

AGENDA ITEM VI.

Evaluation in Global & Regional Multi-Donor Trust Funds and Partnership Programs: How to Proceed?

Room Document 7.

**EVALUATION IN GLOBAL & REGIONAL MULTI-DONOR
TRUST FUNDS AND PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMS: HOW TO PROCEED**

This document has been prepared by the IOB Netherlands for discussion at the 16th meeting of the DAC Evaluation Network.

Contact: Jan Klugkist, jan.klugkist@minbuza.nl

16th Meeting

12-13 February 2014

Evaluation in global & regional multi-donor trust funds and partnership programs: how to proceed?

Summary

This note discusses evaluation policies and practices in global & regional programs supported by DAC donors. While there appears to be some progress, adequate monitoring and evaluation remains a concern in many instances. The note suggests possible strategies for EvalNet and its members to address this.

Introduction

Trust funds accounted in recent years for 11-12% of all aid from OECD DAC members.¹ A large part of this funding is country-specific, but DAC members have also set up and supported several hundreds of global and regional funds and programs to address specific development needs and topical issues. The spectrum ranges from programmatic multi-donor trust funds (MDTFs) without governing bodies to so-called Global & Regional Partnership Programs (GRPPs) that have established a new organization with a governance structure and a management unit to achieve its goals (see table 1 in Annex for an illustrative list).²

Most of the partnership programs focus on a certain sector or theme, such as agriculture, climate, health, or international trade. Some of them are primarily policy or knowledge networks. Other (larger) programs provide local-level technical assistance and aim to catalyze public or private investment. The largest programs provide investment resources in support of global, regional, or national public goods.³

Most GRPPs are housed inside multilateral organizations, in particular the World Bank Group and UNDP. Some (larger) programs have their own (independent) evaluation units (like the Global Environment Fund GEF). While GRPPs that have their own governing bodies are more likely to have periodic external evaluations, programmatic trust funds without governing bodies are not evaluated systematically.

Concern about proper and consistent evaluation of these programs led to a debate in 2006 in DAC EvalNet, initiated by IEG (Independent Evaluation Group of the World Bank Group). IEG organized a workshop in Paris and produced a joint IEG/EvalNet document that would provide a standard for the evaluation of GRPPs. This *Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs - Indicative Principles and Standard* was published in early 2007.⁴ The Sourcebook was to improve the independence and quality of program-level evaluations of GRPPs, in order to enhance the relevance and effectiveness of the programs. The principal audiences would be the governing bodies and management units of GRPPs, as well as professional evaluators involved in the evaluation of the programs.⁵

¹ Worldbank (2012). Trust Fund Annual Report, Washington D.C.: World Bank 2012

² GRPPs have been defined as programmatic partnerships in which (1) the partners dedicate resources (financial, technical, staff) towards agreed objectives; (2) the scope of the activities is global, regional, or multi-country (not single-country); (3) the partners establish a new organization with a governance structure and a management unit to achieve its goals. This note aims to cover GRPPs and other trust funded global/regional level joint-donor programs.

³ IEG/Worldbank (2007). Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs - Indicative Principles and Standard, Washington D.C.: World Bank.

⁴ <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTGLOREGPARPROG/Resources/sourcebook.pdf>

⁵ In addition, IEG worked on the preparation of a *Guidebook Good Practice Guidelines and Examples for Evaluating GRPPs*. IEG reportedly conducted a systematic review of a representative sample of 60 evaluations of GRPPs in

Indications of the current state of evaluation and monitoring

The question is whether current M&E practices in global & regional programs live up to the standards foreseen.

In its latest biennial review of GRPPs, IEG compiled information on 17 GRPPs in which the Bank was involved over the period 2006-2010.⁶ On the state of the GRPP evaluation practices IEG concluded:⁷

- GRPPs are slowly developing a positive culture of evaluation;
- Ten of the sixteen external evaluations reviewed were independent at all stage of the evaluation process;
- Seven out of sixteen evaluations were of satisfactory quality with few shortcomings;
- Weak monitoring and evaluation frameworks adversely affected the quality of virtual all evaluations, especially in assessing achievements at the outcome level; many GRPPs continued to regard periodic evaluations as a substitute for putting adequate M&E systems in place;
- The external evaluations have had noticeable impacts on the programs.

As part of an evaluation of the Dutch contribution to the World Bank, IOB reviewed recent evaluations (2009-2012) of a selection of 9 GRPPs.⁸ Table 2 in the Annex presents an assessment of the quality of the M&E systems, based on the information contained in these evaluations. This generally confirmed the findings of IEG's 2011 assessment of GRPPs. Most of the programs in the IOB review were indeed improving their M&E system, but only few (PPIAF and CGAP) had it fully implemented at the moment they were evaluated. Data quality was thus found to be mostly unsatisfactory.

For the purpose of this note, IOB also made a quick scan of M&E frameworks of global/regional programs in which the World Bank did not play a role as host: UNDP administered MDTFs, MDTFs with other multilateral organizations, and stand-alone MDTFs. In a selection of 35 of such funds⁹, less than half made reference to an M&E framework on their website, while for just over half recent evaluations (2009-13) could be identified.¹⁰ Although all funds for which M&E guidelines could be identified addressed the monitoring of outputs in their M&E guidelines, the available evaluations and reviews of these funds often reported that outputs and outcomes were inadequately monitored.

order to identify best practice. Progress was reported in EvalNet meetings up to February 2010, but it appears that the document has not been finalized.

⁶ The 17 GRPPs were: GISP (Global Invasive Species), ProVention, IAASTD (Agr. Knowledge), ILC (Int. Land Coalition), GFHR (Health Research), ADEA (African Education), GDN (Global Dev. Network), GWP (Global Water P.ship), CGAP, PRHCBP (Reprod. Health Capacity Building), EITI (Transparency Extractive Industries), Cities Alliance, MBC (Mesoamerican Biological Corridor), Dev. Gateway, CEPF (Ecosystem), MMV (Medicines for Malaria), Stop TB.

⁷ IEG (2011). *The World Bank's Involvement in Global and Regional Partnership Programs: An Independent Assessment*, Washington D.C.: IEG/Wordbank.

⁸ The cases were purposefully selected from a sampling frame based on an analysis of Dutch MDTF World Bank contributions (2000-2011) captured in World Bank Client Connection (accessed May 2012). Financial Intermediary Funds (FIFs) were excluded from the sample (as well as country-specific trust funds). Further selection criteria included financial size of the Dutch contribution (more than USD 2.5 million) and availability of a post-2008 independent evaluation. The findings were used in the IOB report *Working with the World Bank – Evaluation of Dutch World Bank Policies and Funding (2000-2011)*; IOB 2013

⁹ A gross list of 170 funds/programs was brought down to 35 by using the following criteria: contributions from 4 or more donors, a global or regional scope (not country-specific), over USD 1 million of expenditures or contributions in the most recent year available.

¹⁰ IOB has not judged the quality of these evaluations.

Looking at the governance of global partnerships, Bezanson & Isenman (2012) found in a recent study that “in most cases, weak or absent M&E systems were (...) a defining characteristic of at least the early years of most of the multi-stakeholder partnerships”.¹¹

Based on this quick review it appears that M&E frameworks are gradually improving, but that there is still work to be done.

Possible action by EvalNet

EvalNet could consider what role it wants to play in addressing this issue. The number of funds and the related funding volume of the current MDTF/GRPP-portfolio of many OECD/DAC donors would justify closer scrutiny. Both the evaluation offices of the participating (bilateral) donors and the evaluation functions of the multilateral hosts could consider stepping up their involvement.

Possible strategies for EvalNet to address weak M&E practices in joint global/regional programs could entail:

A. More systematic analyses/research on the current state of M&E practices.

Information about M&E practices in hundreds of programs concerned is scattered and incomplete. It appears that more information is available about M&E practices in GRPPs hosted by the World Bank than on programs and trust funded activities related to other multilateral hosts. A full overview of M&E practices in this part of the global aid architecture is currently lacking.

B. Concerted action towards DAC donor offices and multilateral hosts, pushing for improved M&E systems and proper evaluation where appropriate.

DAC donors sit on the governing bodies of nearly all partnership programs and could use their influence as members of those governing bodies to request better M&E. DAC donors also fund many multi-donor trust funds without governing bodies; they could require that plans for M&E be specified when trust funds are being set up. EvalNet partners could work to reinforce standards and principles for periodic external evaluations and also contribute to operationalizing independent evaluation of partnership programs in their host institutions.

C. Occasional joint evaluation of selected global/regional programs by the evaluation functions of the donors of a partnership program.

The governing bodies of the programs are not always sufficiently equipped (nor independent) to properly set up and manage evaluations of the programs.¹² EvalNet members could consider joint evaluation. Such a joint evaluation could be led by one or more of the evaluation offices, as is done in joint evaluation at country-level. Obviously, sizable programs that have set up their own independent evaluation units (like GEF and CGIAR), and programs with well-established multi-annual evaluation arrangements agreed among the donors (for instance GAFSP and Adaptation Fund), would not be the first

¹¹ Keith A. Bezanson and Paul Isenman (2012), ‘Governance of New Global Partnerships: Challenges, Weaknesses, and Lessons’, CGD Policy Paper 014,. The authors conducted a meta-review of evaluations of 11 GRPPs: The Global Fund (for the fight against) AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (GFATM), Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization (GAVI), Roll Back Malaria (RBM), International Health Partnership+ (IHP+), the United Nations Agency on AIDS (UNAIDS), CGAP – Consultative Group to Assist the Poor; GPE – Global Partnership for Education; Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN); GWP – Global Water partnership; CGIAR – Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research; and Cities Alliance.

¹² The governing body of a GRPP now often adopts the ToR for an evaluation, hires the consultants/evaluators, adopts the evaluation report and then discusses possible policy implications. In more appropriate division of labor, an external evaluation function would be responsible for the first three steps, while the governing body would prepare a policy response to the outcome of the evaluation.

priority.¹³ The role of the evaluation function of the multilateral host would have to be taken into account. ¹⁴ Timing, planning and funding cycle matters are important.

Discussion

At the 16th EvalNet meeting the following question could guide the debate:

1. Do members share the concerns about limited improvements in evaluation practices in MDTFs/GRPPs?
2. What further action could be taken by EvalNet on this matter:
 - Is further analysis required? On which aspects, and how could this be dealt with?
 - Would joint action towards donor offices be an option? How could this be organised?
 - Would members be willing to consider joint evaluation of MDTFs/GRPPs? Do members have views on possible candidates for joint valuation?

¹³ Adaptation Fund: Monitoring and Evaluation takes place at project, implementing entities and fund level. Projects are followed by a final evaluation. The AF Board may contract an independent evaluator to evaluate the implementing agencies. The AF can be subject to reviews requested by the Conference Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol. A performance review of the board and secretariat was conducted in 2011. GAFSP: 30 percent of all GAFSP projects will be subject to in-depth impact evaluation, while the remaining 70 percent will be subject to less thorough impact evaluation. GAFSP is equipped with an evaluation framework that conforms to the Development Impact Evaluation Initiative (DIME, World Bank) framework.

¹⁴ Independent evaluation functions related to GRPPs include: CGIAR Independent Evaluation Arrangement, EIB Operations Evaluation, FAO Office of Evaluation, GEF Evaluation Office, GFATM Office of the Inspector General, IMF Independent Evaluation Office, UNDP Evaluation Office, UNESCO Internal Oversight Service, UNEP Evaluation Office, UN-HABITAT Evaluation Function, UNFPA Independent Evaluation Office, UN OCHA evaluation office, UN Secretariat Inspection and Evaluation Division, and World Bank Independent Evaluation Group.

Annex

TABLE 1: ILLUSTRATIVE LIST OF ACTIVE GLOBAL & REGIONAL FUNDS AND PROGRAMS WITH > 3 DONORS AND ANNUAL EXPENDITURE/CONTRIBUTIONS > USD 1 MILLION

Acronym	Name	Number of Donors	Annual Expenditure (Contributions) 1)
<i>World Bank Group related</i>			
ACBF	African Capacity Building Foundation	10+	11.6
APOC II	African Program for Onchocerciasis Control Ph. II	10+	21.9
AHI	Avian and Human Influenza Trust Fund Facility	10+	19.3
CF	Carbon Funds	10+	171.0
CPF & CADF	Carbon Partnership Facility and Carbon Asset Development Fund	9	3.0
CITIES	Cities Alliance Program	10+	12.8
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme	6	6.9
CAADP4	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme - Pillar IV Institutions	7	17.2
CGAP	Consultative Group to Assist the Poorest	10+	15.7
EFA-FTI	Education for All - Fast Track Initiative	10+	261.3
FTIE	EFA FTI Education Program Development Fund	10+	23.6
ESMAP	Energy Sector Management Assistance Program	10+	19.9
EITI	Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative	10+	4.5
FIRST	Financial Sector Reform and Strengthening Initiative	7	9.5
FCPF	Forest Carbon Partnership Facility	10+	1.5
GENTF	Gender Trust Funds	10+	11.4
GAVI	Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunizations Program	10+	2.9
GFDRR	Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery	10+	23.4
GFCRP	Global Food Crisis Response Program	8	79.2
GGFR	Global Gas Flaring Reduction Partnership	10+	2.6
GPOBA	Global Partnership on Output-Based Aid	5	22.3
GRSF	Global Road Safety Facility	5	2.5
GPF	Governance Partnership Facility	4	12.2
InfoDev	Information for Development Program	9	7.0
ICP	International Comparison Program	4	1.1
JOBCRT	Job Creation and Economic Growth	5	1.2
KCPII	Knowledge for Change Program II	10+	4.3
NTF	Multi-Donor Nordic Trust Fund	6	1.4
TRTA	Multi-Donor Trust Fund for Trade and Development	4	9.8
NBI	Nile Basin Initiative Trust Fund	10+	21.6
AMC	Pilot Advance Market Commitment for Vaccines against Pneumococcal Diseases	6	65.0
POLIO	Polio Buy-Down Program	4	1.3
PROFOR	Program on Forests	8	2.8
PPIAF	Public-Private Infrastructure Advisory Facility	10+	17.7
PEFA	Public Expenditure Financial Accountability	7	1.3
REPARIS	Road to Europe Program of Accounting Reform and Institutional Strengthening	4	2.5
REF	Roma Education Fund	7	1.6
SPF	State and Peace Building Fund	7	13.7
StAR	Stolen Assets Recovery Initiative	5	1.9

StAR	Stolen Assets Recovery Initiative	6	1.9
SSATP	Sub-Saharan Africa Transportation Program	8	2.6
TDRP	Transitional Demobilization and Reintegration Program	7	2.2
TFSCB	Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building	6	3.8
WSP	Water and Sanitation Program	10+	35.4
<i>Financial Intermediary Funds (FIFs)</i>			
CGIAR	A Global Research Partnership for a Food Secure Future	10+	142.6
AF	Adaptation Fund	10+	9.0
CTF	Clean Technology Fund / Climate Investment Funds	7	114.4
GAFSP	Global Agriculture and Food Security Program	7	4.2
GEF	Global Environment Facility	10+	632.3
GEFIA	Global Environment Facility Implementing Agency	10+	199.1
GFATM	Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria	10+	3342.3
LDCF	Least Developed Countries Fund for Climate Change	10+	21.0
AMC	Pilot Advance Market Commitment for Vaccines against Pneumococcal Diseases	6	65.0
SCCF	Special Climate Change Fund	10+	27.0
SCF	Strategic Climate Fund / Climate Investment Fund	10+	18.1
<i>UN related (mostly UNDP)</i>			
REDD+	REDD+ JP Partnership Support	6	1.2
UN-REDD	UN-REDD Programme Fund	6	3.4
UN TF EAW	UN Trust Fund to End Violence Against Women	6	7.3
CFIA	Central Fund for Influenza Action	4	44.7
UN AASV	UN Action Agst Sexual Violence	8	78.3
UNPBF	Peacebuilding Fund	10+	279.2
PTTF	Poverty Thematic Trust Fund	8	1.9
DGTTF	Democratic Governance Thematic Trust Fund	10+	15.5
CPRTTF	Crisis Prevention and Recovery Thematic Trust Fund	10+	111.4
EETTF	Environment and Energy Thematic Trust Fund	7	5.3
CTF	Codex Alimentarius Fund (FAO)	10+	1.5
FFF	Forest & Farm Facility (FAO)	10+	4.6
VFVT	Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture (OHCHR)	10+	8.0
UNDEF	United Nations Democracy Fund	10+	(13.2)
MF	Multilateral Fund under the Montreal Protocol (UNEP)	10+	(133.4)
WHF	World Heritage Fund (UNESCO)	10+	(4.0)
MHTF	Thematic TF for Maternal Health (UNFPA)	8	19.9
WSTF	Water and Sanitation Trust Fund (UN-HABITAT)	10+	14.5
UN VTF	UN Voluntary Fund for Assistance in Mine Action (UNMAS)	10+	59.1
CERF	Central Emergency Respones Fund (UNOCHA)	10+	485.0
<i>Related to other (multilateral) organisations or free-standing</i>			
TFV	Trust Fund for Victims (ICC)	10+	(2.5)*
TTF MNRW	Managing National Resource Wealth Trust Fund (IMF)	4	5
TTF TPA	Tax Policy and Administration Trust Fund (IMF)	10+	3.6
TTF AML	Anti-Money Laundering Trust Fund (IMF)	10+	5.4
OPIF	OPEC Fund for International Development	10+	459
DDAGTF	Doha Development Agenda Global Trust Fund	10+	(12.1)

	(WTO)		
STDF	Standards and Trade Development Facility (WTO)	10+	(4.5)
EPTATF	Eastern Partnership Technical Assistance Trust Fund (EIB)	5	(1.9)*
ITF	EU-AFRICA Infrastructure Trust Fund (EIB)	10+	(34.5)*
FTF	FEMIP Trust Fund (EIB)	10+	(11.0)*
PIDG	Private Infrastructure Development Group Trust	9	(182.0)
HIF	Health Insurance Fund	5	(15.2)*
ICF	Investment Climate Facility for Africa	8	15.9
UNITAID	UNITAID	10+	183.7*

1) Most recent available year in the period 2009-2012

* = EUR

TABLE 2: QUALITY OF M&E SYSTEMS AS PRESENTED IN EVALUATIONS OF SELECTED GRPPS

Program	Evaluation	M&E system	Data quality	Direction
ESMAP - Energy Sector Management Assistance Program	Baastel (2012)	Work in progress	Unsatisfactory	Improving
FIRST - Financial Sector Reform and Strengthening In.	Effron, Elliot & Fostvedt (2011)	Work in progress	Unsatisfactory	Improving
FCPF – Forest Carbon Partnership Facility	Baastel & Nordeco (2011)	Not fully implemented	N/A	There is a draft M&E framework
WSP – Water & Sanitation Program	Universalia (2009)	Work in progress	Unsatisfactory	Improving
PPIAF – Public-Private Infrastructure Advisory Facility	CEPA (2009)	Implemented	Satisfactory	Good, capture of outcomes needs strengthening
GFDRR – Global Facility for Disaster Reduction & Recovery	Universalia (2010)	Not fully implemented	Unsatisfactory	Evolving
TFSCB – TF for Statistical Capacity Building	Snorrason, Flatt & Jensen (2010)	Grant Reporting and Monitoring	Not externally validated, unsatisfactory	unknown
CGAP – Consultative Group to Assist the Poor	Ayani & Universalia (2012)	Implemented	Satisfactory	Needs to aggregate results
CA – Cities Alliance	COWI (2012)	Work in progress	Unsatisfactory	Improving (but still key area of concern)

Source: IOB 2013