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Introduction
Introduction

• This report presents the findings of the 2017 Client Survey of the World Bank Group’s Independent Evaluation Group (IEG).

• For 15 plus years, IEG has conducted a client survey to gather opinions on the quality and impact of their evaluations to:
  o Obtain feedback on clients’ general awareness and attitudes toward IEG;
  o Assess IEG’s products and services in line with results framework; and
  o Share research findings with key stakeholders (IEG management and World Bank Group Board) as an assessment of IEG’s effectiveness.

• Insights from the 2017 IEG survey will help IEG guide its results framework, inform strategic decision-making, and anticipate demand for its services.

• Specific Key Performance Indicators this report examines include: awareness of IEG; perceived focus of IEG’s work; relevance and effectiveness of IEG’s work; readership of IEG’s products; satisfaction with products; utility, influence; and quality products.

• The findings detailed here are based on three surveys conducted among three different audiences: WBG Board members and advisors, WBG Staff, and External Stakeholders. All WBG staff received the same survey.

• This report shows key comparisons across the three groups as well as individual findings within each group. Additionally, this report compared the results from previous years.
Methodology

- This study was conducted online simultaneously for the three audiences from January 1, 2017 to March 9, 2017.

- ORC International Interviewed a total of 2183 respondents. This sample included:
  - 1239 WBG Staff;
  - 907 Externals; and
  - 37 Board Members.

- The questionnaire was divided into two main sections.
  - The first section focused on general perceptions and attitudes toward IEG as an organization, and asked respondents general questions about their familiarity with IEG’s role, impact and independence.
  - The second section focused on collecting feedback on IEG’s evaluation products, with respondents asked to rate their overall and detailed satisfaction with the most recent evaluation products they read in the last 12 months.

- A copy of the questionnaire may be viewed by clicking on the following icon.

- Throughout this report, statistical testing is conducted at the 90% confidence level.
Key Findings: General Overview

- **Familiarity:** Familiarity with IEG continues to remain strong, particularly with Board Members. Among Staff and Externals, familiarity is highest with senior level WBG Staff and Externals who work in international organizations and academia.

- **Relevance:** IEG continues to hold strong relevance for the WBG’s mission. However, this level of relevance has declined slightly among Staff (from 60% in 2015 to 55% in 2017) and Externals (from 79% in 2012 to 73% in 2017).

- **Independence:** Stakeholder perceptions of IEG’s independence remain high across all audiences (82% among Staff, 90% Board, and 83% Externals). This perception has remained stable for Staff and Externals but has seen a declining trend among Board Members. This decline continued into 2017.

- **Learning vs. accountability gap:** Relative to 2015, the learning vs. accountability gap shrunk for Board Members and Externals but remained stable for Staff in 2017. Staff believe that IEG’s work overemphasizes accountability over learning. Among Staff, this gap is widest with senior level employees. In contrast, Externals see IEG’s learning and accountability emphases as well balanced.

- **Impact:** Board Members (85%) and Externals (84%) rate IEG’s work as impactful to WBG activities, while Staff remain more skeptical (63%). Compared to 2015, Board Members’ rating of IEG’s impact increased by a significant 19%.

- **Utility:** About half (53%) of Staff and sizeable majorities of Board Members (80%) and Externals (64%) have used an IEG report over the past 12 months. Externals’ reading of IEG reports grew compared to 2015.
Overall use: Overall use of IEG products remains high across all audiences (Board, 96%; Externals, 91%; and Staff, 75%). Overall Staff use of IEG products has increased significantly since 2015. Staff use IEG products to provide advice to clients, Externals to assess sector and project strategies, and Board Members to assess country strategies.

Satisfaction: Satisfaction with the quality of IEG products is highest with Externals (4.6) but lowest with Staff (4.1). Among Staff, satisfaction is highest at the GF level and lowest at GH. In terms of evaluation reports, Staff are most satisfied with the executive summaries but are least satisfied with the process of engagement and incorporation of all relevant information.

Influence: Across all influence attributes, perceived influence of IEG reports is highest among Externals and lowest among Staff; influence is greatest for past operational experience.

Satisfaction with IEG Recommendations: Both Staff and Board Members report high levels of satisfaction with IEG recommendations.

IEG Outreach: The email newsletter announcements, the IEG website, and IEG publications are the most effective forms of outreach. Client perceptions of the effectiveness of these channels increased significantly relative to 2015.
Key Findings
## Familiarity with IEG’s work remains highest among Board Members

Familiarity among Staff and Externals has grown since 2014, remaining stable for the past 2 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WBG Staff Total</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14% C</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td>71% C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11% AB</td>
<td></td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WBG Board Total</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100% G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WBG External Total</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
<td>81% M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82% M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Top 2 Box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Familiar &amp; Frequently Read Reports</th>
<th>Familiar &amp; Occasionally Read Reports</th>
<th>Know About But Have Not Read Reports</th>
<th>Not Familiar At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 (1239) A</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>71% C</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (576) B</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100% G</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 (1411) C</td>
<td>81% M</td>
<td>82% M</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base: Total**

Q13. To what extent are you familiar with IEGs work and reports?

Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (A/B/C/D, E/F/G/H, J/K/M/N).
Among Staff, highest levels among senior level staff and those based in HQ.

The GE and GF grade levels had the lowest awareness levels of any group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>HR Grade Level</th>
<th>WBG Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>95% ABEGJMN</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>86% ABEGMN</td>
<td>71% EFN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90% ABEFMN</td>
<td>65% EF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very Familiar & Frequently Read Reports

Familiar & Occasionally Read Reports

Base: Total
Q13. To what extent are you familiar with IEGs work and reports?  * Caution: Small (<30) base size. Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/J/K/M/N).
Among Externals, IEG familiarity is highest among those who work in International Organizations and Academia.

Familiarity is highest in Africa. Lowest among Externals who work in private firms/companies.

Base: Total
Q13. To what extent are you familiar with IEGs work and reports?
*Caution: Small (<30) base size. Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H, J/K/M/N/P/Q/R/S).
IEG continues to be seen as relevant to the WBG mission, however this perception has declined slightly among Staff since 2015 and Externals since 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>WBG</th>
<th>Externals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>19% CD</td>
<td>46% AB</td>
<td>5% C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>20% CD</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7% C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>44% A</td>
<td>5% C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>46% AB</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top 2 Box**

- **55% (2017)**
- **60% (2015)**

**Base:** Familiar With IEG’s Work

Q17. How relevant do you think is IEG’s work to the World Bank Groups overall mission (to end extreme poverty within a generation and boost shared prosperity)?

*Caution: Small (<30) base size. Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (A/B/C/D, E/F/G/H, J/K/M/N).*
Perceived relevance of IEG’s work among Staff is highest among the GE and GF levels, lowest among the GH levels.

Relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>TOTAL (858)</th>
<th>WBG (IBRD/IDA) (566) A</th>
<th>IFC (264) B</th>
<th>MIGA (15)* C</th>
<th>ICFID (1)* D</th>
<th>WBG Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HR Grade Level</th>
<th>GE (48) E</th>
<th>GF (140) F</th>
<th>GG (412) G</th>
<th>GH Managerial (72) H</th>
<th>GH Non-Managerial (130) J</th>
<th>GH+ (28)* K</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67% HJ</td>
<td>64%ABGHJM</td>
<td>48% GHJM</td>
<td>46% AGH JM</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20% BN</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>41% AGH JM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Familiar With IEGs Work

Q17. How relevant do you think is IEGs work to the World Bank Groups overall mission (to end extreme poverty within a generation and boost shared prosperity)?

Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/J/K/M/N).

*Caution: Small (<30) base size.
Relevance of IEG’s work remains high and stable among Externals.

**Organization Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Very Familiar &amp; Frequently Read Reports</th>
<th>Familiar &amp; Occasionally Read Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (731)</td>
<td>73%  (32%)</td>
<td>41%  (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int'l. Org. (148)</td>
<td>72%  (40%)</td>
<td>40%  (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO-Non-Profit (97)</td>
<td>77%  (43%)</td>
<td>43%  (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov't. Donor Org. (32)</td>
<td>73% (40%)</td>
<td>60%  (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper/News Media (5)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>43%  (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov't. (105) E</td>
<td>78%  (44%)</td>
<td>30%  (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Firm/Company (123)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>43%  (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academia/Research (141)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>44%  (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think Tank (20) H</td>
<td>50%  (30%)</td>
<td>20%  (30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Very Familiar &amp; Frequently Read Reports</th>
<th>Familiar &amp; Occasionally Read Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MENA (43) J</td>
<td>67%  (33%)</td>
<td>35%  (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia (82) K</td>
<td>75%  (44%)</td>
<td>31%  (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe &amp; Central Asia (26) M</td>
<td>63%  (25%)</td>
<td>38%  (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe &amp; (107) N</td>
<td>68%  (28%)</td>
<td>40%  (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia &amp; Pacific (61) P</td>
<td>71%  (24%)</td>
<td>48%  (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America (136) Q</td>
<td>76%  (39%)</td>
<td>37%  (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LatAm &amp; Caribbean (86) R</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>49%  (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa (190) S</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>43%  (33%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base:** Familiar With IEGs Work

*Caution: Small (<30) base size.

Q17. How relevant do you think is IEGs work to the World Bank Groups overall mission (to end extreme poverty within a generation and boost shared prosperity)? Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H, J/K/M/N/P/Q/R/S).
Board Members’ perceptions of IEG’s alignment with WBG goals have grown considerably since 2014.

Q18. In your opinion, how strategically aligned are IEG evaluations with the World Bank Group’s goals? Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (D/E/F).

Base: Familiar With IEGs Work

Top 2 Box

- 2017 (35) D: A Great Deal 79%
- 2015 (31) E: Very Much 58%
- 2014 (46) F: Some Extent 61%

Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (D/E/F).
IEG’s perceived independence is generally rated high across all groups, though this perception has declined slightly among Board Members.

### Top 3 Box Average Across All Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 A</td>
<td>WBG Staff Total</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 B</td>
<td>WBG Staff Total</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 C</td>
<td>WBG Staff Total</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 D</td>
<td>WBG Staff Total</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 E</td>
<td>WBG Board Total</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 F</td>
<td>WBG Board Total</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 G</td>
<td>WBG Board Total</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 H</td>
<td>WBG Board Total</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 J</td>
<td>WBG External Total</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 K</td>
<td>WBG External Total</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 M</td>
<td>WBG External Total</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 N</td>
<td>WBG External Total</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: Familiar With IEGs Work

Q21. How would you rate IEG’s independence based on these following criteria? (6=Very High, 1=Very Low)

Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (A/B/C/D, E/F/G/H, J/K/M/N).

* Caution: Small (<30) base size.*
Among Board Members, IEG’s perceived independence remains high and stable, with the exception of “Behavioral independence,” which has declined since 2012.

### Independence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance of conflicts of interest</th>
<th>Protection from external influence</th>
<th>Organizational independence</th>
<th>Behavioral independence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91% 85% 95% 100%</td>
<td>93% 88% 93% 100%</td>
<td>94% 93% 100% 96%</td>
<td>81% 83% 89% 96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 3 Box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% 4% 5% 24%</td>
<td>7% 13% 2% 5%</td>
<td>6% 7% 28% 15%</td>
<td>6% 3% 2% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22% 26%</td>
<td>25% 29% 31% 42%</td>
<td>22% 27% 28% 16%</td>
<td>22% 21% 32% 42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41% 22%</td>
<td>43% 33% 50% 33%</td>
<td>50% 33% 59% 54%</td>
<td>54% 31% 35% 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28% 37%</td>
<td>25% 25% 57% 42%</td>
<td>42% 13% 28% 27%</td>
<td>28% 28% 16% 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Somewhat High</td>
<td>Low/Very Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Familiar With IEGs Work

Q21. How would you rate IEG’s independence based on these following criteria?

Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (D/E/F/G).
WBG Staff continue to see IEG as very independent across all independence attributes.

### Independence

**Avoidance of conflicts of interest**
- Very High: 80%
- High: 78%
- Somewhat High: 79%
- Somewhat Low: 82%
- Low/Very Low: 79%

**Protection from external influence**
- Very High: 81%
- High: 82%
- Somewhat High: 79%
- Somewhat Low: 79%
- Low/Very Low: 86%

**Organizational independence**
- Very High: 79%
- High: 77%
- Somewhat High: 86%
- Somewhat Low: 79%
- Low/Very Low: 82%

**Behavioral independence**
- Very High: 80%
- High: 78%
- Somewhat High: 79%
- Somewhat Low: 82%
- Low/Very Low: 79%

*Base: Familiar With IEGs Work

Q21. How would you rate IEG’s independence based on these following criteria? Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (A/B/C/D).
Among Externals, IEG’s perceived independence remains high; “Behavioral independence” increased relative to 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Avoidance of conflicts of interest</th>
<th>Protection from external influence</th>
<th>Organizational independence</th>
<th>Behavioral independence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 3 Box</td>
<td>85% 82% 81%</td>
<td>80% 76% 79%</td>
<td>85% 81% 85%</td>
<td>81%J 75% 79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37% H</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>16% J</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Somewhat High</td>
<td>Somewhat Low</td>
<td>Low/Very Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Familiar With IEGs Work
Q21. How would you rate IEG’s independence based on these following criteria? Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (H/J/K/M).

* Caution: Small (<30) base size.
The Learning vs. Accountability gap has shrunk for WBG Board and Externals since 2015 but has remained stable among Staff.

Base: Familiar With IEGs Work
Q15. Where would you put IEG’s present emphasis between learning and accountability?
Q16. And where do you believe the emphasis should be?
Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (A/B/C).
Among Staff, the Learning vs. Accountability gap remains highest among senior Staff and has grown among the GH level staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Learning (%)</th>
<th>Where emphasis should be (%)</th>
<th>Present emphasis (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WBG (IBRD/IDA) (566) A</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFC (264) B</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIGA (15)* C</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICFID (1)* D</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE (48) E</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF (140) F</td>
<td>21% ABGMN</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG (412) G</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH Managerial (72) H</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH Non-Managerial (130) J</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI+ (28)* K</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ (467) M</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Based (391) N</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Familiar With IEGs Work

Q15. Where would you put IEG’s present emphasis between learning and accountability?
Q16. And where do you believe the emphasis should be?

Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/J/K/M/N).

* Caution: Small (<30) base size.
Staff who are less satisfied with IEG products and those most familiar with IEG see the largest Learning vs. Accountability gap.

### Familiarity with IEG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiarity Level</th>
<th>Learning Emphasis</th>
<th>Present Emphasis</th>
<th>Where Emphasis Should Be</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (148) A</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>(5.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (709) B</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>(6.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (2) C</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(8.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall Satisfaction with Product Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiarity Level</th>
<th>Learning Emphasis</th>
<th>Evenly Split</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (259) A</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>49% B</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (161) B</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>69% A</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (31) C</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>(7.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Familiar With IEGs Work

*Caution: Small (<30) base size.
Q15. Where would you put IEG’s present emphasis between learning and accountability? Q16. And where do you believe the emphasis should be? Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (A/B/C).
Among Staff, the Learning vs. Accountability gap remains widest among TTLs and those who have been evaluated by IEG.

**Task Team Leader**

- Yes (499) G
  - Learning: 11%
  - Where emphasis should be: 32%
  - Present emphasis: 56% HK

- No (360) H
  - Learning: 14%
  - Where emphasis should be: 39% J
  - Present emphasis: 47%

**Evaluated by IEG**

- Yes (373) J
  - Learning: 11%
  - Where emphasis should be: 30%
  - Present emphasis: 59% HK

- No (486) K
  - Learning: 14%
  - Where emphasis should be: 39% GJ
  - Present emphasis: 47%

*Caution: Small (<30) base size.*

Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (G/H, J/K, G/J, H/K).
Externals believe the current Learning & Accountability emphasis is exactly where it needs to be.

Q15. Where would you put IEG's present emphasis between learning and accountability?
Q16. And where do you believe the emphasis should be?

**Learning vs. Accountability**

- **Learning**: 21%
- **Accountability**: 31%
- **Evenly Split**: 48%

Base: Familiar With IEGs Work
Perceived impact of IEG’s work on effectiveness of WBG activities remains high and increased across all three audiences, but remains lowest among Staff.

### The effectiveness of the World Bank Group’s activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Top 3 Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WBG Board (35) A</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36% B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change from 2015</td>
<td>+19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBG Staff (858) B</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18% C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19% C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change from 2015</td>
<td>+6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externals (731) C</td>
<td>15% B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32% B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change from 2015</td>
<td>+5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The broader development community’s effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Top 3 Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WBG Board (35) A</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16% C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change from 2015</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBG Staff (858) B</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24% C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25% C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change from 2015</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externals (731) C</td>
<td>13% B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27% B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43% B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change from 2015</td>
<td>+8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ratings on perceived impact of IEG’s work increased significantly compared to 2015, especially among Board Members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Top 3 Box</th>
<th>The effectiveness of the World Bank Group's activities</th>
<th>The broader development community’s effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WBG Staff Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (858) A</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>63% +6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (450/420) B</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 (1178/1120) C</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 (653/609) D</td>
<td>63% ABD</td>
<td>63% ABD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WBG Board Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (35) E</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>85% +19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (31) F</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 (45/42) G</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 (26/25)* H</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WBG External Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (731) J</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>84% N +5%</td>
<td>82% KN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (256/255) K</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 (585/610) M</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>90% JKN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 (367/372) N</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Familiar With IEGs Work

Q20. To what extent do you think that IEG’s work in the past 12 months has impacted on the following?

Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (A/B/C/D, E/F/G/H, J/K/M/N).
Use of IEG Products is most common among the Board; over the past 12 months, Externals’ reading of IEG reports grew, but remained stable among WBG Staff and Board Members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Used an IEG Report in the Course of Your Work In P12M</th>
<th>Reports Read In P12M*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WBG Staff Total</strong></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (857) A</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (406) B</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WBG Board Total</strong></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (35) E</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (31) F</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WBG External Total</strong></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (731) J</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (274) K</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Familiar With IEGs Work Q23. Have you used an IEG report in the course of your work in in the past 12 months?
Q24. How many IEG reports have you read, at least in part, in the past 12 months?
Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (H/J/K/M).

* Among those that used an IEG report.
Among Staff, those with a high familiarity with IEG and those evaluated by IEG are most likely to have used an IEG report in their work in the past 12 months.

**Base: Familiar With IEGs Work**
Q23. Have you used an IEG report in the course of your work in the past 12 months? Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (A/B, G/H, J/K, G/J, H/K).
Among Staff, professional use of IEG products is greatest among HQ based and higher grade levels, particularly GI+.

### Utility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>HR Grade Level</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Based</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI+ (28)*</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH Non-Managerial</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH Managerial</td>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG (412)</td>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF (139)</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE (48)</td>
<td></td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: Familiar With IEGs Work*

Q23. Have you used an IEG report in the course of your work in the past 12 months? Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (E/F/G/H/J/K/M/N).
Project-Level Evaluations and Reviews and Sector-Level Evaluations are the most common IEG products read by Staff, Country-Focused Evaluations by Board.

Q25. Which of the following IEG products have you read over the past 12 months?

Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (H/J/K/M).

- **Country-Focused Evaluations And Reviews**: 82% (82%)
- **Project-Level Evaluations And Reviews**: 54% (64%)
- **Corporate And Process Evaluations**: 21% (50%)
- **Results And Performance Of The World Bank Group (RAP)**: 23% (57%)
- **Sector And Thematic Evaluations**: 40% (68%)
- **Global Program Reviews**: 11% (25%)
- **IEG Impact Evaluations**: 36% (46%)
- **Evaluation Capacity Development (ECD) Working Papers**: 6% (14%)
- **IEG’s Annual Report**: 19% (57%)
- **Other**: 7% (7%)

*Base: Familiar With IEGs Work And Used IEG Report
*Caution: Small (<30) base size.

Q25. Which of the following IEG products have you read over the past 12 months?

Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (H/J/K/M).
The percentage of Externals who’ve read IEG reports remains stable; Latin America and South Asia have the highest readership rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>4-5</th>
<th>More Than 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Externals (464)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA (27)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia (51)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe and Central Asia (16)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe (70)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia and Pacific (40)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America (81)</td>
<td>63% K</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LatAm and Carribeans (54)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa (125)</td>
<td>66% K</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Caution: Small (<30) base size.*

Q24. How many IEG reports have you read, at least in part, in the past 12 months?

Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (J/K/M/N/P/Q/R/S).
Overall use of IEG products is high and increasing across all audiences, though it remains lowest among Staff.

**% Top 3 Box**

| WBG Board Total | 2017 (28)* E | 96% |
|                 | 2015 (24)* F | 91% |
|                 | 2014 G       | NA  |
|                 | 2012 (22)* H | 91% |
| WBG External Total | 2017 (464) J | 91% N |
|                 | 2015 (152) K | 86% |
|                 | 2014 M       | NA  |
|                 | 2012 (222) N | 82% |
| WBG Staff Total | 2017 (457) A | 75% BCD |
|                 | 2015 (202) B | 66% |
|                 | 2014 (820) C | 65% |
|                 | 2012 (232) D | 62% |

Base: Familiar With IEGs Work And Used IEG Report  
* Caution: Small (<30) base size.  
Q34/36. Thinking of the IEG products you have read in the past 12 months, to what extent did you use them for the following? (6=Great Deal, 1=Not At All)  
Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (A/B/C/D, E/F/G/H, J/K/M/N).
Overall use of IEG products by WBG Staff increased considerably in 2017.

---

**Overall Use**

**Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2017 (457)</th>
<th>2015 (202)</th>
<th>2014 (820)</th>
<th>2012 (232)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6% C</td>
<td>4% C</td>
<td>2% C</td>
<td>6% C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>21% C</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>48% D</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46% D</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>75% BCD</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean

- **2017 (457) A**: 3.9 BCD
- **2015 (202) B**: 3.7 D
- **2014 (820) C**: 3.6
- **2012 (232) D**: 3.5

---

*Base: Familiar With IEGs Work And Used IEG Report*

Q36. Thinking of the IEG products you have read in the past 12 months, to what extent did you use them for the following? (6=A Great Deal, 1=Not At All)

Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (A/B/C/D).
The various uses of IEG products remain stable; Providing Advice to Clients remains the most common use among Staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 3 Box</th>
<th>% Change from 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Use (444)</td>
<td>75% +9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing Or Modifying Lending Or Non-Lending Operations (412)</td>
<td>51% +4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing Or Modifying Policies And/Or Strategies (419)</td>
<td>54% +1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing Of Modifying Results Frameworks (421)</td>
<td>59% +1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Advice To Clients And/Or Staff (436)</td>
<td>63% +2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Familiar With IEGs Work And Used IEG Report
Q36. Thinking of the IEG products you have read in the past 12 months, to what extent did you use them for the following? (6=A Great Deal, 1=Not At All)
Overall use of IEG products among Externals has increased since 2015; Assessing Projects and Sector Strategies are the most common uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **A Great Deal**
- **Very Much**
- **Some Extent**
- **Little**
- **Very Little/Not At All**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 3 Box</th>
<th>% Change from 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91%</td>
<td>+5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74%</td>
<td>+5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
<td>+7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Familiar With IEGs Work And Used IEG Report
Q34. Thinking of the IEG products you have read in the past 12 months, to what extent did you use them for the following? (6=A Great Deal, 1=Not At All)
Among Board Members, Assessing Country Strategies is the most common use for IEG products; Making the Case for a Particular Course declined from 2015.

### Board Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Overall Use (27)*</th>
<th>Assessing Sector Strategies (26)*</th>
<th>Assessing Projects (28)*</th>
<th>Assessing Country Strategies (27)*</th>
<th>Commenting On Or Making Inputs To The Work Of Others (27)*</th>
<th>Making The Case For A Particular Course Of Action (26)*</th>
<th>Assessing WBG Policies And Procedures (27)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Great Deal</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Extent</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change from 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 3 Box</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Caution: Small (<30) base size.

Q34. Thinking of the IEG products you have read in the past 12 months, to what extent did you use them for the following? (6=A Great Deal, 1=Not At All)
Overall satisfaction with IEG products is highest among Externals, lowest among Staff.

- **Top 3 Box**
  - **Very Satisfied**
    - WBG Board (28)* A: 18%
    - WBG Staff (458) B: 10%
    - Externals (464) C: 25%
  - **Satisfied**
    - WBG Board (28)* A: 46%
    - WBG Staff (458) B: 48%
    - Externals (464) C: 53%
  - **Somewhat Satisfied**
    - WBG Board (28)* A: 21%
    - WBG Staff (458) B: 22%
    - Externals (464) C: 17%
  - **Totals**
    - 86%
    - 80%
    - 95%

Base: Familiar With IEGs Work And Used IEG Report

Q26. How satisfied are you with the overall quality of the IEG products that you read in the past 12 months? Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (A/B/C).
Among Staff, satisfaction with the overall quality of IEG products is highest at the GF level.
Among Staff, satisfaction with the overall quality of IEG products is lowest among TTLs and those evaluated by IEG.

**Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Team Leader</th>
<th>Yes (259) G</th>
<th>No (199) H</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16% K</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluated By IEG</th>
<th>Yes (222) J</th>
<th>No (236) K</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4.5GJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>53% J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17% HK</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q26. How satisfied are you with the overall quality of the IEG products that you read in the past 12 months?

Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (G/H/J/K).
Among Externals, satisfaction with the quality of IEG products is highest in Latin America and Caribbean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied/Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MENA (27)* J</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia (51) K</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe and Central Asia (16)*</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe (70) N</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia and Pacific (40) P</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America (81) Q</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LatAm and Carribeans (54) R</td>
<td>43% PQS</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa (125) S</td>
<td>27% Q</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q26. How satisfied are you with the overall quality of the IEG products that you read in the past 12 months? Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (J/K/M/N/P/Q/R/S).
Satisfaction with IEG evaluation reports remains highest among Externals and lowest among Staff; in particular, Process of Engagement and Incorporation of Relevant Information lowest ranked aspects for Staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>WBG Board* A</th>
<th>WBG Staff B</th>
<th>Externals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance To Your Work</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Of Engagement</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease Of Understanding</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency And Clarity Of The Methodology</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation Of All Available Relevant Information</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbiased And Objective Analysis</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Link Between Conclusions And Evidence</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness Of Executive Summary</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Caution: Small (<30) base size.

Q27. Thinking of all the IEG reports you have read in the past 12 months, how satisfied were you with the following aspects of the evaluation reports? (6=Very Satisfied, 1=Very Dissatisfied)

Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (A/B).
Aspects of IEG reports that Staff are most satisfied with are the Executive Summary and Relevance to Work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied/Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness (406)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance To Your Work (450)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Of Engagement (385)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease Of Understanding (450)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency And Clarity Of The Methodology (441)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation Of All Available Relevant Information (427)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbiased And Objective Analysis (439)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Link Between Conclusions And Evidence (442)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness Of Executive Summary (439)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Familiar With IEGs Work And Used IEG Report
Q27. Thinking of all the IEG reports you have read in the past 12 months, how satisfied were you with the following aspects of the evaluation reports?
In general, satisfaction with relevance of IEG products remains stable among Staff, however the mean score among the GF level has decreased since 2015.

### Staff “Relevance to your work”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Change from 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GE (23)* E</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF (77) F</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG (204) G</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH Managerial (44) H</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14% G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH Non-Managerial (72) J</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI+ (24)* K</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ (281) M</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Based (177) N</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Familiar With IEGs Work And Used IEG Report

* Caution: Small (<30) base size.

Q27. Thinking of all the IEG reports you have read in the past 12 months, how satisfied were you with the following aspects of the evaluation reports? Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (E/F/G/H/J/K/M/N).
Satisfaction levels among Board members have remained excellent or improved considerably since 2015, with the exception of Process of Engagement, which declined since 2015.

### Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Top 3 Box</th>
<th>% Change from 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness (28)*</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>+12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance To Your Work (28)*</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>+5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Of Engagement (26)*</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease Of Understanding (28)*</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency And Clarity Of The Methodology (28)*</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation Of All Available Relevant Information (27)*</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>+5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbiased And Objective Analysis (28)*</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Link Between Conclusions And Evidence (27)*</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>+6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness Of Executive Summary (28)*</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Familiar With IEGs Work And Used IEG Report

Q27. Thinking of all the IEG reports you have read in the past 12 months, how satisfied were you with the following aspects of the evaluation reports? (6=Very Satisfied, 1=Very Dissatisfied)

* Caution: Small (<30) base size.
Externals continue to report good satisfaction ratings of IEG products.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Top 3 Box</th>
<th>% Change from 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance To Your Work (460)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease Of Understanding (461)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency And Clarity Of The Methodology (461)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbiased And Objective Analysis (453)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Link Between Conclusions And Evidence (459)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness Of Executive Summary (456)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Familiar With IEGs Work And Used IEG Report
Q28. Thinking of all the IEG reports you have read in the past 12 months, how satisfied were you with the following aspects of the evaluation reports?

* Caution: Small (<30) base size.
Among Staff, perceived influence of IEG’s products remains high and has grown since 2015; influence is greatest for Past Operational Experience.

**Influence**

**Top 3 Box**

- The Subject Area (443)
  - A Great Deal: 8%
  - Very Much: 30%
  - Some Extent: 38%
  - Little: 13%
  - Very Little/Not At All: 11%
  - 77%

- What Works In Development (435)
  - A Great Deal: 6%
  - Very Much: 21%
  - Some Extent: 43%
  - Little: 16%
  - Very Little/Not At All: 14%
  - 70%

- Essential Lessons Learned From Past Operational Experience (448)
  - A Great Deal: 9%
  - Very Much: 36%
  - Some Extent: 34%
  - Little: 11%
  - Very Little/Not At All: 10%
  - 79%

- Development Results Of Projects/Operations (440)
  - A Great Deal: 8%
  - Very Much: 33%
  - Some Extent: 37%
  - Little: 13%
  - Very Little/Not At All: 9%
  - 78%

- The WBG's Development Effectiveness (434)
  - A Great Deal: 6%
  - Very Much: 24%
  - Some Extent: 42%
  - Little: 16%
  - Very Little/Not At All: 12%
  - 71%

*Caution: Small (<30) base size.*

Q30. Thinking of the IEG products you have read in the past 12 months, to what extent have they improved your understanding of the following?
IEG products remain influential across all aspects for Externals.

**Influence**

![Chart showing the influence of IEG products on Externals across different subject areas.](chart)

- **The Subject Area (459)**: 21% A Great Deal, 43% Very Much, 34% Some Extent, 2% Little, 1% Very Little/Not At All
- **What Works In Development (459)**: 16% A Great Deal, 41% Very Much, 35% Some Extent, 6% Little, 2% Very Little/Not At All
- **Essential Lessons Learned From Past Operational Experience (455)**: 20% A Great Deal, 43% Very Much, 28% Some Extent, 8% Little, 2% Very Little/Not At All
- **Development Results Of Projects/Operations (452)**: 22% A Great Deal, 42% Very Much, 29% Some Extent, 5% Little, 2% Very Little/Not At All
- **The WBG's Development Effectiveness (439)**: 18% A Great Deal, 35% Very Much, 36% Some Extent, 9% Little, 3% Very Little/Not At All

*Base: Familiar With IEGs Work And Used IEG Report*  
Q30. Thinking of the IEG products you have read in the past 12 months, to what extent have they improved your understanding of the following?

*Caution: Small (<30) base size.*
Across all aspects, perceived influence of IEG reports is highest among Externals, lowest among WBG Staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>WBG Board (28)</th>
<th>WBG Staff (458)</th>
<th>Externals (464)</th>
<th>Top 3 Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What works in development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential lessons learned from past operational experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development results of projects/operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Familiar With IEGs Work And Used IEG Report
* Caution: Small (<30) base size.
Q30. Thinking of the IEG products you have read in the past 12 months, to what extent have they improved your understanding of the following? Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (A/B/C).

Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (A/B/C).
Satisfaction with IEG's recommendations has decreased slightly among Staff since 2014 and remained stable for Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied/Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WBG Staff Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (441) A</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (202) B</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 (794) C</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38% D</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 (237) D</td>
<td>11% C</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WBG Board Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (28)* E</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (24)* F</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 (41) G</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 (22)* H</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (H/J/K/M).**

Q40. Thinking of the IEG products you have read in the past 12 months, how satisfied were you with their recommendations on the following criteria? *Caution: Small (<30) base size.*
Among Staff, satisfaction with IEG recommendations remains high, with Clarity continuing to be the biggest strength.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied/Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Quality (441)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence (Connection To Major Issues And Findings) (443)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity (Clear, Straightforward Language) (443)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility (Reasonable, Realistic For Implementation) (433)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-Effectiveness (Implementation Benefits Outweighs Costs) (362)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness (394)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Familiar With IEGs Work And Used IEG Report
Q40. Thinking of the IEG products you have read in the past 12 months, how satisfied were you with their recommendations on the following criteria? (6=Very Satisfied, 1=Very Dissatisfied)
Satisfaction with IEG’s recommendations among Board Members remains high across attributes, with Feasibility increasing since 2015.

**Board**

- **Overall Quality (28)**: 49% Very Satisfied, 44% Satisfied, 7% Somewhat Satisfied, 1% Somewhat Dissatisfied, 4% Dissatisfied/Very Dissatisfied.
- **Coherence (Connection To Major Issues And Findings) (27)**: 49% Very Satisfied, 44% Satisfied, 7% Somewhat Satisfied, 1% Somewhat Dissatisfied, 4% Dissatisfied/Very Dissatisfied.
- **Clarity (Clear, Straightforward Language) (27)**: 47% Very Satisfied, 33% Satisfied, 26% Somewhat Satisfied, 7% Somewhat Dissatisfied, 4% Dissatisfied/Very Dissatisfied.
- **Feasibility (Reasonable, Realistic For Implementation) (28)**: 47% Very Satisfied, 33% Satisfied, 26% Somewhat Satisfied, 7% Somewhat Dissatisfied, 4% Dissatisfied/Very Dissatisfied.
- **Cost-Effectiveness (Implementation Benefits Outweighs Costs) (24)**: 44% Very Satisfied, 42% Satisfied, 25% Somewhat Satisfied, 13% Somewhat Dissatisfied, 8% Dissatisfied/Very Dissatisfied.
- **Timeliness (27)**: 44% Very Satisfied, 33% Satisfied, 33% Somewhat Satisfied, 19% Somewhat Dissatisfied, 4% Dissatisfied/Very Dissatisfied.

**Top 3 Box from 2015**

- **Overall Quality (28)**: 93% Very Satisfied.
- **Coherence (Connection To Major Issues And Findings) (27)**: 93% Very Satisfied.
- **Clarity (Clear, Straightforward Language) (27)**: 89% Very Satisfied.
- **Feasibility (Reasonable, Realistic For Implementation) (28)**: 89% Very Satisfied.
- **Cost-Effectiveness (Implementation Benefits Outweighs Costs) (24)**: 79% Very Satisfied.
- **Timeliness (27)**: 78% Very Satisfied.

**% Change from 2015**

- **Overall Quality (28)**: +5%.
- **Coherence (Connection To Major Issues And Findings) (27)**: +1%.
- **Clarity (Clear, Straightforward Language) (27)**: +1%.
- **Feasibility (Reasonable, Realistic For Implementation) (28)**: +10%.
- **Cost-Effectiveness (Implementation Benefits Outweighs Costs) (24)**: -1%.
- **Timeliness (27)**: +6%.

*Caution: Small (<30) base size.*

**Q40. Thinking of the IEG products you have read in the past 12 months, how satisfied were you with their recommendations on the following criteria?**

- 6=Very Satisfied
- 5=Satisfied
- 4=Somewhat Satisfied
- 3=Somewhat Dissatisfied
- 2=Dissatisfied

**Base:** Familiar With IEGs Work And Used IEG Report
Among WBG Staff, email announcements continue to be the main access for IEG products, use of the IEG website has increased since 2015.

**Outreach**

**Staff**

- **IEG Website**: 44% BCD
  - 2017 (457) A
  - 2015 (550) B
  - 2014 (1176) C
  - 2012 (393) D

- **IEG E-Mail Newsletter And Announcements**: 71% BC
  - 2017 (457) A
  - 2015 (550) B
  - 2014 (1176) C
  - 2012 (393) D

- **IEG Launch Events**: 78% ABC
  - 2017 (457) A
  - 2015 (550) B
  - 2014 (1176) C
  - 2012 (393) D

- **IEG Workshops And/Or BBLs**: 2017 (457) A
  - 2015 (550) B
  - 2014 (1176) C
  - 2012 (393) D

- **IEG Evaluation Week**: 2017 (457) A
  - 2015 (550) B
  - 2014 (1176) C
  - 2012 (393) D

- **Social Media (Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn Communities)**: 2017 (457) A
  - 2015 (550) B
  - 2014 (1176) C
  - 2012 (393) D

- **Videos**: 2017 (457) A
  - 2015 (550) B
  - 2014 (1176) C
  - 2012 (393) D

- **IEG Blog**: 2017 (457) A
  - 2015 (550) B
  - 2014 (1176) C
  - 2012 (393) D

- **Other**: 2017 (457) A
  - 2015 (550) B
  - 2014 (1176) C
  - 2012 (393) D

---

**Base: Familiar With IEGs Work And Used IEG Report**

Q42. How did you become aware of IEG products in the past 12 months? Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (A/B/C/D).
WBG Staff rate IEG publications, the IEG website, and emails/newsletters as the most effective channels; IEG Launch Events decreased in effectiveness compared to 2015.

### Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Top 3 Box %</th>
<th>% Change from 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IEG Publications (1759)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Website (1685)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG E-Mail Newsletter And Announcements (1723)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Launch Events (1283)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG's Workshops And Conferences (1291)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Evaluation Week (1192)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>+6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media (1211)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Blog (1308)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Total

Q43. How would you rate each of the following communications channels used by IEG?
Perception of all outreach is highest among junior (GE and GF) field based Staff. WBG (IBRD/IDA) is the most likely organization to rate IEG publications and blogs high.

### Staff

#### Top 3 Box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WBG Organization</th>
<th>HR Grade Level</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WBG (IBRD/IDA)</td>
<td>% (A)</td>
<td>IFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Publications</td>
<td>(635) B</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 BM</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Website</td>
<td>(635) B</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 M</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG E-Mail Newsletter</td>
<td>(635) B</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And Announcements</td>
<td>79 M</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Launch Events</td>
<td>(635) B</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 G</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG's Workshops And</td>
<td>(635) B</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Evaluation Week</td>
<td>(397) G</td>
<td>(186)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>(393) JG</td>
<td>(163)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Blog</td>
<td>(463) BGHM</td>
<td>(175)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base: Total Analyzed**

Q43. How would you rate each of the following communications channels used by IEG?

Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/J/K/M/N).

*Caution: Small (<30) base size.*
Externals’ perceived value of IEG launch events and workshops declined while all other channels remained stable in 2017.

### Externals: % Top 3 Box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IEG Publications</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Website</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG E-Mail Newsletter And Announcements</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Launch Events</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG's Workshops And Conferences</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Evaluation Week</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Blog</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: Total Analyzed

Q43. How would you rate each of the following communications channels used by IEG?

Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (H/J/K/M).
Externals rate IEG publications, the website and email newsletters as their top outreach channels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Channel</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Ineffective</th>
<th>Ineffective/Very Ineffective</th>
<th>Top 3 Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IEG Publications (784)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Website (792)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG E-Mail Newsletter And Announcements (745)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Launch Events (557)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG's Workshops And Conferences (573)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Evaluation Week (567)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media (623)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Blog (627)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Total Analyzed
Q43. How would you rate each of the following communications channels used by IEG?
For Board Members all outreach channels declined in ratings, IEG Evaluation Week saw the most severe decline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Top 3 Box</th>
<th>2017 D</th>
<th>2015 E</th>
<th>2014 F</th>
<th>2012 G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IEG Publications</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Website</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG E-Mail Newsletter And Announcements</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Launch Events</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG's Workshops And Conferences</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Evaluation Week</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Blog</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Total Analyzed
* Caution: Small (<30) base size.
Q43. How would you rate each of the following communications channels used by IEG?
Letters indicate a significant difference at the 90% confidence level (D/E/F/G).
IEG Board Members consider IEG email newsletters as the most effective channel, followed by workshops and IEG publications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Channel</th>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
<th>Board Rating</th>
<th>Top 3 Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IEG Publications (34)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Website (33)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG E-Mail Newsletter And Announcements (29)*</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Launch Events (26)*</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG's Workshops And Conferences (31)</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Evaluation Week (24)*</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media (20)*</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEG Blog (25)*</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Caution: Small (<30) base size.

Q43. How would you rate each of the following communications channels used by IEG?
Respondent Profile
Staff Profile: WBG Organization, HR Grade Level and Location

**WBG Organization**
- **IFC**: 33%
- **World Bank (IBRD/IDA)**: 65%
- **MIGA**: 1%
- **ICSID**: 0%
- **Other**: 1%

**Professional Grade**
- **GG**: 43%
- **GF**: 22%
- **GE**: 10%
- **GI+**: 3%
- **GH Managerial**: 6%
- **GH Non-Managerial**: 12%
- **Other**: 4%

**Location**
- **HQ**: 50%
- **FO**: 50%

*Base: Total Analyzed*  
Q1. What organization do you work in?  
Q2. What is your professional grade?  
Q3. Where are you based?
Staff Profile: WBG Office and Experience

Q4. Where are you mapped?

Q5. How many years of professional experience do you have (both external and within the World Bank Group)?

Q9. Have you been a task team leader (TTL) or IFC team leader for a project within the last two years?
Q6. What is your position?

Q5. How many years of professional experience do you have (both external and within the World Bank Group)?

Q7. In the past 2 years, has your work involved engagement with IEG reports and activities?
Q11. How would you categorize your organization?
Int'l organization 18%
Academia 18%
Private firm 18%
Government 15%
NGO/Non-profit 14%
Gov't donor organization 5%
News Media 1%
Think Tank 3%
Other 8%

Q5. How many years of professional experience do you have (both external and within the World Bank Group)?
More than 10 years 67%
5-10 Years 17%
1-4 Years 8%
Less than 1 year 2%
Other 6%

Q12. Which region are you located in?
Africa 25%
South Asia 12%
West. Europe 14%
N. America 18%
Lat. America & Caribbean 12%
East Asia & Pac. 9%
East. Europe & Cent. Asia 4%
Mid. East & N. Africa 6%
Coded Verbatims
Q22

Q22. Is there anything you would like to add to elaborate your answers? (Be as specific as possible.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>This Organization</strong></td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of Interest</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence (Overall)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff/Evaluators</strong></td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Evaluators (Overall)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Usefulness (Overall)</strong></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Impact</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results/Outcome</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accuracy/Transparency</strong></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias/Objectivity</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology</strong></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to Input/Feedback</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods/Channels</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership/Management</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Management</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Management</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Management</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance (Overall)</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Focus</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Answered Q22 (625)

Q22. Is there anything you would like to add to elaborate your answers? (Be as specific as possible.)
Q29. Is there anything you would like to add to elaborate your answers? (Be as specific as possible.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusion/Outcome</th>
<th>22%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion (Overall)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Impact</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons Learned</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real-World Factors</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results/Outcome</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This Organization</th>
<th>12%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Evaluators</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usefulness</th>
<th>12%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Use</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness (Overall)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>12%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Focus</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Focus</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance (Overall)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accuracy/Transparency</th>
<th>11%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias/Objectivity</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency/Clarity</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Data</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methodology (Overall)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports/Evaluations</th>
<th>9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Detail</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pages</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Generic</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methods/Channels</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q31. Is there anything you would like to add to elaborate your answers? (Be as specific as possible.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusion/Outcome</th>
<th>24%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion (Overall)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons Learned</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real-World Factors</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results/Outcome</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>11%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Focus</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports/Evaluations</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Detail</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Understanding</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This Organization</th>
<th>6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Evaluators</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usefulness</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Use</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness (Overall)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Information</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods/Channels</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accuracy/Transparency</th>
<th>6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transparency/Clarity</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q33. Is there anything you would like to add to elaborate your answers? (Be as specific as possible.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusion/Outcome</th>
<th>24%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion (Overall)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining Insight</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Impact</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons Learned</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real-World Factors</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results/Outcome</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>14%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology (Overall)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Usefulness                   | 15% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>12%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Information</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods/Channels</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>14%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Focus</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance (Overall)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others</th>
<th>4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This Organization</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy/Transparency</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports/Evaluations</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Answered Q33 (110)
### Q37

Is there anything you would like to add to elaborate your answers? (Be as specific as possible.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusion/Outcome</th>
<th>41%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaining Insight</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons Learned</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results/Outcome</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usefulness</th>
<th>13%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Use</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness (Overall)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Focus</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance (Overall)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports/Evaluations</th>
<th>7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Reports</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accuracy/Transparency</th>
<th>6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bias/Objectivity</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Data</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Service</th>
<th>8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports/Evaluations</th>
<th>7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Reports</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accuracy/Transparency</th>
<th>6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bias/Objectivity</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Data</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methodology (Overall)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This Organization</th>
<th>4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Evaluators</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q39. Is there anything you would like to add to elaborate your answers? (Be as specific as possible.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusion/Outcome</th>
<th>19%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion (Overall)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining Insight</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons Learned</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usefulness</th>
<th>15%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Use</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness (Overall)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>13%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology (Overall)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports/Evaluations</th>
<th>11%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Understanding</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pages</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Broad/Vague</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accuracy/Transparency</th>
<th>11%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency/Clarity</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Focus</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Focus</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance (Overall)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This Organization</th>
<th>7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equality and Fairness</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Evaluators</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methods/Channels</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Client Service           | 2%  |

Base: Answered Q39 (154)
Q41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusion/Outcome</th>
<th>38%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion (Overall)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining Insight</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Impact</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real-World Factors</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results/Outcome</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This Organization</th>
<th>18%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equality and Fairness</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Evaluators</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports/Evaluations</th>
<th>11%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Reports</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pages</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Broad/Vague</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Generic</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Focus</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance (Overall)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methodology (Overall)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methods/Channels</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usefulness</th>
<th>5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Use</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness (Overall)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accuracy/Transparency</th>
<th>3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication (Overall)</th>
<th>36%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Information</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction/Involvement</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notifications/Updates</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Methods/Channels</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Much Information</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>14%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Publications</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports/Evaluations</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results/Outcome</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>12%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Initiatives</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Events</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops/Conferences</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing/ Don't Know/Everything/Refused</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not familiar/Never used any of the above</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Social Media</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of E-mail</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q45. And finally, what is the most important thing, in your view, that IEG can do to help increase World Bank Group effectiveness?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusion/Outcome</th>
<th>19%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Impact</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons Learned</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results/Outcome</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports/Evaluations</th>
<th>11%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reports/Evaluations (Overall)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Information</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Methods/Channels</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising Awareness</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness (Overall)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology (Overall)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This Organisation</th>
<th>8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff/Evaluators</th>
<th>8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Evaluators (Overall)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance (Overall)</th>
<th>6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Focus</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Focus</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accuracy/Transparency</th>
<th>6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transparency/Clarity (Overall)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Relationships</th>
<th>5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork and Working Relations</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy and Planning</th>
<th>4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Objectives</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Initiatives</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usefulness (Overall)</th>
<th>3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership/Management</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Service</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>