

# National Committee for Sub-National Democratic Development Secretariat (NCDDS)

## Integration of Social Accountability into National and Sub-National Systems Phase II Project

### Terms of Reference

**Position** : National Consultant for Project End Evaluation  
**Duty Station** : NCDD Secretariat, Phnom Penh, Cambodia  
**Duration** : 35 days  
**Basis** : Short-Term Individual Consultancy Contract

#### 1. BACKGROUND

##### *National Program on Sub-National Democratic Development*

The Royal Government of Cambodia has committed to improve Sub-National Democratic Development (SNDD). The National Committee for Sub-National Democratic Development (NCDD) was established by a Royal Decree to coordinate and take lead the implementation of the Law on Administrative Management of the Capital, Provinces, Municipalities, Districts and Khans, the Law on Administrative Management of Communes, Sangkats and the Decentralization and Deconcentration Policy. To implement these legal documents, NCDD developed the first 10-year National Program on Sub-National Democratic Development (NP-1) from 2010-2020 which was divided into 3 phases. The first phase implementation plan (IP3-I) of the NP-1, which ran from 2011-14, focused on developing Sub-National Administration (SNA) operational structures, systems and procedures. The second phase implementation plan (the IP3-II), which covered the period 2015-2017, aimed at applying the new structures, systems and procedures developed during the first and second phases in order to improve SNA service delivery, local development and governance. The third phase implementation plan (the IP3-III), which covered the period 2018-2020 focused on key priorities wish to achieve in this final phase of the NP-1 and included continuing to strengthen the transfer of functions and increase financial resources to SNAs. The second 10-year National Program on Sub-National Democratic Development (NP-2) from 2021-2030 is currently implementing to address all important unresolved challenges remaining from NP1 and any new challenges that arise. The objective of the NP-2 is that by 2030 structures and systems of sub-national governance are modern, autonomous, effective, transparent, and accountable in their provision of public services and local development. They will respond to the prioritized needs of the people in their jurisdiction in an equitable and inclusive manner. Each type of SNA will have adequate power and capacity to carry out their functions under the oversight of their councils to strengthen accountability to citizens.

##### *Social Accountability*

Social accountability is an essential component for improving SNA service delivery and governance. Therefore, the Social Accountability Strategic Plan was formulated and approved by NCDD on July 11, 2013. To implement this Strategic Plan, Implementation of the Social Accountability Frameworks (ISAF) have been developed and approved: ISAF-I (2016-2018) and ISAF-II (2019-2023). The Strategic Plan and its frameworks have been implemented under overall management of the Implementation Social Accountability Framework Partnership Steering Committee (ISAF-PSC) and in close cooperation between development partners and civil society organizations in order to enhance the constructive engagement between citizens and government as an integral element of governance arrangements through which public decision-making and action takes place. It includes all those activities in which citizens and their representatives can advocate for their interests (voice) and thereby check the performance of officials and service providers (accountability) as they make, implement and enforce public decisions (collective choices) relating to rights, regulations, investment/resources and service delivery.

The I-SAF represents an integral element of the NP-1 and NP-2. The both phases of I-SAF specify activities to be undertaken by the demand side – implemented by civil society organizations and the supply side- by government entities at national and sub-national levels.

The World Bank, the Social Accountability and Service Delivery Trust Fund (SASD-TF) has been established with financial contribution from BMZ, SDC, and DFAT. This SASD-TF has become operational in March 2020 and will run until 2024. It has provided financial support to two projects to support the Implementation of Social Accountability Framework II (I-SAF II) 2019-2023. The two projects are 1) Integration of Social Accountability into National and Subnational Systems, being implemented by NCDDS and 2) Engaging Citizens to Improve

Service Delivery Through Social Accountability, being implemented by World Vision International (WVI).

### ***Project End Evaluation***

The Integration of Social Accountability into National and Subnational Systems project was designed as support for the “supply-side” of social accountability, enabling national and subnational authorities to provide the information that citizens need to hold public service providers accountable and to build the will and capacity of government officials to respond to feedback and demands from citizens. It is complemented by another project that is implemented by a lead NGO, World Vision, to strengthen the “demand-side” of social accountability, enabling citizens to become more knowledgeable about public services and to engage more actively in demanding and contributing to improvements to such services.

There are five components of this project including three main components which comprise the annual cycle of social accountability activities: (1) Transparency and access to information; (2) Citizen monitoring; and (3) Implementation of Joint Accountability Action Plans (JAAPs). Components (4) Training and capacity development, and (5) National and subnational coordination and partnership support, provide overarching support to building the capacity required to implement the planned activities and sustain them beyond the duration of this project.

The primary beneficiaries of the project are the citizens of the targeted coverage area who stand to benefit from improved access to information and knowledge of public service delivery, an increased ability to influence the delivery of services, and eventually improvements in the quality of public services. As such, potentially all households in the targeted geographic area can benefit from the project. Secondary beneficiaries include national and subnational government officials who have improved information to identify areas for improvement by service providers as well as the service providers themselves who can become more knowledgeable of the service standards they are expected to follow, and thus be better able to improve the quality of the services they provide. Due to this project’s focus on government systems, the benefits to government officials are a key feature of the results framework for the project.

The project development objective (PDO) is to improve the performance of public service providers through the development and institutionalization of national and sub-national government systems for improved transparency, strengthened citizen engagement and responsive action.

The following indicators are used to measure the achievement of the PDO:

- Percentage of service providers covered by the project that are meeting key national standards.
- Percentage of JAAP actions completed or ongoing in target communes/sangkats.
- Percentage of target communes/sangkats that have completed three full annual ISAF cycles.
- Percentage of target communes/sangkats that allocate resources to support the implementation of the ISAF process.

## **2. OBJECTIVES OF THE CONSULTANCY**

The End Evaluation is about telling the story of the project, focusing on the outcomes, the factors that contributed to achieving the outcomes (and the factors that may have limited achievement of outcomes), and the lessons learned. It covers, among other things, the degree to which the Project’s Development Objectives (PDOs) and results have been achieved and provides lessons learned. The assessment of outcomes should rely heavily on and present the available evidence, both quantitative and qualitative. Audiences for the End Evaluation are the NCCDS ISAF project team, the World Bank Task Team, the World Vision team, the government and their agencies, development partners (e.g. Germany, Switzerland, Australia), civil society stakeholders, project beneficiaries, and the general public that has an interest in the project.

The consultant is expected to prepare the End Evaluation of the project, with a first full draft submitted June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2024 and the final version of the report submitted on July 14<sup>th</sup> to be disseminated through a workshop.

## **3. SCOPE OF WORK**

Consultant Duties and Accountabilities:

- Carry out primary and secondary research (consisting of reviewing Project documentation and management information system (MIS) data as well as interviewing ISAF project staff, government officials, World Vision staff working on ISAF, donors and Bank staff involved in the Project); the consultant could include a field visit to ISAF project site(s).
- Conduct discussions with the ISAF project team, World Vision, the implementing agency, beneficiaries, and other stakeholders, as needed.

- Review the final project indicators (achievements) prepared by the project team, and the specific documentation/records for each of the indicators, to assess consistency (results framework and other indicators).
- Work with the ISAF project team to draft the end evaluation according to the guidelines provided by the project team/World Bank. The end evaluation should include, among other aspects:
  - (i) Description of the project story line, including the operation’s context, the rationale for the operation, and the relevance of the operation’s objectives during preparation and at completion (i.e., for Cambodia’s development policies and/or programs);
  - (ii) Assessment of the outcomes of the operation against the agreed objectives; with a focus on providing (qualitative and/or quantitative) evidence of the achievement of the operation’s objectives, and of the contribution of the supported activities and outputs to the project’s development outcomes;
  - (iii) Assessment of the key factors and events pertaining to the World Bank, ISAF project team, government, co-financiers, other partners, and the external environment during preparation and implementation, that affected (i.e., contributed to and/or limited) performance and outcomes;
  - (iv) Evaluation of the project team’s own performance (both NCDDS and World Bank) during the preparation and implementation of the operation with special emphasis on lessons learned that may be helpful in the future; and
  - (v) Description of the proposed arrangements for future operation of the project (i.e., continuation of project activities beyond Bank financing, if any).
  - (vi) Present the findings and lessons learned of the End Evaluation at a workshop to be organized jointly by the consultant and NCDDS.

Special attention will be given to the data requirements of the evaluation, including the need to assemble sufficient results, for attribution (to the extent possible), accountability and learning lessons. The end evaluation is expected to pay particular attention to the inclusion of gender, ethnic minorities, ID poor, and persons with disabilities, looking at results achieved, and actions (if any) undertaken during implementation to support the participation of women and persons with disabilities, and the benefits these groups may have received from the ISAF project. The consultant is also expected to investigate the availability of data regarding health centers such as changes in number of patients at health centers (including the ID poor patients) and changes in health center’s revenues from patient fees. The evaluation should help capture ISAF impacts beyond the PDO. The evaluation will also include in annex a matrix summarizing ISAF achievements under the 6 OECD criteria<sup>1</sup>: (i) relevance: the extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries, global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change; (ii) coherence: the compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution; (iii) effectiveness: the extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups; (iv) efficiency: The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way; (v) impact: the extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects and (vi) sustainability: the extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are likely to continue.

#### 4. TIMELINE AND DELIVERABLES

The consultancy will start on or around **May**, 2024, and will end on July 30<sup>th</sup>, 2024. During this period, the consultant is expected to conduct and deliver the following:

| <b>Tasks and deliverables</b>  | <b>Timeline for delivery of documents</b> |
|--|---|
| Submit draft detailed table of contents (with explanations of sections) of the evaluation report, to be submitted for NCDDS review and approval (inception report) | Within 5 days from contract signing       |
| Desk review of project documents to collect secondary data   | N/A                                       |
| Field visits to project sites (to be agreed and organized with NCDDS) to collect primary data  | N/A                                       |
| Submit draft evaluation report, and draft PowerPoint presentation of key findings and lessons learned, for NCDDS review  | By Jun 15 <sup>th</sup> , 2024            |
| Review of draft evaluation by NCDDS and the World Bank (share comments and have discussion with consultant on the comments)  | By Jun 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2024            |

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

|  |                                 |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Discussion with consultant on the comments on the evaluation   | By Jun 27 <sup>st</sup> , 2024  |
| Submit revised evaluation report based on the comments from NCDDS and World Bank   | By Jun 30 <sup>th</sup> , 2024  |
| Review of updated evaluation report by NCDDS and World Bank  | By July 7 <sup>th</sup> , 2024  |
| Share final revised Evaluation report and presentation slides for the workshop, reflecting comments received from NCDDS and World Bank                 | By July 14 <sup>th</sup> , 2024 |
| Workshop to be organized together with NCDDS, to present the report. The consultant would present the PowerPoint presentation to guide the discussion. | By July 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2024 |

**5. PAYMENT**

The payment will be made on the basis of a daily fee that will be stated in the contract to be determined based on qualifications and NCDDS pay scales and negotiation with the consultant.

**6. REPORTING**

The Consultant will work under the overall supervision of the Head of the NCDDS and direct supervision of ISAF Project Manager. The Consultant will work closely with the ISAF Project Coordinator and other ISAF consultants, SNAs, relevant line ministries, and other relevant agencies following consultation and advice of the Project Manager.

**2. QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCES**

The consultant will have a track record of the following qualifications and experiences:

- Master degree or higher in public administration, planning, social sciences, governance, project management, or a related field.
- Extensive, relevant professional experiences in the areas of social accountability, local governance
- Proven knowledge and understanding of Implementation of the Social Accountability Framework (I-SAF) and Decentralisation and De-concentration reforms in Cambodia.
- At least 8 years’ experience in conducting evaluations of donor projects in Cambodia and/or East Asia.
- Knowledge, expertise, and experience in conducting project evaluations in projects related to social accountability, governance, delivery of public services, health, education, gender, community development, etc.
- Expertise and experiences in conducting data analysis, including both quantitative and qualitative data.
- At least 10 years’ experience in working with national institutions, local governments, multilateral or bilateral donor, preferably in Cambodia and/or East Asian in the area of social accountability, governance, delivery of public services, health, education, gender, community development, etc.
- At least 10 years’ experience in planning, conducting quantitative and qualitative evaluations, , using results framework, and reporting.
- Critical thinking skills, initiative and creativity.
- Robust knowledge of engagement of gender/women, the poorest (e.g., ID Poor), minority groups and persons with disability in development projects.
- Fluent in Khmer and English in both writing and speaking including demonstrated good reporting and writing skills.

.....

## Annex 1 – Proposed Structure of the Project End Evaluation Report

### **I. Introduction, context and development objectives of the project**

### **II. PROJECT CONTEXT AND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES**

**Context/Rationale**

**Project Development Objectives (PDOs) and Relevance of Objectives/Design**

**Key Expected Outcomes and Outcome Indicators**

**Components**

### **III. Objectives, design and relevance (categorized by components of I-SAF II)**

*3.1. Relevance of objectives, project design and relevance of the design*

*3.2. Achievement of objectives (effectiveness)*

*3.3 Efficiency*

*3.4. Justification of the overall assessment of the results*

*3.5. Evaluation of the results of operations and implementation*

*3.6. Other results and impacts*

*3.7. Feasibility of Sustainability*

### **IV. Key factors affecting implementation and results**

### **V. Compliance issues and risks related to the development results**

*5.1. Quality of monitoring and evaluation*

*5.2 Compliance: Procurement, financial management and social and environmental safeguards*

*5.3. Risk to the development results*

### **VI. Lessons and recommendations**

#### **Annexes**

*1. Results Framework (completed with explanations when targets are over or under achieved)*

*2. OECD Evaluation Matrix Results*

*3. Gender, ID Poor, Ethnic Minority and Disability (Data and further assessment)*

*4. Project cost per component*

## Annex 2 – Guiding Note for the Project End Evaluation

### GUIDING NOTE Project End Evaluation ISAF

The project ISAF is expected to complete an End Evaluation before the project closure. It is about telling the story of the project, focusing on the outcomes, the factors that contributed to achieving the outcomes (and the factors that may have limited achievement of outcomes), and the lessons learned. The report will be drafted by an independent consultant.

The End Evaluation will provide:

- (i) Description of the project story line, including the operation's context, the rationale for the operation, and the relevance of the operation's objectives during preparation and at completion (i.e., for Cambodia's development policies and/or programs);
- (ii) Assessment of the outcomes of the operation against the agreed objectives; with a focus on providing (qualitative and/or quantitative) evidence of the achievement of the operation's objectives, and of the contribution of the supported activities and outputs to the project's development outcomes;
- (iii) Assessment of the key factors and events pertaining to the Bank, recipient, co-financiers, other partners, and the external environment during preparation and implementation, that affected (i.e., contributed to and/or limited) performance and outcomes;
- (iv) Evaluation of the recipient's own performance during the preparation and implementation of the operation with special emphasis on lessons learned that may be helpful in the future; and
- (v) Description of the proposed arrangements for future operation of the project (i.e., continuation of project activities beyond Bank financing).

Special attention is given to the data requirements of the evaluation, including the need to assemble sufficient results and cost/benefit data for accountability and learning lessons.

The Evaluation is prepared for closure of the project. It covers, among other things, the degree to which the Project's Development Objectives (PDOs) and results have been achieved and provides lessons learned.

Audiences for the End Evaluation are project team, World Bank Task Team, governments and their agencies, stakeholders and beneficiaries and the general public that has an interest in the project. This final end evaluation will contribute to informing the drafting of the World Bank Implementation Completion Report.

Text elements in this End Evaluation are intended to be specific, concise and focused on outcomes of interventions in the context of objectives. The text explains factors that affected performance and results and the resolution of implementation challenges. **The text avoids unsupported assertions** (especially about achievements or attribution of results to the project) **and instead makes statements that are supported by evidence.**

- (i) **Description of the project story line, including the operation's context, the rationale for the operation, and the relevance of the operation's objectives during preparation and at completion (i.e., for Cambodia's development policies and/or programs);**

***For the context.*** Provide a brief story line of the operation's context and rationale, including a summary of the country and sector context and national priorities relevant to the issues the project was designed to address. Describe the rationale for Bank support at the time of approval and how the operation was to contribute to the country higher-level objectives.

- (ii) **Assessment of the outcome of the operation against the agreed objectives; with a focus on providing (quantitative and/or qualitative) evidence of the achievement of the operation's objectives and of the contribution of the supported activities and outputs to the project's development outcomes.**

**Theory of change.** Briefly present the theory of change or the results chain/logic behind the operation, as described in the Project Appraisal Document (PAD). The theory of change illustrates the results chain, explaining the links between the operation's interventions, outputs, intermediate results, and desired outcomes, along with underlying assumptions. The theory of change or results chain is structured in a way that the PDO statement is

explicitly visible at the level of the desired outcomes. The results chain can also highlight longer-term outcomes expected to occur beyond the project's closing.

**Project Development Objectives.** Present the original PDO statement, exactly as stated in the Legal Agreement (not in the PAD) since the Legal Agreement is the binding document. If the PDO in the PAD is substantially different from the PDO as stated in the Legal Agreement, this should be noted in the report.

**Key expected outcomes and outcome indicators.** The assessment of the PDOs is organized around each objective or outcome captured in the statement of objectives.

**Components.** List and summarize the project components, including the estimated and actual resource allocation for each component (in US\$ millions). The estimated and actual component costs add up to the estimated and actual total project costs, respectively. If they do not, the reason for the difference needs to be noted.

**The assessment of the PDOs is organized around each objective or outcome** captured in the statement of objectives. Therefore, a compound PDO statement with multiple outcomes needs to be “unpacked” so that each promised outcome can be assessed separately. For each of the objectives (or each of the outcomes specified in the PDO statement), present the key PDO indicators to be used to assess the achievement and other results from evaluations (if available). If the PDOs, key associated outcome targets, PDO indicators, and components were revised through restructuring, state (a) the date of revision(s), and (b) the key change(s).

**Other Changes.** Describe any other significant changes- for example, changes to the scope and scale, implementation arrangements and schedule, funding allocations including counterpart financing and co-financing, Additional Financing, reallocation of funds among components, and cancellation of funds and give the date (s) of revisions (s).

**Rationale for changes and their implication for the original theory of change.** For all changes, state the reason(s) for them. In addition, describe how the changes affected the theory of change and the originally expected outcomes and their targets.

#### **Assessment of Achievement of each Objective or Outcome**

(a) How to organize the assessment of the achievement of PDOs:

Compound PDOs with multiple outcomes linked together in a single sentence are “unpacked” and each outcome assessed separately. Assessment of each objective or outcome is based on the level of achievement and the directness of demonstrated connections between the activities of the project and the achievements reported.

The ISAF PDO is complex, so it will need to be unpacked:

- 1) To improve the performance of public service providers .
- 2) Development and institutionalization of national and sub-national government systems.
- 3) Improved transparency,
- 4) Strengthened citizen engagement and responsive action.

It will be important to use indicators and qualitative content and other indicators to describe the achievements against the PDO.

For each objective or outcome specified in the PDO statement, assemble and succinctly present the (qualitative and/or quantitative) evidence for its achievement. Use this evidence to explain plausible causal relationships between the operation's activities/outputs and achieved outcomes, as distinct from other non-project factors that may have affected the observed outcomes (e.g. other interventions, policy changes unrelated to the operation, natural events, and market factors). This helps in making a reasonable assessment of plausible attribution of observed outcomes to the project's specific interventions.

The Results Framework can provide information for demonstrating the achievement of each expected outcome stated in the PDO statement. Data on indicators document observed achievements and compare them to baselines and targets. It is important to assess efficacy at the level of expected outcomes and avoid just presenting data of the project's results indicators.

It is important to also look beyond the Results Framework to any other available data and evidence – both quantitative and qualitative. Using multiple sources of information helps with “triangulation” – when different

sources point to the same types of achievement. Such convergence provides a richer, more robust and accurate assessment of achievement of the objectives or outcomes. Examples of evidence presented in the End Evaluation can include monitoring data that compare observations made in regions or populations where the operation was active, with observations made in similar regions or populations where the operation was not active. An End Evaluation can also usefully present impact evaluations and related research to verify the links in the causal chain underlying the logic of the project design.

### **Other Outcomes and Impacts (if any)**

This section assesses any effects and impacts of the operation that were not covered in previous sections - whether intended or unintended, positive or negative, including impacts on gender, institutional strengthening, mobilizing private sector financing, and poverty reduction and shared prosperity (inclusion of ID poor, persons with disability, ethnic minorities, etc.).

**Gender.** This section summarizes the key project outcomes and impacts relevant to gender (**the same approach can apply to ID poor, person with disability and ethnic minorities**). It is important to report/identify impacts (positive impacts as well as unintended negative impacts). It is also useful to explain how gender has been integrated into the project during its implementation.

It could include:

- Assess how project integrated gender in its design.
- A quantitative and narrative analysis based on the results obtained.
- Identification of problems (issues that arose during project implementation) and successes.
- The analysis should consider the strengths and weaknesses of the implementation of activities benefiting women.
- Lessons learned for future projects and activities.

**Institutional strengthening.** Discuss the operation's effects and impacts on institutional development, particularly on the longer-term development of the country's capacity and institutions.

- (iii) **Assessment of the key factors and events pertaining to the Bank, borrower, co-financiers, other partners, and the external environment during preparation and implementation, that affected performance and outcomes;**

### **Key Factors that Affected Implementation and Outcome**

This section provides an analysis of key factors and events that influenced the operation's achievements or non-achievements during preparation and implementation. It also discusses actions taken by the Bank and borrower to address and correct each factor undermining project performance. Presenting the factors (positive or negative) by categories, as described below can assist with drawing effective lessons.

**Key Factors during Preparation.** Summarize key factors during the preparation stage or issues related to quality at entry that affected implementation and outcomes. A few examples follow; choose the ones that are relevant and/or add additional ones.

- Realistic objectives (including setting objectives that are clear and at the right level of ambition);
- Simple design (including clearly structured components with clear operational logic, and appropriate timing and sequencing of tasks, given the country context);
- Well-designed Results Framework (including indicators that are aligned with operational objectives and that have baselines and appropriate targets);
- Appropriate plan for monitoring (including having in place realistic measures to collect information that constitutes evidence of achievement of outcomes);
- Appropriate selection of stakeholders to engage or beneficiary groups to target;
- Adequacy of risk and mitigation measures identification;
- Readiness for implementation.



**Key Factors during Implementation** Three groups of implementation factors may be distinguished: (a) factors subject to the control of the government and/or implementing entities control, (b) factors subject to the control of the World Bank, and (c) factors outside the control of government and or implementing entities. A few examples follow: choose the ones that are relevant and/or add additional ones.

(a) Factors subject to the control of government and/or implementing entities

- Coordination and engagement (including clear roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders, and avoiding administrative barriers or structures that slow implementation);
- Commitment and leadership (including continuous commitment and leadership in the government or relevant stakeholders and articulation of clear organizational priorities);
- Human resources and organizational capacity (including mobilization of skilled human resources, and broad organizational capacity);
- Legislation and regulations (including having in place relevant regulation, legislation and simple regulatory processes);
- Governance and politics (including clear accountability and limited political interference);
- Basic logistics (including ICT and transportation logistics);
- Fiduciary (including having in place adequate procurement, financing, budgeting, and financial management mechanisms);
- Environmental and social (including compliance with safeguards/ESF requirements);
- and
- Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) (including appropriate data collection, adequate use of M&E information for project management, and ability to report in a timely fashion).

(b) Factors subject to the control of the World Bank control

- Adequacy of supervision (including proactive identification of opportunities, appropriate follow-up and resolution of implementation issues, appropriate adaptation to changing conditions, low turnover of TTLs, appropriate advice on and support to M&E, and ensuring transition arrangements); and
- Adequacy of reporting

(c) Factors outside the control of government and/or implementing entities

- Macroeconomic environment (including changes in world markets and prices);
- Conflict and instability (including conflict/post-conflict situation, civil unrest, and insecurity);
- Natural disasters (including natural disasters and disruptions caused by epidemics).

**Criteria for the Assessment of the Quality of M&E**

The assessment of the quality of M&E is based on three main elements: the quality of M&E design; the quality of M&E implementation; and the quality of M&E utilization.

**Quality of M&E design.** This sub-section assesses whether the operation's theory of change is clear and adequate indicators were identified to monitor progress towards achieving the PDO using effective M&E arrangements:

- Was the theory of change (documenting how the key activities and outputs led to the outcomes) sound and reflected in the results framework?
- Were the objectives clearly specified?
- Were there indicators encompassing all outcomes of the PDO statement?
- Were the intermediate results indicators adequate to capture the contribution of the operation's components (activities) and outputs toward achieving PDO-level outcomes?
- To what extent were the indicators specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound? To what extent were there baselines and targets available for all indicators?
- Were the proposed sampling and data collection methods, and analysis appropriate for all indicators? How were comparators selected and handled?
- Where the M&E design and arrangements well-embedded institutionally?

**Quality of M&E implementation.** This sub-section assesses whether M&E data

were collected and analyzed in a methodologically sound manner:

- Was planned baseline data collection carried out?

- Were any weaknesses in M&E design, including specification of indicators, fixed during implementation?
- Did the agency or the various stakeholders responsible for the M&E function ensure attention to effective M&E implementation?
- Were the data reliable and of good quality? Important elements of this include: sound methodology, independence of analysts, and quality control.

**Quality of M&E utilization.** This sub-section assesses whether M&E data on performance and results progress were used for management and decision-making:

- Were M&E findings communicated to the various stakeholders?
- Did M&E information influence positive (or negative) shifts in the implementation direction of the operation (e.g. restructuring or Additional Financing)?
- Was the M&E data used to provide evidence of achievement of outcomes (as opposed to only providing evidence of application of inputs and achievement of outputs)?
- Did the M&E data or findings inform subsequent interventions (e.g., Phase II operation)?

### **Risk to Development Outcome**

Risk to Development Outcome is the risk, at the time of completion, that development outcomes that have been achieved or are expected to be achieved will not be maintained. It does not refer to the project’s risk assessment at preparation, but rather to the probability and likely impact of threats to achieved outcomes moving forward.

The Risk to Development Outcome addresses two dimensions: (a) the likelihood that some changes may occur that are detrimental to the ultimate maintenance of achievement of the operation’s development outcome; and (b) the impact on the operation’s development outcomes if some or all of these changes materialize. Some risks are internal or specific to a project; they are primarily related to the suitability of the project’s design to its operating environment. Other risks arise from factors outside the project and may appear at the country level, such as price changes, or on a global scale, such as technological advances. The impact on outcomes of a change in the operating environment depends on the severity and nature of the change, as well as the adaptability (or lack thereof) of the project’s design to withstand that change.

- (iv) **Evaluation of the recipient’s own performance during the preparation and implementation of the operation with special emphasis on lessons learned that may be helpful in the future;**

### **Deriving Lessons Learned**

Drawing on the descriptions and analysis in the earlier section of key factors that affected performance and outcomes, this section briefly presents the most significant positive and negative lessons learned from the operation’s experience.

1. The purpose of the End Evaluation is both accountability and learning. An End Evaluation without good lessons is a missed opportunity to learn and do better. End Evaluation for projects that don’t achieve their objectives often produce some of the most valuable lessons.

2. The End Evaluation needs to present 3-5 key lessons that have emerged from the project. This section needs to avoid stating facts and findings, focusing rather on lessons that are underpinned by evidence in the End Evaluation. The table below distinguishes among facts, findings, lessons, and recommendations.

### **The Difference Between Facts, Findings, Lessons, and Recommendations**

|                | <b>What is it?</b>  | <b>Example</b>   |
|----------------|---|--|
| <b>Fact</b>    | What happened – an event and data (results). Not in dispute | “The project manager was dismissed in Year 5”          |
| <b>Finding</b> | What the analyst interpreted or concluded from the facts    | “Mainly because replacement of the project manager was |

|                       |  |  |
|-----------------------|--|--|
|                       | specific to the project. Can be disputed.  | delayed, the project did not meet its targets”   |
| <b>Lesson</b>         | The broader significance of a finding. it draws a conclusion from experience that may be applicable beyond the operation under review. | “Poor performance by project managers can critically affect project outcomes.”   |
| <b>Recommendation</b> | Suggests how to proceed in the future in the light of this experience. Proposes actions.   | “The borrower needs to ensure that key project management positions are filled with competent Staff. The Bank helps ensure this through appropriate covenants and prompt supervision”. |

#### **A few pointers on drafting lessons:**

- When some aspect of the project has been shown not to work, the End Evaluation does not generally assume or speculate on what would have worked, unless the project has some evidence of what would have worked.
- If there is good evidence, a valuable lesson can point to why an intervention or project worked or did not work. Often there is variation in project performance across areas – in some places the intervention had better results than in others. Pointing to the factors that led it to succeed in some cases but not in others – including contextual differences – can be extremely helpful.
- Lessons can also usefully point to the contextual factors under which an intervention succeeded or did not succeed. Explaining the context of the results yields valuable insights into the constraints faced – for example, low-income households, fragile states, middle-income countries, or weak or strong institutions, Good results achieved in spite of difficult contexts or weak results in spite of less difficult contexts are good fodder for lessons. The context also includes aspects of Bank and borrower performance – factors such as quality at entry, M&E, country ownership, capacity of the implementing agency, and so forth.

#### **OECD Evaluation Matrix in Annex**

The evaluation will also include in annex a matrix summarizing ISAF achievements under the 6 OECD criteria<sup>2</sup>: (i) relevance: the extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries, global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change; (ii) coherence: the compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution; (iii) effectiveness: the extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups; (iv) efficiency: The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way; (v) impact: the extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects and (vi) sustainability: the extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are likely to continue.

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>