About IEG

The Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) is an independent unit within the World Bank Group. It reports directly to the Boards of Executive Directors, which oversee IEG’s work through the Committee on Development Effectiveness. IEG is charged with evaluating the activities of the World Bank (the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Development Association), the International Finance Corporation (IFC), and the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA).

The goal of IEG’s evaluation work is to improve the Bank Group’s ability to achieve development outcomes by providing impartial, evidence-based assessments and lessons on drivers of success and failure. IEG uses rigorous methods that triangulate findings from a cross-section of sources to provide credible evaluations with new insights based on the choice of topic and methodologies used. Sharing these findings, strengthening client evaluation practice, and engaging stakeholders ensures that insights are understood and necessary improvements made.

All evaluations discussed in this report are available on IEG’s website at http://ieg.worldbank.org.
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The close of the fiscal year marks the end of my first six months as Director-General, Evaluation, at the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG). Two specific things have struck me. The first is that there is significant appetite for relevant, timely, and useful independent evaluation. During my first months, I engaged with members of the Board of Executive Directors, World Bank Group senior management, and key stakeholders to better understand what is working well and where there are opportunities for IEG to create even more value. We have converted many of these ideas into a new work program for fiscal years (FY) 20–23. The second is the need for evaluation to move beyond confirming development truisms to better understanding not only “what works” but why, how, and for whom. This means asking not only whether the Bank Group is doing things right but whether it is doing the right things to support the twin goals and maximize the contribution it and its partners can make to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), both in client countries and globally.

FY19 saw IEG becoming more engaged and creating space and demand for the range of work we do—from evaluations to learning engagements—while retaining our independence. IEG’s work program was aligned with the World Bank Group’s strategic priorities, the SDGs, and the commitments made in the capital increase packages for the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and International Finance Corporation (IFC), together with the replenishment of the International Development Association (IDA). While IEG evidence confirmed that the Bank Group continues to be an effective partner in the development progress of most of its client countries, several evaluations during the year highlighted the persistent challenges of including poor and vulnerable groups in sustainable economic growth, tackling historically high levels of forced displacement, and creating markets in low-income settings, among others.

IEG’s FY20 work program concentrates even more squarely on the development effectiveness questions that are central to the delivery of the Bank Group’s mission. We are also increasing our focus on the Bank Group’s contribution to development outcomes, bringing greater attention to country development results and what is needed to successfully tackle complex and systemic problems that affect client countries. To achieve these ends, IEG must look carefully at what we evaluate and how we can do better to deepen our evaluative evidence across our streams of work, while seeking to innovate to deliver more timely evaluations without losing rigor. We are also looking to expand our activities in evaluation capacity development, building on the successes to date but with an even greater emphasis on promoting better monitoring and evaluation practices and capacity in client countries.

We have a huge agenda ahead of us, and I am excited to be at IEG.

Alison Evans
Director-General, Evaluation
In a year marked by change throughout the World Bank Group, IEG’s commitment to rigorous analysis, innovative methodological approaches, and the sharing of knowledge and lessons remains its foundation. Though topics ranged from forced displacement to creating markets, the evaluations presented similar stories about development and the effectiveness the World Bank Group, providing guidance on improving outcomes. Common themes included building resilience, monitoring who benefits, and increasing private sector engagement.

In FY19, IEG published five major evaluations.
Conflict-Induced Displacement

Since 2016, the World Bank Group has stepped up its engagement in situations of conflict-induced forced displacement, responding to the steep increase in the numbers of internally displaced persons and refugees and the extreme poverty and human suffering associated with this increase. Recognizing that the humanitarian model by itself is not a sustainable long-term approach, IEG’s evaluation, World Bank Group Support in Situations of Conflict-Induced Displacement, found that a complementary and simultaneous development response starting from the onset of a crisis helps build the conditions that enable the forcibly displaced to move toward independence, dignity, and hope. The development approach can ease the impact on host communities by bringing together development partners to build institutions and policies that promote economic opportunities. Private sector investment presents an underused pathway to economic growth that could increase the participation of the forcibly displaced in the market. The evaluation recommends that the Bank Group build on its analytical work to create context-specific interventions, strengthen country-level coordination, and identify and support opportunities for private sector development.

Urban Resilience

More than 1 million people move into cities each week, and such rapid growth strains institutions and infrastructure. Cities with unmanaged growth cannot respond appropriately to shocks, such as natural disasters, or chronic stresses, such as violence and crime. These challenges can be overcome by investing in and implementing policies that build urban resilience. In Building Urban Resilience: An Evaluation of the World Bank Group’s Evolving Experience (2007–17), IEG noted that because urban needs and capacities vary greatly, the Bank Group must constantly innovate and learn by doing. However, it can be difficult to extract lessons from innovations because the Bank Group lacks a shared understanding of “urban resilience,” and no institutional framework exists to assess how projects contribute in the medium or long term. At the operational level, better coordination is needed among the Bank Group institutions and among the Global Practices. At the system level, more systematic assessment of resilience risks is warranted to identify and strategically respond to the most critical risks. The Bank Group’s approach also needs to expand beyond addressing acute shocks to tackling chronic stresses. The evaluation recommends increasing multisectoral and cross-institutional coordination, identifying system-level risks evenly across the portfolio, and systematically incorporating resilience characteristics throughout the project cycle.

Regional Integration

Development issues often transcend borders. Natural disasters, climate change, pandemics, and other crises do not respect geography. Tackling issues regionally allows for both immediate responses and long-term planning to increase resilience over time. In Two to Tango: An Evaluation of the World Bank Group Support to Fostering Regional Integration, IEG determined that the Bank Group fosters regional integration by enabling clients through advisory and analytical work, financing projects through policy and investment loans, and convening state and nonstate actors for coordination and collective actions. Interventions generally improved regional connectivity, public goods, or institutions. Although the portfolio includes a spectrum of practice areas, sectors, regions, and subregions, most efforts across the World Bank (69 percent), IFC (51 percent), and MIGA (89 percent) focused on infrastructure. Bank Group Regions also receive disparate amounts of support because the Bank Group lacks high-level commitment or strategic priorities on regional integration in all Regions except Africa, which has a Regional Integration Strategy. Project success reflects these two areas of concentration. The report recommends that the Bank Group increase commitments outside Africa by tailoring regional strategies and rebalance projects to emphasize regions that are found to have high integration potential.
Knowledge Flow and Collaboration

Achieving the Bank Group’s ambitious goals requires an effective operating model that allows for adequate knowledge sharing and collaboration among institutions and units. In Knowledge Flow and Collaboration under the World Bank’s New Operating Model, IEG recognized that the creation of Global Practices (GPs) and overarching Global Theme Groups in 2014 improved knowledge flow across Regions, but a systematic approach to managing and investing in knowledge is not present in all GPs. GPs with coherent knowledge strategies address gaps through cross-support, staff rotation, knowledge hubs, and training. Knowledge is transferred to operations through help desks, safe-space meetings, and other platforms. However, interviews with Country Management Units revealed that larger country programs receive more knowledge than smaller programs.

As for collaboration, although the GPs reduce siloing among Regions, heavy transaction costs and competition among GPs complicate collaboration. The 2014 model lacks the strong leadership needed to encourage collaboration except in cases of crisis response or in high-profile projects. The evaluation recommends improving incentives for knowledge production, curation, and sharing; strengthening links among GPs and Regions to improve coordination; and empowering Program Leaders to connect staff and knowledge across boundaries to find integrated solutions.

Creating Markets

The international community recognizes that the SDGs will not be achieved without participation from the private sector, but engaging the private sector requires competitive markets that function efficiently. The 16 case studies reviewed for “Creating Markets to Leverage the Private Sector for Sustainable Development and Growth revealed that IFC and MIGA have contributed significantly to market creation. In addition to expanding services to small and medium markets, IFC has made markets competitive and sustainable by enhancing public and private sector capacity; fostering innovation, generating demonstration effects, and promoting the integration of value chains. However, the Bank Group could greatly amplify its contribution by fully understanding the sectors and areas it gets involved in, using more diagnostic approaches. For example, enhancing access to markets for the underserved groups, including the poor, will require better understanding how market creation specifically affects each group. For IFC to engage more in creating markets, it needs to adapt its overall business model and its incentives for staff to work in nascent private sector markets, taking more risks and allocating more resources up front. IEG recommends enhancing the understanding of market creation opportunities, including through the recently introduced Country Private Sector Diagnostics, and ensuring that such knowledge is adequately reflected in the Country Partnership Framework.
Synthesizing Past Lessons for Future Gains

The Bank Group’s twin goals of ending extreme poverty and achieving shared prosperity demand a clear focus on who is benefiting from growth and development; specifically, what is happening to the most vulnerable people in society—those at higher risk of falling into or remaining in poverty. In FY19, IEG extracted findings and lessons from past evaluations on topics relevant to the poorest, the often-excluded, and those affected by crises to clarify Bank Group support in a specific area from different perspectives.

Of the four synthesis reports, three cover IDA-related topics, including special windows. The fourth considers inclusive growth, an important part of achieving the twin goals.
Learning from IDA Experience

IDA’s 18th Replenishment, the largest in the institution’s 56-year history, was expected to speed progress toward the international community’s 2030 agenda. Special themes included jobs and economic transformation; gender and development; climate change; fragility, conflict, and violence (FCV); and governance and institutions, each of which is examined in Learning from IDA Experience: Lessons from IEG Evaluations, with a Focus on IDA Special Themes and Development Effectiveness. Achievement of the objectives varied across themes, with the strongest results seen in gender and jobs and economic transformation. This review of evaluations from FY12–17 showed that development effectiveness of IDA operations is improving overall but still lagging in FCV countries and that while project-level ratings improved, country program ratings remain below the corporate target. A key message in the report is that monitoring and evaluation design and country data gaps need to be substantially strengthened so appropriate indicators can be selected, tracked, and used to inform decision-making in real time. Training in results reporting at the corporate level and the use of systemwide approaches to build statistical capacity show promise in ameliorating these problems.

IDA Crisis Response Window

IDA’s Crisis Response Window, put in place in 2008 with IDA’s 15th Replenishment, originally focused on economic shocks but later expanded to include natural disasters and public health crises. The window is designed to offer rapid response, transparency and predictability, support for resilience in natural disaster response, and support for long-term development objectives. IDA’s Crisis Response Window: Lessons from IEG Evaluations found that half of the funding from 2010 to 2018 went to the Africa Region, and about half responded to natural disasters. Projects financed through the window performed better than the average IDA operation in delivering project outcomes. Success was associated with building on existing operations that were already good performers, close coordination with partners and other international institutions in the process of crisis response, taking a more flexible approach to delivery, and putting future resilience at the centre of operational design. However, because Crisis Response Window funds were frequently pooled with other IDA financing, it remains challenging to separately evaluate the achievement of all of the window’s objectives.
IDA Regional Window

IDA’s Regional Window Program funds regional integration-related projects in low-income countries. Since the window’s inception in 2003, support to such projects has nearly tripled. Evidence in IDA Regional Window Program 2003–17: Lessons from IEG Evaluations indicates that Regional Window support works both upstream to strengthen the institutional capacity of regional institutions, promote regional policy reform, and set up new regional institutions, and downstream to finance cross-border power, transport, and other predominantly infrastructure projects. The Africa Region received the largest share of support through the window. Outside of Africa, the report found that the window has been used especially well in landlocked countries, small states, and FCV states; however, support is less prominent in regions and subregions with high potential and demand for integration. Although the Regional Window guidelines specify that projects should generate benefits that spill over country boundaries, the definition of what this means is unclear, making it difficult to find evidence of such effects.

Inclusive Growth

The Bank Group has pursued an inclusive agenda for decades, and strategies increasingly focus on equity. Considering evaluations completed between FY09 and FY18, Inclusive Growth: A Synthesis of Findings from Recent IEG Evaluations found that the Bank Group was a leading source of analytical work used to understand the drivers of inclusive growth, and its interventions supporting various related aspects (for example, economic assets and opportunities, human development, and social protection) have effectively achieved their expected development outcomes. However, projects did not always clearly articulate the mechanisms through which they helped the poorest or the often-excluded, and several recommendations called for the systematic consideration of these groups in the design of strategies and operations. The evaluation noted that the Bank Group made significant strides in extending access to basic social, infrastructure, and financial services to large segments of the population, though lack of data on the poorest groups and the often-excluded is a major constraint. Access is not the same as use, however, and reaching true inclusion will require a deeper understanding of the needs of those being served. The role of the private sector, though acknowledged, also requires further investigation.
The flagship report, the Results and Performance of the World Bank Group (RAP), is IEG’s annual review of the development effectiveness of the Bank Group. This year’s report showed that outcome ratings and Bank performance ratings for World Bank lending have continued on an upward trajectory by number and lending volume. Ratings increased in all Practice Groups, with standout improvements in the Human Development Practice Group, and across all Regions, except for the Latin America and the Caribbean Region, which is largely explained by weaker project outcomes in Mexico and Brazil. In countries with fragile and conflict-affected situations, a modest decline in ratings was seen, mainly owing to weak project outcomes in Afghanistan and the Republic of Yemen. IFC development outcome ratings continued the decline that began in 2008. Although the latest cohort of evaluated projects coincided with difficult economic conditions globally, the decline in ratings remained strongly associated with persistent challenges in IFC’s work quality, which the institution is now seeking to address. MIGA’s development outcome ratings increased modestly, with the strongest showing in environmental and social effects.

Source: Independent Evaluation Group.
Note: Different time frames are applied to assessing the performance of projects across the institutions. IFC investment projects are sampled, evaluated, and reported by fiscal year. World Bank, IFC advisory services, and Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency projects are reported by calendar year. World Bank, IFC advisory services, and Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency projects are reported by calendar year. CY = calendar year; FCS = fragile and conflict-affected situation; FY = fiscal year; IBRD = International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; IDA = International Development Association, and the IDA category includes IDA blend; IFC = International Finance Corporation; MS+ = mostly satisfactory or above (World Bank) / mostly successful or better (IFC).

a. IEG assigned FCS status based on the harmonized list of FCS situations.
b. Although the FY18 restructuring of EFI phased out the Trade and Competitiveness (T&C) Global Practice, some projects mapped to T&C remained in World Bank business systems as of October 3, 2018, the data cutoff date for this report. Therefore, T&C is still reported as a Global Practice in this report. Some T&C-mapped projects are expected to be remapped to Finance, Competitiveness and Innovation, others to Macroeconomics, Trade, and Investment.

c. FY05–07 data not available.
Strengthening Client Evaluation Practice

IEG is a key player in supporting evaluators both in IEG and in client countries through several evaluation capacity development programs. IEG drives two capacity building initiatives, the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET) and the Centers for Learning on Evaluation and Results (CLEAR) Initiative. IEG also invests in the skills and capabilities of its own staff through the IEG Academy.
Evaluation Capacity Development

One important part of IEG’s mandate is to assist national, regional, and local governments, as well as civil society and nongovernmental organizations, in strengthening their monitoring and evaluation (M&E) capacity in support of better-designed public policies and increased accountability for results. It is particularly important in the context of the SDGs and Agenda 2030, which require governments to monitor progress and understand what accelerates advancement toward them.

CLEAR is a global network comprising six centers that provide capacity building support for M&E in six different regions of the world. The objective is to deepen the M&E culture in these regions and help establish the needed legal and regulatory framework, systems, procedures, and skills. In FY19, CLEAR demonstrated its commitment to evaluation capacity development with projects in each region.

Anglophone Africa

Worked with members of the Tanzanian Parliament to increase the use of evidence in parliamentary discussions and decisions.

Francophone Africa

Conducted a workshop with Niger’s Finance and Budget Committee to deepen the country’s commitment to evaluation and build capacity in performance-based budgeting.

Brazil and Lusophone Africa

Developed and delivered, together with CLEAR Francophone Africa, a foundations of M&E course for policy makers in Guinea-Bissau as part of ongoing efforts to improve the effectiveness of public policy in a fragile state.

South Asia

Worked with the state government in Tamil Nadu to establish a comprehensive system of M&E throughout the government and support the use of evidence by state officials in public program design.

East Asia

Trained nearly 500 M&E professionals with the objective of growing the pool of highly skilled local evaluators.

Latin America

Led, with support from the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the delivery of the Program in Rural M&E (PRiME) course to 158 rural sector professionals from over 50 countries to enhance the use of M&E by government officials working in the agricultural sector.
CLEAR is also a strong advocate for promoting the use of evidence in policy making globally. In June 2019, CLEAR launched the gLOCAL Evaluation Week. This event recognized that today, more than ever before, global knowledge is shaping local evaluation practices while, at the same time, local experiences are contributing to strengthening global evaluation thinking. In this context, over 270 events were organized in more than 90 cities across 38 countries to share global and local M&E knowledge and experiences.

IPDET is a global executive program in M&E. In July 2019, IEG supported—with its partners the Center for Evaluation in Germany and the University of Bern, Switzerland—the second year of IPDET. This year’s program benefited from closer collaboration with partners and instructors from the Global South. A total of 230 participants from 85 countries took the course this summer to enhance their M&E knowledge and skills.

**Methods Advisory**

IEG’s methods advisory team aims to advise and influence IEG evaluators in implementing high-quality methodological approaches in their evaluations and introducing methodological innovations within IEG. To that end, the methods advisory team worked with other IEG teams to apply a broader range of methodological approaches, including process tracing, social network analysis, Delphi techniques, structured literature reviews, and protocol-based portfolio analysis, in evaluations occurring in FY19. A highlight of FY19 involved the release of the World Bank Group Evaluation Principles, co-led by the IEG Methods Adviser. Finally, other work involves updating and developing methodological guidelines, unifying and professionalizing the work done by IEG’s data analysts, collaborating with World Bank M&E colleagues on bringing external experts to community of practice learning events (the Results Measurement and Evidence Stream), and guiding M&E training with the IEG Academy. Regarding the latter, the methods advisory team successfully organized and delivered courses for IEG staff (and, increasingly, with participation from colleagues from other international DC-based institutions such as the Inter-American Development Bank): Foundations of Evaluation Design; Theory of Change; and several Portfolio Review and Analysis training modules.

**IEG Academy**

In FY19, the IEG Academy took on its second year in full force. Two all-staff dedicated Learning Days highlighted the importance of professional growth and development to IEG. Courses covered a wide range of topics, including the foundations of evaluation design, problem-solving techniques, and design thinking. In addition, over the course of the year, IEG Academy hosted 47 classes and provided on-the-job tools and coaching opportunities.

A highlight of FY19 was the release of the World Bank Group Evaluation Principles, co-led by the IEG Methods Adviser in collaboration with IFC, MIGA, and the World Bank. Based on the evaluation framework established in FY18, the document delineates core principles for evaluation and underlying principles for planning, conducting, and using evaluations at the Bank Group. Informed by international evaluation principles and good practice standards, the common principles are designed to enhance development results by strengthening accountability and learning. The principles align the Bank Group’s evaluative efforts with global challenges and with its strategic focus; clarify the roles and responsibilities of key actors and encourage synergy among them throughout the evaluation process; and ensure that all Bank Group evaluations are robust, of high quality, and credible.
FY19 Highlights

- Major Evaluations: 5
- Corporate Evaluation: 1
- Sector and Thematic Evaluations: 4
- Country Program Evaluations: 0
- Meso Evaluations: 2
- Synthesis Reports: 4
- Learning Engagements: 7

Total Validations:
- Reports: 443
- Countries: 96+

Implementation Completion and Results Report Reviews:
- Reports: 228
- Countries: 89

Project Completion Reports:
- Reports: 75

Expanded Project Supervision Reports:
- Reports: 104

MIGA Validations:
- Reports: 18
Evaluating Globally

Note: CLRR = Completion and Learning Report Review; ICRR = Implementation Completion and Results Report Review; PPAR = Project Performance Assessment Report.
INDEPENDENT EVALUATION GROUP

Most-Downloaded Reports

- Citizen Engagement: 1,583
- Knowledge Flow and Collaboration: 847
- 2017 RAP: 1,481
- Carbon Finance: 1,067
- Health PPP LP: 946
- Health Services: 864
- Regional Integration: 825
- Facilitating Trade: 649
- Creating Markets: 548

Most-Read Blogs

- Hope or Hype? Attracting Investors to Emerging Markets and Developing Economies: 3,509
- Uncovering Factors of Project Success: A Literature Review: 3,316
- Evaluation and the Sustainable Development Goals: Unpacking the Issues: 2,067
- Why Growth Alone is Not Enough to Reduce Poverty: 1,957
- A Return to the World Bank Group: 1,806
Total Spending, FY15–19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of IEG Expenses, FY19

- Administration: 27% ($10.1K)
- Major Evaluations: 23% ($8.5K)
- Knowledge and Communications: 17% ($6.6K)
- Valuations: 8% ($3.1K)
- Project-Level Evaluations: 13% ($4.9K)
- Meso Evaluations: 5% ($1.9K)
- Country-Focused Evaluations: 4% ($1.4K)
- Learning Engagements: 1% ($0.5K)
- Evaluation Capacity Development: 2% ($0.8K)
Maximizing Strategic Focus to Increase World Bank Group Effectiveness

In FY20, IEG will position itself to focus on the development effectiveness questions that most concern the institution and its clients. IEG’s work program for FY20 is built around several work streams that align with Bank Group strategic priorities, the IBRD and IFC capital packages, and recent IDA replenishments. The work program seeks to provide even greater impact by building evidence across evaluations, providing more timely and flexible evaluation formats, and closing the feedback loop through more systematic engagement throughout the evaluation cycle.
To increase the benefits of its strategic topic selection, IEG will seek lessons from multiple perspectives at the country, client, and beneficiary levels, and will offer improved knowledge packaging and customized outreach for different audiences. For example, Country Program Evaluations will be geared toward maximizing their potential to inform the design of subsequent Country Partnership Frameworks while contributing more broadly to enhancing the Bank Group support for development impact more broadly. Demand-driven learning engagements will be held on M&E frameworks in FCV situations, the World Bank’s organizational effectiveness to deliver on its jobs agenda, and South-South exchanges. At the corporate level, IEG plans to provide timely inputs to the IDA19 midterm review and the IDA20 discussions by evaluating areas relevant to the IDA18 and IDA19 Replenishment Themes.

IEG will also increase its engagement with operational counterparts throughout the evaluation life cycle to enrich content and use. At the beginning of the process, this will provide evaluators with informed, context-specific inputs. At the end, the increased attention to dissemination will boost uptake and allow evaluators to see their lessons put into play, providing more insights for future evaluations.

All facets of Bank Group projects should be examined and learned from, but the most visible, and perhaps the most meaningful, of these is outcomes. IEG will work closely with Bank Group management in FY20 to take the institution’s outcome orientation agenda to the next level. This means finding ways to generate better information on the results and impacts of Bank Group operations, extending beyond simple attribution to a concrete analysis of contribution, which will encourage an even stronger push for results. IEG will contribute by reviewing project-level validations and evaluations for quality, use, cost, methodology, and value.

Improving evaluation practice is a cornerstone of IEG’s work. In FY20, IEG intends to expand its role as an incubator of innovative practices and methods for evaluation and build on its unique position to bring technical experts together by expanding its role as an incubator of innovative practices and methods for evaluation. Overarching themes include systems approaches, case-based methods (especially relating to causal analysis), using new data (for example, social media or geospatial data), and new approaches for data analytics and visualization.

As IEG introduces more flexible approaches to answer strategic evaluation questions, it will take a correspondingly adaptable approach to presenting its findings. FY20 will see shorter, more focused evaluative products and more willingness to consider different product styles designed for specific audience needs. We are excited to push the evaluation practice in a fresh, meaningful direction.
Work Program, FY20–23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDG</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Gender equality in FCV countries (E)</td>
<td>Gender strategy (TE)</td>
<td>PSEA and GBV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragility, Conflict, and Violence</td>
<td>Post-conflict reconstruction and reintegration (E)</td>
<td>FCI/FCV countries (TE)</td>
<td>FCV strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>Natural resources degradation (TE)</td>
<td>Solid waste management (TE)</td>
<td>Climate action plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximizing Finance for Development</td>
<td>Mobilization of private capital (TE)</td>
<td>Blended finance (TE)</td>
<td>Catalyzing private finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Capital</td>
<td>Aging (TE)</td>
<td>Stunting (TE)</td>
<td>High fertility (TE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Evaluations particularly relevant to the Bank twin goals are shown in green. AIMM = Anticipated Impact Measurement and Monitoring; CPE = Country Program Evaluation; CPF = Country Partnership Framework; E = other evaluation; FCV = fragility, conflict, and violence; GBV = gender-based violence; PSEA = Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse; RAP = Results and Performance of the World Bank Group; RAS = reimbursable advisory services; SCD = Systematic Country Diagnostic; SOE = state-owned enterprise; T = thematic evaluation.
### IEG Deliverables and Spending (number, unless otherwise indicated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Major Evaluations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Evaluations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector and Thematic Evaluations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Program Evaluations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meso Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Engagements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Evaluations and Global Program Reviews</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Validations</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Completion and Results Reports</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion and Learning Report Review</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Completion Reports</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Project Supervision Reports</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIGA Validations</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** — = not available.

a. For validation products, IEG makes a rough estimate of the planned numbers at the beginning of the year, but actual delivery is determined by how many reports the World Bank Group provide to validate. FY18 delivery of Project Performance Assessment Reports was below target values because of one-time effects from substantial turnover in staff and management. Internal coordinators for these reports have been put in place, and a robust pipeline has been developed for FY19 delivery. In the case of the Completion and Learning Report (CLR) Reviews, actual delivery to the Board is determined by the timing of the Country Partnership Framework Board discussion. All CLRs received by IEG are reviewed and delivered to the Board on schedule in line with the Policy and Operations unit of the Secretariat lead time requirements. In other words, the percentage does not reflect slippages in CLR Review delivery but slippages or delays in Country Partnership Framework Board discussions.

### IEG Staffing (number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-GD</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gl and above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (ETT, ETC, UC)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>