



Self-Evaluation at Other International Organizations

To provide context for its assessment of self-evaluation at the IMF, the IEO examined the evaluation frameworks in place at other international organizations. In addition to reviewing publicly available information, the IEO conducted a survey regarding evaluation policies and practices at ten other international financial institutions (IFIs).¹ This annex presents findings and highlights distinctions relative to the IMF. [Table A1.a](#) summarizes the survey results.

Policies²

The IFIs other than the IMF that were covered by the survey, as well as several other international organizations, have policies setting out institutional and management frameworks for evaluation, including self-evaluation. Often these policies were formally approved by their Boards.³ These policies typically outline the function that evaluation is intended to play within the organization;

¹The survey was disseminated among the Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG), which is comprised of the evaluation offices of member IFIs including the IMF. The ECG was founded, inter alia, to strengthen the use of evaluation for greater multilateral institution effectiveness and accountability and to enhance collaboration and share lessons among institutions. Survey respondents were the independent evaluation offices from the African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, Black Sea Trade and Development Bank, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), European Investment Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, International Fund for Agricultural Development, International Monetary Fund, Islamic Development Bank, and the World Bank Groups (Independent Evaluation Group—World Bank and Independent Evaluation Group—International Finance Corporation). The survey was administered jointly by the IEO and the EBRD Evaluation Department in March 2012.

²In looking at evaluation policies, the IEO broadened its review beyond ECG members to include other select comparator international organizations, notably the World Health Organization and the United Nations Development Programme.

³Most have self-standing evaluation policies. The Asian Development Bank and the World Bank policies are contained within dedicated sections on evaluation within the institutional operations and procedures manual.

describe the scope of the organization’s evaluation system; and delineate the roles and responsibilities of institutional actors for evaluation activities, including follow-up. Most also designate a senior manager responsible for self-evaluation. Often these policies include standards or guidelines for preparation of self-evaluation products, and, in a number of instances, they specify the organization’s key self-evaluation outputs.

Nearly all the IFIs and other international organizations that were examined outline the frameworks for both self- and independent evaluation in a policy document, which indicates how these two functions are intended to complement each other. Provisions ensuring the integrity of independent evaluation, including of the office, its reports, and access to internal information, are also included. Examples of key provisions of these policies are provided in [Table A1.b](#).

The IMF does not have an institution-wide policy that governs or establishes a framework for evaluation across its activities. Board decisions mandate the self-evaluation of select IMF lending arrangements; Staff guidelines specify the parameters and features for these assessments. For capacity-development activities, a new policy and practices statement was issued in 2014 that lays out a framework and basic parameters for monitoring and self-evaluation (IMF, 2014c). The parameters for independent evaluation are laid out in the Terms of Reference for the Independent Evaluation Office.

Self-Evaluation Practices

Coverage

To varying degrees, IFIs conduct self-evaluation at the institutional, program, and project levels. The arrangements for doing so—including timing (ex ante, mid-term, ex post), periodicity, and the systematic nature of assessments—are similar in many institutions

other than the IMF. Below is a summary of survey responses, with a comparison to practices at the IMF.

- *Lending.* Of the respondent IFIs that undertake sovereign lending, all reported conducting ex post self-evaluation of these operations. Most did so for all their loans, usually in the form of a project completion report or similar product. At the World Bank, for instance, an Implementation Completion and Results Report (ICRR) is prepared at the close of every project. The ICRR assesses the extent to which a project has achieved its intended objectives efficiently; a rating is assigned for overall outcomes as well as for Bank and borrower performance. The IMF conducted ex post self-evaluations for about half of the lending arrangements it approved in 1999–2012.
- *Capacity building.* Of the respondent IFIs that engage in technical assistance/cooperation or training, a majority, including the IMF, evaluated these activities. Self-evaluation of TA was mandatory at two-thirds of these institutions, with the degree of coverage varying from 30 percent to 100 percent. While self-evaluation of TA was most often integrated within program completion reports, some institutions, including the IMF, have developed self-standing products for TA assessments. Self-evaluation of training was conducted at a majority of the respondent IFIs including the IMF, most often using self-standing products, even though it was mandatory at only one-fifth of these institutions.
- *Operational policies.* Most respondent IFIs did not conduct self-evaluation of operational policies. The IMF carries out periodic reviews of institution-wide activities and policies, such as surveillance and conditionality, which in practice typically include an element of self-evaluation.

Utilization and Monitoring

All respondent IFIs selectively circulated self-evaluations internally, and the majority (including the IMF) publicly disclosed some self-evaluations. At a majority of these IFIs, the Board utilized self-evaluation findings “to some extent” (and, at one institution, “quite a lot”); respondents from a majority of the IFIs indicated that management utilized self-evaluation findings “quite a lot” and a few reported that this occurred “to some extent.” However, most respondent IFIs, including the IMF, had no system to track self-evaluation findings and lessons, and most had no formal process for monitoring the implementation of resulting recommendations.

Role of the Independent Evaluation Office

At all of the respondent IFIs other than the IMF, the mandate for the independent evaluation office included an implicit or explicit role to oversee the quality of self-evaluation. Typically, this involved periodic review or validation of self-evaluation reports. For example, at the World Bank, the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) undertakes a desk review of each ICRR and a more detailed, field-based assessment of a sample of completed projects. IEG also monitors and discusses arrangements for learning and accountability across the institution and highlights in its annual report, *Results and Performance of the World Bank Group*, issues that require attention to improve performance. In some organizations, the independent evaluation function also prepares or assesses an annual report on development effectiveness.

Table A I.a. Summary of IEO Survey on Self-Evaluation at IFIs, March 2012¹

	Policy/Practice	Yes	No	IMF
Policy, guidelines and institutional arrangements	Evaluation policy that covers both independent and self-evaluation	8	2	No
	Guidelines for the preparation of self-evaluation products	9	1	Yes
	Senior manager responsible for self-evaluation	8	1	No
	Corporate units that carry out regular or occasional self-evaluations of operational activities as part of their regular mandate	6	3	No
	Centrally-managed review/quality assurance system for all types of operations	6	3	Yes
	Interdepartmental groups are responsible for self-evaluation	3	6	Yes
	Independent evaluation department mandate includes an implicit or explicit oversight role with respect to the quality of self-evaluation and learning process	10	0	No
Coverage	Operational policies	2	7	Yes
	Lending	10	0	Yes
	Technical assistance/cooperation	7	2	Yes
	Training	6	3	Yes
			I N/A	
Utilization of self-evaluation findings	Self-evaluations are circulated internally	10	0	Yes
	Self-evaluations are disclosed externally	6	4	Yes
	System in place to track the use of self-evaluation findings		9	No
			I DK	
	Self-evaluation findings are captured in a database for future use	3	6	No
	Formal requirement regarding the use of self-evaluation findings	7	3	No
	Extent of utilization by Executive Board			
	Not at all			
	To some extent	5		IMF
	Quite a lot	1		
Extensively	0			
Don't know	3			
Extent of utilization by Management				
Not at all	0			
To some extent	3		IMF	
Quite a lot	5			
Extensively	0			
Don't know	2			
Monitoring and implementation	Who is accountable for the monitoring and implementation of self-evaluation lessons or recommendations?			
	Management and department/unit	4		
	Department/unit (only)	2		IMF
	Management (only)	1		
	Management, department, no one	1		
	No one	1		

¹ There were eleven survey respondents from among the independent evaluation offices of Evaluation Cooperation Group member IFIs. Some entries do not add to total due to no response. While information related to some survey responses may be in the public realm, there is no institutional attribution here, per participant requests. The survey was administered jointly by the Independent Evaluation Office (IMF) and the Evaluation Department (EBRD).

N/A = Not applicable. DK = Don't know.

Table A I.b. Evaluation Policies at International Organizations: A Snapshot Comparison of Self-Evaluation Elements

	Policy Description	Role of Self-Evaluation	Assignment of Roles and Responsibilities for Self-Evaluation	Self-Evaluation Outputs and Preparation Guidelines	Connection Between Independent and Self-Evaluation
ADB¹	Not free-standing; policy and operational procedures contained in Operational Manual. Includes independent and self-evaluation.	Along with independent evaluation, to improve the design and execution of future operations and activities and to revise policies and business processes.	<i>Operational departments</i> conduct self-evaluations and notify management and the Executive Board.	Self-evaluation is included in project completion reports (or equivalent) prepared for all public sector, non-sovereign, and technical assistance operations. Self-evaluations (reviews) also undertaken for some country and regional partnership strategies and policies and procedures. Self-evaluation reports should assess operations and evaluate the adequacy of preparation, design, appraisal, and implementation arrangements, as well as the performance of consultants, contractors, suppliers, borrower, client, or executing agency (if any), and the ADB overall.	Two-tier approach to evaluating implementation performance and effectiveness: (1) operational departments undertake self-evaluation of projects and other activities; and (2) the ADB Independent Evaluation Department (IED) validates self-evaluations, as well as undertakes independent evaluations. IED also comments as a peer reviewer on major draft project and policy operations documents.
EBRD²	Free-standing Board-approved policy. Includes independent evaluation and self-evaluation.	The inter-related self- and independent evaluation system is intended to contribute to superior institutional performance by providing an evidence-based and independent assessment relative to objectives.	<i>Executive Board</i> establishes the Bank's evaluation policy and oversees its implementation; has the discretion to request reports from management; and assesses whether evaluation findings have been adequately taken into account. <i>Management</i> is responsible for establishing an effective system of self-evaluation. This includes ensuring that relevant evaluation findings and lessons are adequately reflected in documents for Board consideration.	All operations are self-evaluated when deemed ready by the (independent) Evaluation Department (EvD) and management following agreed guidelines.	EvD is responsible for setting policies and overseeing the EBRD's overall evaluation program (self- and independent evaluation). This includes disseminating findings and maintaining a database of lessons, training EBRD staff in self-evaluation, and encouraging use of evaluation findings. EvD also tasked with validating self-evaluation, or undertaking independent evaluation, of a sample of operations, selected to yield statistically sound and credible results.

(Continued)

Table A I.b. (continued)

	Policy Description	Role of Self-Evaluation	Assignment of Roles and Responsibilities for Self-Evaluation	Self-Evaluation Outputs and Preparation Guidelines	Connection Between Independent and Self-Evaluation
IFAD³	Free-standing Board-approved policy. Focuses primarily on independent evaluation; also includes self-evaluation.	The purpose of the self-evaluation system is to ensure performance assessment and generation of lessons.	<i>Management</i> is responsible for the self-evaluation system; the Program Management Department takes the lead in executing this work. Management produces an Annual Report on IFAD's Development Effectiveness, which is discussed by the Evaluation Committee and Executive Board.	The policy calls for review of all country programs and projects financed by IFAD.	The policy specifies that self-evaluation is essential to facilitate independent evaluations by IFAD's Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE). Management and IOE use the same evaluation criteria, questions, and ratings system. The policy also calls for IOE to assess the design and functioning of the self-evaluation system and for IOE to comment on IFAD's Annual Report on Development Effectiveness.
UNDP⁴	Free-standing Board-approved policy. Policy covers both independent evaluation and self- ("decentralized") evaluation.	To generate information to be used for evidence-based decision-making.	<i>Senior managers</i> of bureaus and offices managing programs are responsible for: developing an evaluation plan, working with other stakeholders; drawing on evaluation findings to improve the quality of programs; and promoting organizational learning through analysis and application of evaluation findings across regions, themes, and results areas. <i>The Administrator</i> of UNDP is responsible for overseeing self-evaluation; preparing a management response to self-evaluations; promoting utilization of lessons; and ensuring appropriate follow-up.	Plans prepared by bureaus/offices should provide for decentralized self-evaluation of an appropriate mix of global, regional, country and thematic evaluations, as well as those required by external partnerships. These self-evaluations should together provide sufficient coverage of programmatic activities, address all outcomes in the program document, and produce evaluative evidence to inform decision making and support accountability and learning.	The Evaluation Office of UNDP is the custodian of the evaluation function (independent and self-/decentralized evaluation). It sets standards for decentralized evaluations; maintains depository of evaluation resources; disseminates methodology and good practices; and supports a network of evaluation practitioners.
World Bank⁵	Not free-standing; included in operational policy and procedures manual. Covers self-evaluation ("monitoring and evaluation") as well as independent evaluation.	Monitoring and evaluation provides information to verify progress toward and achievement of results, supports learning from experience, and promotes accountability for results.	Staff must take into account the findings of relevant monitoring and evaluation reports in designing the Bank's operational activities.	The policy provides for monitoring and evaluation of results of country assistance strategies, sector and thematic strategies, financing operations, and analytic and advisory services. Policy provides links to guidelines for the evaluation of lending and financing operations.	The policy provides for validation of self-evaluations by the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG), which also undertakes independent assessments of operational activities. Policy also requires IEG to appraise World Bank self-evaluation and risk-management systems.

Table A I.b. (concluded)

	Policy Description	Role of Self-Evaluation	Assignment of Roles and Responsibilities for Self-Evaluation	Self-Evaluation Outputs and Preparation Guidelines	Connection Between Independent and Self-Evaluation
WHO ⁶	Free-standing Board-approved policy.	To ensure accountability and oversight for performance and results, and reinforce organizational learning in order to inform policy for decision makers and to support individual learning.	<p><i>Executive Board</i> sets policy, provides oversight of the evaluation function, and approves biennial work plan (in consultation with senior management). It also has the discretion to commission an evaluation of any part of WHO.</p> <p><i>Office of Internal Oversight</i> is the custodian of the evaluation function. It manages evaluation across the organization, including by developing the biennial work plan; guiding preparation of evaluations; maintaining a tracking system for findings and lessons; and building capacity among WHO staff for the conduct of evaluations.</p> <p><i>WHO Secretariat</i> commissions evaluations.</p>	Thematic evaluations focus on selected topics, such as a new way of working, a strategy, cross-cutting theme, or core function; programmatic evaluations assess how and why results and outcomes have been achieved over several years in a country, region, or at the global level; office-specific evaluations focus on work in a country, region, or at headquarters.	Not applicable.

ADB=Asian Development Bank; EBRD=European Bank for Reconstruction and Development; IFAD=International Fund for Agricultural Development; UNDP=United Nations Development Programme; WHO=World Health Organization.

¹*Operations Manual Bank Policies (BP) and Operational Policies (OP)*, OM Section K1/BP and OM Section K1/OP, issued October 1, 2013. See also *Review of the Independence and Effectiveness of the Operations Evaluation Department*, ADB Policy Paper, November 2008.

²*Evaluation Policy*, EBRD Policy Document, Approved by the Board January 16, 2013.

³*Evaluation Policy*, IFAD, May 2011.

⁴The Evaluation Policy of UNDP, DP/2011/3, November 15, 2010.

⁵OP13/60 – Monitoring and Evaluation, Revised April 2013.

⁶WHO reform: Draft formal evaluation policy, EB131/3, May 3, 2012.