

Annex D: Suggested Appraisal Template for Global Programs

Program aspect	Appraisal criteria
<p>Global The activities of the program cut across more than one of the Bank's operational Regions.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the program cover more than one of the Bank's operational Regions? 2. Does the program demonstrate strong potential for development effectiveness and poverty alleviation, and hence relevance to developing countries? 3. Does the proposal demonstrate why the issue the program addresses requires public investments and action at the global level? 4. Does the proposal demonstrate the value added from the Bank's involvement? Does it articulate how the program fits with the Bank's mission, its global public-goods priorities, and its corporate-advocacy priorities? If the program does not meet these criteria, does the proposal explain why the program is still justified in addressing an important global issue? 5. Does the proposal either demonstrate the absence of alternative, cheaper sources of supply for addressing the issue or make a convincing case for why increased competition in supply entailing Bank involvement would be desirable? 6. Does the proposal provide a full accounting of the expected benefits of the program—including expected spillovers—to borrowers and donors, as well as to the private and public sectors? Does it explain how the realization of those benefits is being ensured in program design?
<p>Partnership The program involves partners—who participate in the governance of the program—in addition to the World Bank.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the proposal demonstrate the value added by using a partnership? Could the Bank working alone accomplish the program goals? Does the proposal demonstrate that the benefits of the partnership outweigh the costs? 2. Does the proposal demonstrate how the program meets the Development Committee criteria for engaging in partnerships: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence for an emerging international consensus that global action is required? Or if the program itself is intended to help develop international consensus where none currently exists? • Why Bank action is needed to catalyze other resources or if others can do it just as well? For example, is the Bank's convening power or potential linkage to country assistance critical in ensuring relevance of the global program and its eventual success? • The Bank's comparative advantage relative to other partners in relation to this program?^a • The value added to the Bank's development objectives? 3. Does the proposal demonstrate why the Bank should address this issue as a global program, or regional program, rather than through an institutional partnership?^b That is, does it have: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly identified and deliverable new products or services • Shared objectives • Shared responsibility for governance • Shared resources? 4. Does the proposal demonstrate that all potential partners needed to ensure development effectiveness of the program were consulted, that the chosen partners are the most appropriate to achieve expeditious and cost-effective results and impact, and that the Bank's role is consistent with its comparative advantage? Are other partners' roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities consistent with their comparative advantages and clearly spelled out?
<p>Objectives Either formally or informally, the partners reach explicit agreements on objectives.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the proposal describe the process used to arrive at an agreement on objectives, including consultation with stakeholders? 2. Are the objectives of the program clearly defined and results-oriented, even if results are intermediate outcomes? 3. Do the objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give focus and direction to the program • Express a development purpose that is realistic, specific, and quantitatively or qualitatively measurable • Provide a basis for evaluating the performance of the program with specific and realistic schedules? Are there clear intermediate performance indicators, or is there a clear indication of how the program will develop such indicators?

Program aspect	Appraisal criteria
<p>Activities</p> <p>The program generates new products or services.</p>	<p>Are the program activities clustered into components that can deliver results on the stated objectives? Are the components clearly described, and are the objectives and components internally coherent? Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For global networking activities, the proposal should demonstrate either current or proposed steps to ensure that developing countries receive the benefits of the program through ensuring access, building capacity, or other means. Similar steps should be evident for regional activities within the global program. • For country-level technical assistance activities, the proposal should articulate the steps needed to build capacity or involve borrowing countries in networking. It should also identify whether and how links to subsequent country assistance (including Bank lending) might bring this about. • For country-level investments, the proposal should argue the case for additionality or complementarity to current Bank lending operations. • For new products and technologies, such as collaborative research or analysis, the proposal should clearly demonstrate their global public goods nature and the absence of alternative sources of supply. It should justify international public involvement in the provision of these new products and technologies.
<p>Governance and management</p> <p>Either formally or informally, the partners agree to establish a new organization or to vest an existing organization (including one of the Bank's own units or those of other international agencies) with a new and additional function.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What were the main scope and design options considered, and why were competing alternatives, such as regional programs, rejected? 2. Were relevant stakeholders consulted in the program design process? 3. Do relevant stakeholders have access to the program? What steps are being taken to ensure access? 4. Does the proposed authorizing environment for the program provide adequate balance between ensuring legitimacy in governance, relevance to developing countries, and efficiency in achieving results? 5. Do the governance and management structures include clear responsibilities among partners with respect to resources, risks, and decisionmaking? 6. Are there clear accountabilities for results, and clearly defined plans and target audiences (or stakeholders) for the activities of the program? 7. To what extent are developing countries (including transition countries) actively engaged in the governance of the program and in the design and management of program activities? 8. Does the program design ensure recruitment of high-quality advisory committees and clarify their accountability for ensuring scientific/professional excellence in approaches? 9. Are reporting arrangements of managers and advisors to specific levels clearly spelled out?
<p>Financing</p> <p>The partners contribute dedicated resources to the program.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where the Bank is providing DGF grants, do they comply with OP 8.45 for grant making and with the DGF criteria for subsidiarity, arm's length relationship, and exit strategy?^c 2. Where the Bank is administering trust funds that support the program, do they comply with OP 14.40 for trust funds and address the five issues in the recent Trust Funds Review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment with the Bank's strategic priorities • Dependency risks • Cost-effectiveness • Fiduciary risks • Reputational risks? 3. Where the Bank is providing resources for the program from its administrative budget (BB)—for program administration or program activities—is there a realistic assessment of BB needs, and is it a clearly appropriate use of BB resources? 4. Is the Bank's share of the overall resources dedicated to the program appropriate?^d 5. Are regional- and central-unit BB needs spelled out? 6. Does the program have an exit strategy? Does it follow the foundation model, the venture capital model, or the long-term development assistance model? Is the model used clearly justified? Have steps been taken within the context of the model to ensure the long-term sustainability of the program? If the venture capital model is used, does it follow best practice on venture financing? Is the form of exit defined clearly (financial exit, participation exit, legal exit)? How well is the exit strategy planned?

Program aspect	Appraisal criteria
Risks and risk management	<p>This category cuts across the previous six, consistent with the way risks are treated in the Bank financing of projects.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have the risks (applying to both the private sector and NGOs) been assessed at the outset?^e <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reputational risks • Conflict-of-interest risks • Unfair-advantage risks • Governance risks 2. Are the risks associated with the program greater than the expected benefits? Have appropriate procedures been established to manage these risks during program implementation?
Monitoring and evaluation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has a monitoring and independent evaluation system been established for the implementation phase of the program? Does it comply with OED standards for best practice? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear project and component objectives verifiable by indicators • A structured set of quantitative or qualitative indicators • Requirements for data collection and management • Institutional arrangements for capacity-building • Feedback from monitoring and evaluation to Bank management and the Board? 2. Is there adequate provision for routine Bank oversight of the program? 3. Is the Bank exercising adequate fiduciary responsibility for in-house secretariats and for the management of trust funds, with periodic centralized reporting of accounts and audits, which are routinely monitored for quality and completeness?
External review	Has the program been endorsed by independent external reviewers?

a. The *Strategic Directions Paper* (World Bank 2001b) mentions six comparative advantages: (1) global mandate and reach, (2) in-depth country-level knowledge, (3) multisector capacity, (4) convening power, (5) expertise in country and sector analysis and (6) mobilizing financial resources. Others might include access to borrowing countries' policymakers and potential for country assistance.

b. "Institutional partnerships" typically involve information exchange and consultations with a variety of partners in order to improve the Bank's ability to conduct its traditional country- and regionally oriented business more effectively. These do not produce a new product or service and do not involve the establishment of a new organization or entity with separate governance and management structures.

c. These need to be assessed at the appropriate level. In some cases, the DGF is retailing grants to grantees, and in other cases, the DGF is wholesaling to global programs that are retailing to grantees.

d. This needs to be measured consistently across programs.

e. The following are the risks that are assessed in the private sector partnership assessment and approval process that is administered by PSI. See Annex K for a definition of each of these risks.

Source: Reproduced from the Phase 1 Report, Appendix 1, pp. 57–59.