.7.3 It should be noted that the enhanced quality of the PCRs will lead to a reduction in resources allocated to the preparation of evaluation reports, which will be rechannelled towards OPEV's recently launched products: preparation of country assistance strategy evaluations, sector or thematic experience reviews, operational procedures, as well as the conduct of sector policy evaluations.

### 3. **FEEDBACK AND UTILIZATION OF EVALUATION RESULTS**

#### 3.1 **Towards an Integrated System for Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Effectiveness**

- 3.1.1 OPEV submitted to CODE, at its meeting of 22 September 2000, a document entitled 'Towards an Integrated System of Evaluation of Development Effectiveness –Results-Based Management' (ADB/BD/WP/2000/89). This document underscored the need to shift from input/output evaluation to the evaluation of effects and impacts, in order to measure the level of success or failure of the development assistance provided by the Bank Group as a result of the introduction of a results-based management (RBM) system, the characteristics of which are described below (BOX A).

#### BOX A

##### **Towards an Integrated System for Evaluation of Development Effectiveness: Results-Based Management**

Many organizations, cooperation agencies and governments have adopted the results-based management (RBM) system to define a cohesive training and accountability framework in a decentralized environment. The RBM supports the ongoing transition in the Institution from an annual budget exercise towards a strategy-driven planning cycle, and from input/output to results-based internal management. RBM focuses on development effectiveness and accountability, and is fully in keeping with the requirements of the new external environment. It fosters a culture based on results in the field as well as on greater transparency and participation.

The results chain reflects the RBM framework: inputs follow a process which leads to the outputs, then to the effects, and finally the impacts:

*INPUT → PROCESS → OUTPUT → EFFECT → IMPACT*

While the implementation modalities vary from institution to institution, all the RBM systems share the following characteristics:

1. Clearly defined goals and objectives of the organization
2. Clearly defined responsibilities within a decentralized framework
3. Results-based performance measurement
4. Linkages between results, planning and resource allocation
5. Training Culture (and the use of lessons learned from experience)
6. Client focus
7. Stakeholder participation

- 3.1.2 The results-based management and development effectiveness monitoring-evaluation systems will be implemented in several stages. OPEV will initially play a leadership role in the preparation of the necessary evaluation tools which will be contained in the design document. OCOD and OESU will take over in the second phase, which will involve the systematization of strategic planning, by the preparation of strategic frameworks at the level of the Vision and sector and thematic policies. Finally, the country operations group will be responsible in this third phase for preparing the country assistance strategy framework, which will provide the linkage between sector strategies and policies and the objectives of the selected projects/programmes. The fourth stage will comprise the operationalization of the permanent monitoring system on the computer base of the SAP system, which will involve most Bank Departments.
- 3.1.3 In its reaction to this document, CODE invited Management to set up a Task Force comprising representatives of the operations complex and other Vice-Presidencies with a view to preparing an implementation plan and clearly defining the strategies and procedures for the implementation of an 'Integrated System for Evaluation of Development Effectiveness'

## 3.2 **Dissemination of Evaluation Results**

- 3.2.1 The study on the quality of the supervision process, the results of which were widely distributed among the Operations Departments, revealed a number of shortcomings to be corrected with a view to improving the quality of the implementation of active projects and programmes in the portfolio. In response to the conclusions and recommendations of the report, the Committee invited Management to take into consideration the areas of improvement described in Box B below. The study report, as well as the formal reply of the Vice-Presidency, Operations were submitted to CODE for consideration in February-March 2000.

### BOX B

#### **Quality of the Supervision Process of Active Projects**

##### **Some Areas for Improvement**

1. The Bank's Country Assistance Strategy Paper, on which the lending programme is based, should take into consideration sector priorities where the Bank will have a greater impact on development;
2. Greater priority should be granted to supervision activities which should go beyond the evaluation of administrative or physical performances and cover development impact aspects;
3. Though the opening of the Bank's country offices is helping to enhance the quality of the supervision process, mid-term reviews should be systematized and from time to time independent evaluations carried out so as to ensure the efficacy and efficiency of these review procedures;
4. Accountability, flexibility, transparency and diligence in the dissemination of the results of the Bank supervision missions should serve as the guiding principles for all quality supervision activities.

- 3.2.2 OPEV also submitted summary notes on the lessons learned from specific projects the aim of which is to provide the Bank's sector experts with best practices and the results of experiences following the implementation of these projects. In particular, these notes concerned the sugar, rural water supply, technical and vocational education, rural development and poverty reduction projects. The subsequent recommendations were approved by CODE with a view to their consideration in the design and implementation of the Bank's future operations.

3.2.3 OPEV presented the results of the mid-term review of the ADF programme concerning support to micro-finance in Africa (AMINA Programme) which were discussed at a special meeting of CODE at which it was recommended that the Bank's micro-financing strategy be revisited with a view to providing an appropriate solution to capacity building in African micro-finance institutions. The study report, which also contained a review of the programme results by target country, was widely disseminated to the Bank's Operations Departments at the meetings held to present and discuss the conclusions and recommendations of the study, led by the consultants.

### 3.3 **Results of the Activities of the Evaluation Cooperation Group of the Multilateral Development Banks.**

3.3.1 In the context of the activities of the Evaluation Cooperation Group of the Multilateral Development Banks on the harmonization of evaluation policies, methods and procedures, OPEV participated in the conduct of major studies which impacted directly on the development of tools and best practices in respect of portfolio performance and country assistance evaluation as well as sector and thematic policy evaluations.

3.3.2 With regard to the harmonization of public sector project and programme performance evaluation criteria, and as in the case of private sector investment operations, a task force was created to comprehensively review the rules and procedures for the evaluation of public sector operations and lead to the adoption of a series of best practices comprising a set of performance evaluation indicators to be used in the evaluation of results and the impact of projects on development. The entire Multilateral Development Bank (MDB) Group is adopting this framework.

3.3.3 As from 1999, OPEV initiated a large-scale review of its evaluation methods with the inclusion of new concepts, as well as reference indicators in the performance evaluation guidelines. The revised guidelines for evaluation procedures and methods have been submitted to the members of CODE for information. This initiative will be pursued by the dissemination of performance evaluation procedures and practices in respect of private sector operations.

3.3.4 Closer cooperation is expected among MDB following the adoption of these criteria, especially in the evaluation of cofinanced projects through exchanges of completion and post evaluation reports, the joint evaluation of country assistance strategies, as well as sector and thematic evaluations.

### 3.4 **Other Activities relating to the Dissemination and Utilization of Evaluation Results**

3.4.1 OPEV participated in various working groups and meetings within the Operations Departments focusing on financial sector policy documents, development finance institutions, agricultural institutions and sector reviews of livestock and aquaculture projects. These contributions provided opportunities to present the results of experiences and lessons learned in these areas.

3.4.2 OPEV also participated in the design and implementation of the SAP system, one module of which was devoted to post-evaluation and project and programme performance ratings. The effective utilization of this system which will enter into force in 2001, will permit the conduct of cross-cutting country and sector analyses on the quality of Bank Group-financed operations.

#### 4. **DEVELOPMENT OF EVALUATION CAPACITIES**

##### 4.1 **Regional Seminar and Workshop on Monitoring-Evaluation Capacity Development in Africa<sup>4</sup>**

4.1.1 This seminar was held from 25 to 29 September 2000 and brought together 56 participants from 11 regional member countries<sup>5</sup> and 32 participants from donor organizations. Its principal goals were to:

- define the requirement and capability for monitoring and evaluation in the context of good governance and accountability for better results;
- familiarize the participants with the utilization of monitoring and evaluation systems ;
- design and conduct cost effective evaluations of issues relating to gender, human rights, corruption, the environment and infrastructure, participatory methods and local knowledge sharing;
- encourage professional teambuilding through national networks and monitoring and evaluation service providers;
- develop a collaborative strategy and adequate infrastructure for a pan-African network which will adopt best monitoring-evaluation practices in Africa.

4.1.2 Consolidating the achievements of the first regional conference on evaluation held in Abidjan in 1990, and the regional seminar on monitoring-evaluation capacity development held at Abidjan in November 1998, as well as the outcome of the inaugural conference of the Pan-African Evaluation Association held in Nairobi in 1999, the seminar organized in association with the Development Bank for Southern Africa and the World Bank, fostered the creation of an evaluative culture in African in the context of transparency and good governance with a view to improving the development effectiveness of the results.

4.1.3 The report on the seminar, which is being published, will be widely disseminated in the participating countries and the Ministries of regional member countries. The principal results of the seminar are presented in Box C below.

---

<sup>4</sup> This seminar received financial support from the following organizations: World Bank, Development Bank for Southern Africa (DBSA); Swiss Development Cooperation Agency (SDC) ; Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs; and the contribution of the UNICEF and CRDI (Canada) Regional Representation in Southern Africa.

<sup>5</sup> Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Niger, the Republic of South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia.

BOX C**Results of the Regional Seminar on Monitoring-Evaluation Capacity Development in Africa  
Johannesburg, 25-29 September 2000**

1. Forty-five (45) documents discussed during the seminar covered the different aspects of evaluation and the challenge of development in Africa, the efforts of some countries in the development of the demand and infrastructure necessary for monitoring-evaluation and the introduction of new evaluative methods, the African experience in the development of monitoring and evaluation systems, the establishment of national evaluation associations and opportunities for international cooperation, and concluded with a glance at the future.
2. The principal outcomes of the seminar were a better perception of the role of evaluation in the establishment of good governance focused on greater accountability of the decision-making bodies at government level and greater transparency in the implementation of administrative reforms. With the introduction of the integrated development framework and poverty reduction strategy approach, the monitoring-evaluation system gains in importance in the evaluation of results and through the strengthening of the role of civil society in the evaluation of the performance of government activities. In fact, the evaluation of development should be focused on the measurement of results in terms of enhanced social conditions.
3. The evaluation should focus on the relevance of development activities, the degree of country ownership and the commitment with a view to obtaining sustainable long-term results. The lessons learned from the evaluation should serve development and the representatives of civil society should become involved in the evaluation exercise with a view to ensuring the relevance and consideration of the country's needs and priorities.
4. The development of evaluation capacities requires an increase in both the supply (qualifications, instruments and institutional structure of evaluation at country level) and demand for evaluation (sensitization to the need to have a monitoring and evaluation system the scope, objectives and possible uses of which should be properly understood). The consideration of local conditions, values and country standards is pivotal to the design and implementation of such systems.
5. Such gatherings foster exchanges of experiences and networking with a view to ensuring effective collaboration. A pan-African monitoring and evaluation network will make it possible to systematically transfer knowledge, establish norms and standards and boost the development of national networks.
6. African expertise and experiences in the area of evaluation already exist. The challenge lies in the national ownership of monitoring and evaluation systems and the development of systematic linkages with national and continent-wide economic and social development processes.

**4.2 Cooperation in support of the Establishment of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems**

A common stance was adopted under the Bank's Strategic Partnership with the World Bank with a view to carrying out joint evaluation development or capacity building activities in Africa. Furthermore, OPEV was invited to participate in the overall evaluation of the World Bank's initiative of the integrated development framework. During 2001-2002, this participation will entail diagnostic missions on the effects of the principles of the integrated development framework on some African countries such as Uganda, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, and Burkina Faso, the discussion and validation of evaluation results and the future development of these principles and approaches in the context of poverty reduction.

## 5. **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### 5.1 **Conclusions**

- 5.1.1 The achievements of the year 2000 were significant, especially in respect of thematic and sector studies, the review of the operational procedures of the project cycle and the strengthening of the feedback mechanism, and the incorporation of lessons learned from experiences. These achievements consolidate the activities already carried out to enhance the approaches and instruments adopted for the evaluation and measurement of development effectiveness.
- 5.1.2 The launching of new products such as the review of the Bank's experience in some sectors and evaluation studies on operating procedures have demonstrated the need to evaluate development effectiveness in the attainment of the Bank's strategic objectives, thus shifting the project focus to regional member countries as analysis units, as well as towards the new sector and crosscutting themes<sup>6</sup> and to a greater extent, towards the measurement of the results of the Vision.
- 5.1.3 Performance evaluations serve more as reference frameworks for evaluations of effectiveness and the impact of country assistance strategies, as well as thematic or sector reviews, which increases the relevance of the lessons learned and heightens the learning and knowledge management roles generated from the evaluation system, and strengthens the dialogue initiated with the Operations Departments under the aegis of CODE.
- 5.1.4 The September 2000 workshop and seminar confirmed the rationale of the Bank's activities in respect of monitoring and evaluation capacity development in member countries. African experience and expertise already exists. The consideration of local conditions, values and country standards is essential for the design and implementation of such systems which should serve development and permit the representatives of civil society to become more closely involved in the evaluation exercise.
- 5.1.5 The revision of the evaluation methods by the inclusion of new concepts, as well as reference indicators in the performance evaluation guidelines, is in keeping with the harmonization of evaluation rules and practices of Multilateral Development Banks. The revised guidelines of evaluation procedures and methods submitted for information to the members of CODE will be pursued by the dissemination of the performance evaluation procedures and practices of private sector operations.
- 5.1.6 The principal constraints to the attainment of the annual objectives of the Department remain tied to the need to beef up OPEV's staffing with a view to covering the principal themes of the Vision and to enable the preparation, as from 2003, of the annual report on development effectiveness as part of the implementation of the integrated evaluation system which the Bank intends to establish.
- 5.1.7 The strategic partnership agreement with the World Bank constitutes an appropriate framework for, on the one hand, building the Bank's internal monitoring and evaluation capacities, the coordination of capacity development efforts in member countries and, on the other the conduct of joint evaluations of country programmes and assistance strategies.

### 5.2 **Recommendations**

---

<sup>6</sup> poverty reduction, governance, post-conflict aid, regional and global public property, etc.

In order to consolidate the changes in evaluation approaches and tools and to tackle the key areas of development effectiveness, the following measures are recommended:

- (i) the review of the effectiveness of the Bank's sector assistance strategies for regional member countries, as well as the thematic and sector evaluations, will constitute a priority in the future activities of OPEV, for which additional resources (human and material) will have to be allocated.
- (ii) by assuming a resource and support role in the different stages of the implementation of the integrated system for evaluation of development effectiveness, OPEV will have to pursue its activities relating to the revision of the evaluation guidelines and methods and prepare documents on sector performance indicators.
- (iii) In the context of the implementation of a results-based management system, efforts will have to be coordinated to create a training culture within the Bank, especially to systematize and spread best practices, to train and recruit experts in knowledge management.
- (iv) as part of the activities concerning the monitoring of institutional capacity building for evaluation in member countries, the Bank will have to encourage meetings and exchanges of experiences within the framework of the pan-African monitoring and evaluation association as well as national networking, while strengthening the components on evaluation demand at country level through sensitization activities to ensure greater transparency in the context of good governance and administrative reform programmes.
- (v) OPEV will have to step up its cooperation and partnership efforts with the other development agencies operating on the continent, especially in the context of strategic partnerships, similar to that established with the World Bank.

**OPERATIONS EVALUATION DEPARTMENT**  
**THE YEAR 2000 ANNUAL REPORT**

**LIST OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS PROCESSED DURING THE  
YEAR 2000**

**A – Carried Over from 1999**

1. Benin : Telecommunications Development
2. Ethiopia : Sidamo-Gofa Rural Development
3. Togo : Structural Adjustment
4. Tunisia : Ghezala-Mateur Agricultural Development
5. Swaziland : Telecommunications III
6. Uganda : Water Supply and Sanitation for 5 Urban Centres
7. Lesotho : Khamane-Oxbow Road

**B – PPER initiated and finalized in the year 2000**

1. The Central African Republic: Rural Development of the Mbaiki Berberati Coffee-Growing Regions
2. Egypt : Economic Reform and Structural Adjustment
3. Tunisia : 2<sup>nd</sup> Agricultural Line of Credit (BNA)
4. Ethiopia : Structural Adjustment
5. Ghana : 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Agricultural Lines of Credit to the Agricultural Development bank of Ghana (AgDB)
6. Malawi : Primary and Secondary Education (Education III)
7. Nigeria : Bauchi Water Supply and Sanitation
8. Nigeria : 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Agricultural Lines of Credit to the Nigerian Agricultural Cooperative Bank (NACB)

**C – PPER initiated in 2000 being finalized**

9. Chad: Rehabilitation of Telecommunications Infrastructure
10. Uganda : Poverty Reduction
11. Botswana : Review of Bank Education Project Assistance
12. Malawi : Agricultural Sector Adjustment
13. Mauritania : Social Dimensions of Adjustment
14. Ethiopia : Institutional Support in the Water and Sanitation Sector



**OPERATIONS EVALUATION DEPARTMENT**  
**THE YEAR 2000 ANNUAL REPORT**

**QUALITY OF COMPLETION REPORTS (PCR)**  
(Analysis of PCR Review Note Forms)

**Table : 1 : Ratings per PCR Chapter**

PCR Chapter	RATINGS								TOTAL
	Highly Unsatisfactory (1)		Unsatisfactory (2)		Satisfactory (3)		Highly Satisfactory (4)		
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	
1. Project Goals/Objectives and Formulation	23.5	4	29.5	5	47.1	8	0.0	0	17
2. Execution and implementation	5.9	1	29.4	5	41.2	7	23.5	4	17
3. Project Performance	41.2	7	29.4	5	23.5	4	5.9	1	17
4. Environmental and Social Impact	25.0	4	37.5	6	37.5	6	0.0	0	16
5. Project Sustainability	6.3	1	37.4	6	50.0	8	6.3	1	16
6. Performance of the bank, Borrower and Cofinanciers	5.9	1	47.0	8	41.2	7	5.9	1	17
7. Overall Rating and Rating of Performance Criteria	0.0	0	0.0	0	100.0	3	0.0	0	3
8. Conclusions, Lessons Learned and Recommendations	5.9	1	41.2	7	52.8	9	0.0	0	17
9. Other Items	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	0.0	0	3
<b>AVERAGE OVERALL RATING</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11.8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>64.7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>23.5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>17</b>

Table 1 shows that the quality of the majority of the PCR analyzed (15 out of 17, i.e. 88.2%) is considered satisfactory overall. This relative satisfaction does, however, conceal some shortcomings which are revealed in a chapter by chapter analysis.

The chapters on project implementation, sustainability and the conclusions and lessons learned are the only ones considered satisfactory (or highly satisfactory) for over half of the PCRs (respectively 64.7% and 56.3% and 52.8% of the PCR for each of the chapters)

The other chapters have unsatisfactory ratings (or highly unsatisfactory) for most of the PCR. The chapter on the analysis of Project Performances in particular, has a highly unsatisfactory assessment (41.2% of PCR).

In addition, for approximately one out of four projects (23.5% exactly), the chapters on project objectives and formulation are highly unsatisfactory, which in most cases refers to ex-ante evaluations without an appropriate assessment of the quality of their formulation within the project framework or as they appear in the logical design framework of such projects (clarity and consistency of goals, objectives, outputs and activities/inputs).

**Table 2 : Frequency of Conclusions Learned from the Evaluation of PCR**

<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Number of Cases</b>
1. Summary Project Evaluation (Audit)	11.8	2
2. Intermediate Evaluation	5.9	1
3. Post-Evaluation of Performances	58.8	10
4. Awaiting Completion of another project for a joint performance audit	5.9	1
5. Sector Evaluation of the Bank's Intervention	11.8	2
6. The PCR is well-prepared but the information may be used in studying the Bank's experience	5.9	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>17</b>

**Source :** OPEV – Utilization of 199-2000 PCR Evaluation Notes

As shown in Table 2 below, it is noted that: over three out of four PCR (76.5%) recommended the preparation of an evaluation report. The remainder were considered as references for thematic or sector evaluations.