

Independent external evaluation of
EBRD's evaluation system

Final Report: Annexes

Colin Kirk, Senior Evaluation Consultant

July 2019

Annexes

1. Terms of reference
2. Evaluation matrix
3. Approach and methods
4. List of people met/interviewed
5. Survey questionnaires
6. Comments on the Independent External Evaluation of EBRD's evaluation system by Robert Picciotto, Senior Independent Evaluation Adviser.

Annex 1: Terms of reference

Terms of Reference for Independent External Evaluator/Consultant

Evaluation of EBRD's Evaluation System

Introduction

The Audit Committee of the EBRD Board of Directors (the Board) has authorised an independent external evaluation of the EBRD's Evaluation Department (EvD) and overall evaluation system¹, the first such review since an independent EvD was created and made directly accountable to the Board in 2005. The external evaluation will result in a final report to the Audit Committee and the full Board. A qualified external evaluator will be hired on a short-term consultant basis to produce this independent evaluation.

Purpose

The purpose of the external evaluation is to assess whether EvD and the broader evaluation system are operating consistent with the Bank's Evaluation Policy and wider evaluation best practices, and contributing as intended to institutional performance, learning and accountability. The independent external evaluation is also aimed at assessing the efficiency of EvD and the Bank's evaluation system.

Scope of Work

The scope of the external evaluation should cover experience since the Evaluation Policy was approved in January 2013 and include:

- An assessment of EvD's work programmes, organisation and evaluation processes in terms of quality, relevance, effectiveness and efficiency; and
- An assessment of other elements of EBRD's evaluation system, in particular with respect to the roles and responsibilities of the Board and Management, as set out in the Evaluation Policy.

Evaluation Objectives

- a). Assess overall performance of the evaluation system relative to the Evaluation Policy, and whether the Policy remains appropriate and fit for purpose.
- b). Review EvD's Work Programmes (full range of products and services) and assess their relevance, quality, value and adequacy against wider institutional evaluation needs and best practice, as well as the methodology for developing Work Programmes and their execution in terms of efficiency and timeliness.
- c). Review EvD's structure, organisation, staffing, management (e.g., profile/tenure), capacity, budget and business processes to assess whether they adequately and effectively support delivery of Work Programmes and provide institutional value.
- d). Review EvD's evaluation approach, methods and processes including with reference to evaluation best practices and EBRD's specific operational features.

¹ The EBRD's Evaluation Policy, approved on 16 January 2013, establishes the scope and objectives served by evaluation in the EBRD and sets out the evaluation-related activities and responsibilities of EvD, EBRD Management, and the Board. Taken together, this Bank-wide effort is referred to as the "evaluation system" for the purposes of this Terms of Reference.

e). Assess EvD's interactions with and oversight by the Board, its engagement with Management and staff, and its relationships with other quality assurance functions (e.g. Internal Audit Department).

e). Assess the effectiveness of the Bank's evaluation system in terms of the dissemination, uptake and integration of evaluation findings and recommendations into Bank operations and policy, as well as the effectiveness of the Board process for monitoring Management's delivery of commitments made in response to EvD findings and recommendations.

g). Provide actionable recommendations for EvD, the Board and Management to strengthen EBRD's evaluation system and policy based on global best practices.

Methodology

A qualified external individual will be selected by the Audit Committee on the basis of demonstrated and relevant knowledge and professional experience. This individual should have had no business relationship of any type with EvD, its staff or EBRD in the past year. The external evaluator will propose the most appropriate methodology for evaluating EBRD's evaluation system in an Approach Paper, which will be approved by the Audit Committee. The approach, methodology and report should be peer reviewed by an individual with significant IFI evaluation experience. The external evaluator will be home-based but is expected to travel to London to interview representatives from the Board, EvD, Senior Management and staff, and then to present the final report. The selected individual will report to the Audit Committee Chair. EvD shall provide support to the external evaluator (e.g. documentation and other inputs) with the approval of the Audit Committee.

Deliverables

Deliverables will include:

- An Approach Paper setting out the methodology and composition of the review, per the elements enumerated above; expectations as to full access to information from EvD, Board, Senior Management and staff in accordance with Bank's internal rules and regulations; planned methods (surveys, interviews); and timetable. The Approach Paper is to be delivered by [May 15, 2018] and approved by the Audit Committee.
- A full draft report, submitted to the Audit Committee for review and comment as they see fit by July 15, 2018.
- A Final report, submitted to the Audit Committee, by September 30, 2018.
- The evaluator may be asked to present the final report to the Audit Committee in London.

External Evaluator Profile

The external evaluator should have substantial knowledge of and senior-level experience working with EBRD's counterpart multilateral financial institutions, as well as the following expected skills and experience:

- At least 10 years of evaluation experience.
- Demonstrated experience working or consulting for a multilateral development bank/international financial institution.
- Experience leading, conducting or participating in a similar exercise (e.g., external evaluation, organisational peer review).
- Demonstrated experience in high-level strategic organisational assessments.
- Skills/knowledge include fluency in development finance and project finance, an ability to synthesize disparate information related to individual evaluations or events, and the ability to communicate succinctly.

Timing

The external evaluation will be completed no later than 30 September 2018.

Annex 2: Evaluation matrix

Overall: *Is the performance of the evaluation function at EBRD satisfactory? Does it make a useful contribution to institutional performance, learning and accountability at EBRD?*

Key questions	Sub-questions	Judgment criteria and indicators	Data sources	Data collection instruments	Data analysis
1. Is the EBRD Evaluation Policy (2013) appropriate, comprehensive and fit for purpose?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the Evaluation Policy aligned with and relevant to EBRD's objectives, organizational framework and evolving institutional needs? In terms of policy intentions, is there an appropriate balance between learning and accountability? Does it meet international evaluation standards and good practice, including the principles of independence, credibility and utility? Are there significant omissions? 	<p>Content of the policy assessed in terms of accepted international evaluation standards:</p> <p>a) ECG: <i>Big Book on Evaluation Good Practice Standards (2012): II. Independence of International Financial Institutions' Central Evaluation Departments;</i></p> <p>b) UNEG: <i>Evaluation Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016): Standard 1.2;</i></p> <p>c) OECD/DAC: <i>Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance (1991).</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EBRD Evaluation Policy and related papers (Guidance Notes etc) EBRD <i>Evaluation Department Self-Assessment (2017)</i> and related papers Evaluation policies of other IFIs. External reviews of other IFIs. Stakeholder responses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review of polices and related literature. Semi-structured interviews. Online survey questionnaire. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy analysis using matrix based on key criteria. Comparative analysis drawing on analysis of policies of other IFIs etc. Analysis of interview and survey data. Triangulation of results from various data sources and instruments.

<p>2. Does EBRD's Evaluation Department operate in accordance with the Bank's Evaluation Policy and evaluation best practices?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has EvD effectively operationalised the elements of the 2013 Evaluation Policy for which it has responsibility? • Does EvD work independently? • Does EvD have adequate human and financial resources to allow timely delivery of a high quality work programme? • Does Management adequately fulfil its responsibilities for independent evaluation under the policy? • Has the Executive Board maintained effective oversight of implementation of the Evaluation Policy? • Do independent evaluation practices at EBRD meet internationally accepted good practice standards? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance with key elements in the Evaluation Policy by EvD, Management and the Executive Board respectively. • EvD reporting lines in EBRD organizational chart. • Compliance with internationally agreed norms, standards and good practices for evaluation (as above: ECG 2012; UNEG 2016; OECD DAC 1991). • Familiarity of key stakeholders with policy content. • Executive Board Decisions regularly refer to evaluation evidence and address evaluation matters. • Stakeholder appreciation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EvD workplans and budgets (EvD, various years) • <i>Evaluation Department Self-Assessment (2017)</i> • Annual Evaluation Reviews (EvD various years) • Management reports • Minutes of Executive Board meetings • External documentation relating to EBRD evaluation function (e.g. OECD DAC: <i>Evaluation Systems in Development Co-operation 2016 Review</i>) • External reviews of other IFIs (see Annex 3: Key Documentation). • Stakeholder responses. • Results of previous surveys (EBRD 2011, 2016). • Stakeholder views. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review of relevant documentation including previous survey results. • Semi-structured interviews. • Online survey questionnaire. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of policy implementation. • Comparative analysis. • Analysis of interview and survey data. • Analysis of evaluation output and coverage. • Analysis of evaluation expenditure relative to output. • Triangulation of data from different sources and instruments.
--	---	--	---	---	---

<p>3. Are the Evaluation Department's products and services of satisfactory quality and quantity? Are they appropriate to EBRD's needs and delivered in appropriate and timely ways?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are EvD evaluation reports relevant, timely and useful? • Are they based on adequate and appropriate methods, evidence and analysis? • Do they use appropriate evaluation criteria? • Do they give sufficient attention to social and environmental issues including gender equality? • Are they presented in appropriate formats and media? • Does EvD provide sufficient oversight and timely review of self-evaluations? • Does EvD provide other services such as evaluation advice, guidance and training at a satisfactory standard and in adequate volume? • Does the quality of EvD products match those of other IFIs? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workplan alignment with key strategic institutional issues. • Performance against EvD workplans. • Compliance with internal evaluation quality assurance processes and quality standards • Quality ratings assigned by internal quality assurance processes • Ready availability of evaluation products. • Effective sequencing: i.e. timing of delivery to feed into significant Bank processes (e.g. preparation of new policies or interventions) • Stakeholder appreciation • Compliance with internationally accepted evaluation quality standards and good practices (see ECG 2012) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation products: reports, notes, presentations, learning products etc. • Sample of 9 EvD reports selected for quality review. • Evaluation lessons database. • EvD web pages (internal and external). • Annual Evaluation Review (EvD various years). • Stakeholder responses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review. • Semi-structured interviews. • Online survey. • Questionnaire. • Quality review of 9 selected EvD evaluations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of interview and survey data. • Comparative analysis. • Triangulation of data from different sources and instruments.
--	--	--	---	--	--

<p>4. Are the lessons, recommendations, evidence and insights produced by the Evaluation Department endorsed, absorbed and acted upon by Management, staff and the Executive Board at EBRD?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are EvD lessons and recommendations relevant, clear and actionable? • Are formal, written Management Responses to evaluation recommendations prepared in a systematic and timely way for all EvD evaluations? • Are formal Management Action Plans (MAPs) prepared and implemented in a timely, systematic and comprehensive way? • Is there evidence of informal learning and changes in practices on the part of staff and management? • Has the Executive Board maintained adequate oversight of the uptake and use of evaluation findings and recommendations by 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment in terms of relevant quality standards (ECG 2012) and guidance material (ECG 2017, 2018). • % of evaluation lessons and recommendations of satisfactory quality. • % of EvD evaluations addressed by a formal Management Response • % of EvD recommendations followed by Management Action Plan (MAP). • % of MAPs implemented. • Changes in practices at EBRD informed by evaluation findings, lessons and recommendations • Quality, usability and use of evaluation lessons database • Relevant Executive Board Decisions and commentary. • Stakeholder appreciation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EvD system for tracking follow up on EvD recommendations. • Reports on <i>Follow-Up on EvD Recommendations</i> (EvD, various years). • Reports on Evaluation lessons database usage. • Audit reports. • Executive Board minutes. • External reviews of other IFIs. • Relevant reports from other IFIs. • Stakeholder responses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review. • Semi-structured interviews. • Online survey Questionnaire. • Quality review of selected EvD evaluations. • Case studies of selected EvD evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of interview and survey data • Comparative analysis • Triangulation of data from different sources and instruments

	<p>Management and staff?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there relevant good practice lessons from other IFIs on evaluation recommendations and follow up? 				
<p>5. Does the self-evaluation system at EBRD operate in accordance with the Bank's Evaluation Policy and evaluation best practices?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has EBRD management effectively operationalised the elements of the Evaluation Policy for which it has responsibility? • Does EvD adequately fulfil its responsibilities relating to the self-evaluation system (validation, reporting etc)? • Has the Executive Board maintained effective oversight of the self-evaluation system? • Do self-evaluation practices at EBRD meet internationally accepted good practice standards? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance by EvD, Management and the Executive Board respectively with key elements in the Evaluation Policy. • Compliance with internationally agreed norms and standards for evaluation (ECG 2012: VI. GPS on Self-Evaluation • Stakeholder appreciation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EvD workplans and budgets • <i>Evaluation Department Self-Assessment (2017)</i> • Annual Evaluation Reviews (EvD, various years) • Management reports. • Audit reports • Minutes of Executive Board meetings. • Previous survey results (2011, 2016) • External documentation relating to EBRD evaluation function (e.g. ECG reviews, DAC reviews) • External reviews of other IFIs • Stakeholder responses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review of relevant documentation including previous survey results. • Semi-structured interviews • Online survey questionnaire 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of policy implementation • Analysis of interview and survey data. • Comparative analysis • Triangulation of data from different sources and instruments.

<p>6. Is the performance of the self-evaluation system satisfactory? Are self-evaluation products of satisfactory quality and useful to EBRD management?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are self-evaluation reports relevant, timely and useful? • Are they based on adequate and appropriate evidence and analysis? • Are they presented in appropriate formats and media? • Does EvD provide appropriate and timely validation of self-evaluations? • Does management respond appropriately to the findings, lessons and recommendations of self-evaluations? • Is there evidence of informal learning and changes in practices on the part of staff and management? • Does performance of the self-evaluation system at EBRD match standards of self-evaluation practices in other IFIs? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantity, quality and coverage of self-evaluations against management plans. • Disclosure, communication and availability of completed evaluations. • Management use of completed evaluations. • Changes in operational practices linked to self-evaluation findings and lessons. • Good practice standards and lessons from other IFIs. • Stakeholder appreciation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Evaluation Reviews (EvD, various years) • Management reports. • Audit reports • Minutes of Executive Board meetings. • Previous survey results (2011, 2016) • External documentation relating to EBRD evaluation function (e.g. ECG reviews, DAC reviews) • External reviews of other IFIs • Stakeholder responses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review of relevant documentation including previous survey results. • Semi-structured interviews • Online survey questionnaire 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of policy implementation • Analysis of interview and survey data. • Comparative analysis • Triangulation of data from different sources and instruments.
--	---	---	---	---	--

Annexe 3: Approach and methods²

Approach, methods and instruments

Approach

The assessment will be both normative and functional in approach:

- A *normative* assessment will examine how far elements of the evaluation system are consistent with the evaluation policy; and how far the policy itself meets established global evaluation principles, norms and standards.
- A *functional* assessment will review the working of the evaluation system in practice and assess how far performance meets targets and delivers outputs of the intended quality and quantity, and how far uptake and use of evaluation findings and recommendations is practised. It will also assess how far significant outcomes are achieved and add value in terms of contributions to learning, accountability and institutional performance. Importantly, the evaluation will also provide an opportunity to identify any unplanned results and unintended consequences.

The evaluation will be undertaken in a consultative but impartial and methodical way³. This report is itself informed by useful exchanges with key stakeholders within the Bank and it is expected that engagement with internal stakeholders will help to build ownership and uptake of the eventual findings and recommendations.

A mixed method approach is proposed, based on assessment using established evaluation criteria and standards, and drawing comparisons where relevant with examples of established good practice in evaluation.

The proposed approach will use qualitative and quantitative data from both primary and secondary sources. Data sources will include internal EBRD documentation, relevant documentation from other IFIs and evaluation networks, perspectives of EBRD stakeholders shared through interview and survey responses as well as feedback on this document and other material produced by the evaluation.

The evaluation will undertake systematic analysis of an array of relevant evidence. It will draw on the considerable volume of documentation on EBRD's evaluation function already available, including the recent EvD self-assessment. Evaluation reports from EvD and from the self-evaluation system will be examined and quality assessment of a sample of EvD reports undertaken.

Engagement with a range of internal stakeholders is planned, including remote contact with management in country offices although no visits to countries of operations are envisaged. In seeking views and information from stakeholders, care will be taken to undertake this efficiently and economically to avoid burdening busy staff with extensive or unfocused enquiries. The evaluation

² From *Independent External Evaluation of EBRD's Evaluation System: Inception Report: Main Report*. March 2019.

³ Evaluation is understood as: *The systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.* OECD/DAC 2002. *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*

will include an online survey of Bank management and staff and a separate survey of members of the Executive Board.

Oral presentations will be offered at one or two key points to inform stakeholders, inspire discussion and solicit feedback. Within EvD, group discussions could provide an opportunity for professional peer exchange.

Systematic comparison with other IFIs will be undertaken while recognizing the great variation in mandates and contexts and giving due consideration to the specific institutional setting at EBRD, which provides its assistance mainly through private sector channels to support economic and political transition across the region and more widely. EBRD's unique mandate does not preclude comparisons but certainly makes meaningful and systematic benchmarking challenging.

Methods and instruments

The evaluation will deploy a set of analytical tools and methods to generate information, insight and understanding of the function's performance and contribution. Use of a range of information sources and a variety of analytical tools will allow cross-checking and triangulation to identify patterns of consistency and variation and for verification.

The following list summarises the instruments to be employed. Further details are provided in the Annexes:

- a) Policy review: assessment of key elements of the evaluation policy in terms of established norms and standards, supplemented by systematic comparison with the evaluation policies of other MDBs. See Annex 2.
- b) An evaluation matrix or framework setting out evaluation questions, judgment criteria, indicators and sources of data. See Annex 1.
- c) Desk review of key documentation. See Annex 3.
- d) Short online surveys of (a) members of the Executive Board and (b) Management and staff, including EvD staff. See Annex 4.
- e) Semi-structured interviews with Board members, Management and evaluation staff.
- f) Focus group discussions and/or informal meetings for feedback and exchange.
- g) Assessment of evaluation report quality, using a framework based on ECG good practice standards. Analysis will be based on 9 recent evaluations (three Operations Evaluations and six Special Studies, all issued in 2016-2018). See Annex 5.
- h) Case studies drawing on multiple sources of information, tracing several evaluations "from cradle to grave" to provide insight into the production and use of evaluation evidence. See Annex 6.
- i) Benchmarking and comparative analysis: selective comparison of key aspects of the evaluation function with other IFIs. See Annex 7.

A preliminary list of persons to be consulted is provided at Annex 8. This includes:

- Selected members of the Audit Committee and other Board members;
- Members of senior management (in headquarters and in country offices), and staff in operations departments and technical departments;
- EBRD staff dealing with results-based management, knowledge systems, programme appraisal, management response on evaluations, good practices and portfolio quality improvement, and internal audit;
- EvD Director and Staff.

Limitations

As already noted, the approach outlined above is selective and will not yield a comprehensive evaluation. Although the focus on issues of performance, quality, use and value is already wide, some key aspects of the function will receive less attention. The organization and resourcing of the Evaluation Department and other elements of the evaluation function will be considered but systematic, in-depth analysis and review fall outside the scope of this exercise. This in turn precludes rigorous or exhaustive assessment of efficiency. Assessment of the eventual impact and sustainability of outcomes linked to evaluation at EBRD also falls outside the scope of the evaluation.

No attempt will be made to construct a comprehensive counterfactual or “with/without” comparison (i.e. “with/without the 2013 Evaluation Policy”). In focusing mainly on the period following the approval of the new Evaluation Policy (especially the period from 2016), in-depth assessment of the situation before 2013 will not be attempted. This will preclude a thorough “before and after” analysis. Consequently, any assessment of medium term trends and changes in the evaluation function will be limited (and would not, in any case, serve the stated purpose of this evaluation).

The evaluation will include some comparative analysis and consideration of alternatives for policy and practice. This will draw mainly on available materials, such as the routine collations of information by the ECG and OECD/DAC. Systematic data collection direct from other MDBs or other evaluation partners will not be possible. Comparative analysis will in any case be limited by the wide variations in mandate and operational contexts of different institutions and the specificities of EBRD itself: as noted above, EBRD has an unusual mandate, and its private sector focus poses specific challenges for evaluation tools and methods.

The approach outlined in this paper is for a largely internal analysis. The time and resources available will not allow for a systematic consultation of EBRD clients, partners and national stakeholders. This is a significant limitation as external client perspectives could offer valuable insights for strengthening the function and its contribution to operational results.

The final report will include a note on the limitations of the exercise and any constraints encountered.

Ethics

The evaluation will be conducted with sensitivity to gender and diversity of stakeholders. Individual informants’ views will be anonymised and used on a “no attribution” basis. Any sensitive business or personal issues arising will be treated in confidence.

Annex 4: List of people met/interviewed

Board Members

- David Avarello
- Anthony Bartzokas
- Filippo Giansante
- Douglas Nevison
- Ilkka Raisanen
- Horst Reichenbach
- Judy Shelton
- Leander Treppel
- Andris Vilks

Management

- Sue Barrett – Director, Transport
- Harry Boyd-Carpenter - Director, Head of Power and Energy Utilities
- Christoph Denk - Country Strategy Coordination, Results Management and EU Affairs (CSRM)*
- Hassan El-Khatib - Managing Director, Equity
- Elisabetta Falcetti - Director, Sector Economics and Policy, VP Policy and Partnerships
- Sue Goeransson - Director, Head of Municipal and Environmental Infrastructure
- Janet Heckman - Managing Director, Southern and Eastern Mediterranean Region (SEMED)
- Matthew Jordan-Tank – Head, Infrastructure Project Preparation Facility
- Natasha Khanjenkova - Managing Director for Central Asia and Russia*
- Andre Kuusvek – Director, Local Currency and Capital Markets Development
- Alexia Latortue - Managing Director, Corporate Strategy
- Andrew McDonald - First Vice President's Office, Client Services Group
- Francis Malige - Managing Director, Financial Institutions
- Nandita Parshad - Managing Director, Sustainable Infrastructure Group
- Jean-Marc Peterschmidt - Managing Director, Industry, Commerce and Agribusiness and COO for Client Services Department
- Enzo Quattrocioche - Secretary General
- Mattia Romani - Managing Director, Economic Policy and Governance
- Alan Rousso - Managing Director, External Relations and Partnerships
- Charlotte Ruhe - Managing Director, Central and South Eastern Europe
- Alexander Saveliev - Director, Financial Institutions
- Anita Taci, Country Strategy Coordination, Results Management and EU Affairs (CSRM)*
- Trevor Watson, VP office, Banking

**Focal Point for evaluation*

Evaluation Department

- Joe Eichenberger – Director
- Barry Kolodkin – Deputy Director
- Karin Becker – Associate Evaluation Manager
- Stephanie Crossley – Analyst
- Shireen El Wahab – Associate Director, Senior Evaluation Manager
- Bob Finlayson – Associate Director, Senior Adviser
- Regina Husakova, Associate Director, Senior Evaluation Manager
- Saeed Ibrahim – Principal II, Principal Evaluation Manager
- Sophia Keenan – Assistant Analyst
- Victoria Millis - Associate Director, Senior Evaluation Manager
- Olga Mrinska – Associate Director, Senior Evaluation Manager
- Alejandra Palma – Principal I, Evaluation Manager
- Beatriz Perez-Timmermans – Principal II, Principal Evaluation Manager

Annex 5: Survey questionnaires

Online survey questionnaire

Each question to be answered from the following multiple choice array:

- Agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Don't know

1. About you (all respondents)

- 1.1. Where are you located?
- London
 - A location other than London
- 1.2. What is your position at EBRD?
- Director
 - Deputy Director
 - Staff
- 1.3. How many years have you worked at EBRD?
- Less than 5 years
 - From 5 to 10 years
 - More than 10 years

2. About EvD (all respondents)

- 2.1. I understand EvD's role and purpose within EBRD.
- 2.2. I am well aware of EvD's work.
- 2.3. I regularly seek out EvD material and views.
- 2.4. EvD colleagues are responsive and helpful when I contact them.
- 2.5. In terms of accountability and learning, EvD's present emphasis is appropriate.
- 2.6. EvD should place increased emphasis on accountability.
- 2.7. EvD should place increased emphasis on learning.
- 2.8. EvD project level assessments are relevant and useful.
- 2.9. EvD sector-level and thematic studies are relevant and useful.

- 2.10. EvD should undertake more sector-level and thematic analysis.
- 2.11. EvD reports and analyses are of high quality.
- 2.12. EvD reports are generally timely and inform ongoing work.
- 2.13. EvD reports are useful only for the Executive Board.
- 2.14. EvD materials are easy to read.
- 2.15. EvD reports present key information clearly and effectively.
- 2.16. EvD reports are a suitable length.
- 2.17. EvD reports leave me with a good grasp of relevant issues.
- 2.18. EvD reports provide useful perspectives that I would not otherwise have had.
- 2.19. EvD recommendations are clear.
- 2.20. EvD recommendations are actionable.
- 2.21. EvD recommendations are important.
- 2.22. Management action and follow up of recommendations is a high priority.
- 2.23. EvD findings, lessons and recommendations have led to significant changes in Bank practices.
- 2.24. I have discussed EvD evaluation findings or lessons with colleagues or management during the past 90 days.
- 2.25. I often discuss EvD evaluation findings or lessons with interlocutors outside the Bank.
- 2.26. EvD makes a positive contribution to Bank performance.
- 2.27. Overall, EvD's work represents a good investment for the EBRD.

3. For members of the Executive Board

- 3.1. My constituency colleagues and authorities place high value on EvD's work and function.
- 3.2. My constituency colleagues and authorities are generally satisfied with EvD and its work.
- 3.3. Past findings from evaluation are evidently being reflected in the improved quality of new proposals presented to the Board
- 3.4. Evaluation findings, lessons and recommendations help the Executive Board to fulfil its function.
- 3.5. The Evaluation Policy provides an adequate framework for evaluation at EBRD.

4. About self-evaluation (for senior management and staff).

- 4.1. Self-evaluation through the OPA process is a valuable exercise.
- 4.2. Self-evaluation is an important operational priority.
- 4.3. Self-evaluation reports are credible and useful.
- 4.4. Self-evaluation reports provides useful perspectives that I would not otherwise have had.
- 4.5. Self-evaluation findings and lessons are effectively shared and used.
- 4.6. A more extensive self-evaluation process by Operations staff would improve learning and feedback.
- 4.7. Increased participation of national partners and stakeholders in the OPA process would improve learning and feedback.
- 4.8. If you attended OPA training: the OPA training was useful to me when completing an OPA.
- 4.9. I have discussed self-evaluation findings or lessons with colleagues or management during the past 90 days.
- 4.10. I often discuss self-evaluation findings or lessons with interlocutors outside the Bank.

Annex 6: Comments on the Independent External Evaluation of EBRD's evaluation system by Robert Picciotto, Senior Independent Evaluation Adviser

This evaluation report is fluently written and well documented. It is logically designed, well-structured and easy to read. While it is very long, it includes a concise and serviceable executive summary. The main body of the report addresses the terms of reference in a systematic way and, except perhaps for light touch treatment of evaluation methodology (see below), it takes on credibly all the major issues facing the EBRD evaluation function.

All in all, the conclusions are well grounded in evidence and the evaluation approach is sound even though the response rate of the internal surveys was low, and no effort was devoted to securing clients' perspectives. These limitations are fully acknowledged by the author and, given the very tight resource constraints within which the evaluation had to be carried out, the overall result is commendable.

At the outset, the report cogently describes the objectives of the external evaluation, lays out its evaluation framework in a transparent way, and provides a convincing account of the demanding evaluation context. Next, it offers an uncompromising, no-holds-barred diagnostic of the self-evaluation function and of the transaction-oriented culture within which it is embedded.

Compelling evidence is adduced regarding the striking lack of management ownership of the evaluation function. Furthermore, and revealingly, the report points to the growing role confusion between management and the Evaluation Department (EvD) – the result of EvD's ill-considered decision to manage the self-evaluation function – instead of attesting to its quality at arm's length. This core finding undercuts the report's lenient assessment of EvD's behavioural independence.

This said, taken as a whole, the report provides a plausible account of how the EBRD evaluation function evolved since the approval of the 2013 Evaluation Policy. It focuses on the much-needed elevation of the independent evaluation function to the higher plane of operational policy. This shift in emphasis was welcomed by the Executive Board and the report gives high marks to the special studies generated by EvD under its current leadership.

Unfortunately, the shift of independent evaluation priorities towards strategic evaluation was achieved at high cost: project level evaluations took a back seat, a seriously deleterious development within a project-driven institution.

As a result, the accountability for results dimension of the evaluation function has suffered grievously. The learning function has also been affected since project level evaluations are essential building blocks for country and thematic evaluations.

From this perspective, the report fails to stress the extent to which the current independent evaluation methodology driving EvD's work has become increasingly disconnected from good international practice as endorsed by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and the Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG):

- EvD has consistently neglected the impact and sustainability criteria of the DAC, thus undermining the adaptive management requirements of the organization
- EvD made no significant effort to relate performance metrics to the overarching transition agenda of the organization, a major failing from a corporate management perspective
- EvD used the same approach for private sector and public sector operations (and privileged the former over the latter) whereas good practice requires tailor-made treatment, as in the World Bank Group.
- In 2016, EvD abandoned the goal of a statistically valid account of aggregate project-based performance, a major departure from ECG standards

This said, the proposed agenda of reform put forward by the External Review is well conceived. It is appropriately demanding. A positive sea change in the quality of the evaluation system would materialise if the Executive Board and Bank management (working closely together) choose to heed the assessment of the Review and implement its recommendations, as follows:

- Upgrading of the Evaluation Policy
- Repair of the broken self-evaluation system, including full alignment with EBRD's results architecture and enhanced knowledge management
- Promotion of EvD's 'independence without isolation', including observer status for the EvD Director in senior management and board meetings
- Relaxation of the excessive budget constraint that has long been imposed on independent and self-evaluation
- Strengthened Board oversight of the evaluation function, including the set-up of a Board Committee of Transition Effectiveness
- An Internal Audit examination of the extent of compliance with the recommendations of the External Review, as well an attestation of the

effectiveness of results-based management in EBRD, by the Multilateral Organization Assessment Network (MOPAN)

For such an ambitious agenda to materialize - and for EBRD to comply with international good practice standards - the Executive Board may wish to consider raising the profile of the EvD head in the organization through upgrading of the position (in line with World Bank Group practice).

Finally, given the demanding methodological challenges that lie ahead, and so that the EBRD transition agenda is fully reflected in the Bank's performance metrics, the Executive Board should ensure that the next incumbent has 'state of the art' evaluation credentials.

RP/rp
July 24th, 2019