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The Role of CDD Projects in World Bank Lending

- Over 560 projects
- With over 32 Billion USD worth in lending since 1998
- Equivalent of 25% of total lending (based on 2003 figure)

- Increased use due to believe that CDD can (among others):
  - Better target the poor
  - Distribute resources more effectively
  - Increase transparency and accountability through empowering direct beneficiaries
Does CDD work?

• Absence of hard evidence, call for evaluations (Steinich, 2000; Mansuri and Rao, 2004)
• “UNDP may need to document its impact to prove that it brings its comparative advantages to bear” (UNDP/BMZ, 2000, p. 39)
• Number of impact evaluation studies conducted since then studying (summarized in Rao and Mansuri 2012), for example:
  • **Targeting effectiveness** *(in a decentralized anti-poverty program in Bangladesh: Galasso and Ravallion, 2005; Bradhan et al (2008))*
  • **Resource distribution** *(improved infrastructure quality through community engagement (Mansuri, 2011))
  • **Transparency and accountability** *(through citizen’s participation in GS and GP’s in India: Besley et al (2005, 2007);*
Why Monitoring in CDD-type project matters

M ≠ E

• **Evaluation**: measurement of impact through causalities (ideally based on baseline data)
• **Monitoring**: frequent data collection during project implementation to monitor progress towards objectives

Signalling mechanism for projects going off track and setting corrective measures

• M is often confused with E: joint responsibility, but often restricted to M
• ideally M&E truly integrated in a project’s M&E framework
• E can inform design/adjustment throughout program phases
Why Monitoring in CDD-type project matters

• Despite continuous practice, monitoring of CDD projects often weak (OECD, 2005; IEG, 2009)
• Traditional monitoring: compliance (inputs, activities, outputs w/o objective setting)
• Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action supported development of results-based M&E systems: focus on outcomes and impacts (Kusek and Rist, 2004); importance of baseline data
• Dynamic not only new to LIC’s and MIC’s – OECD as well (Kusek and Rist, 2004)
• Monitoring maybe even more important for CDD-type projects:
  • Limited experiences
  • Diverging country contexts
  • Learning-by-doing
  • Need for continuous flow of useful information from local to central levels
Potential challenges to CDD monitoring?

- Incentives misaligned for TTL’s, facilitators, beneficiaries, evaluation consultants (Rao and Mansuri, 2004; Ahmed and Bamberger 1989)
- Lack of capacity: results-based monitoring needs experience, skills and institutional capacity, IT set-up

Risks compliance-task and hence under-utilization of data collected
How could community monitoring address these challenges?

Community monitoring could....

• align incentives by making beneficiaries responsible to monitor services provided for them (Stiglitz, 2002)
• be effective to ensure benefits accrued by targeted communities, control capture (World Bank, 2003)

Through....

• establishing a decentralized monitoring system (Ahmed and Bamberger, 1990)
• developing simple and economical M&E systems
Potential caveats with community monitoring?

• free-riding and capture by the “powerful” (Bardhan, 2002; Bardhan and Mookherjee, 2005), unless private good monitoring (Olken, 2007)

• establishing demand and ownership

• non-existence of inter-ministerial collaboration (that could reduce the costs of establishing such systems)

• lack of longer-term strategic economic investment and policy planning

• driven by donor-communities
WB/DRG study overview

• Primary data: TTL questionnaire (165 TTL’s, 44% response)
• Secondary data: universe of all WB CDD projects (~600, ‘99-’07), 345 sub-sample (72 or < % CDD), incl PAD’s, PID’s, ISR’s and ICR’s (SDV database)
• 68 projects reviewed more in-depth for M&E component

**General project characteristics:**
• frequent TTL switches (1 or more in more than 55% of cases)
• implementation mechanisms at local level: 1/3 local government, 40% local development councils, remaining sectoral representatives
• 62% make role for community explicit
• local funding: 88% Bank grants, 52% Central Gvt transfers, 70% community contribution, 22% community contribution through user fees, 5% taxes
How is monitoring of CDD-type projects/programs conducted in practice?

• nearly half of the projects set M&E money explicitly aside, including the assignment of an M&E specialist in the PMU

• other half does either or – figures may be higher according to TTL survey

• even though all collect data to measure PDO and IRI’s, only 40% give a more detailed account of what kind of information is collected and how

• community monitoring tools used in 2/3 of the projects
How is monitoring of CDD-type projects/programs conducted in practice?

*Results Framework Policy of 2004 had an impact?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Before 2004</th>
<th>After 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection of baseline values</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting progress values on all indicators</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reported indicators in ISR’s</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Majority of indicators’ progress values reported</strong></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No progress reports at all</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any baseline value reported</strong></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No baseline value reported at all</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How is monitoring of CDD-type projects/programs conducted in practice?

Are deficiencies recognized in the process?

• AM’s, MTR’s: no or bad quality data due to human and technical, and also financial capacity failure

What is recommended?

• increased training and capacity building
• recruitment of additional staff
• revision of RF’s, data collection method
• good practice recommendations: include participatory M&E, M&E by independent agencies, more outcome-orientation of indicators
How is monitoring of CDD-type projects/programs conducted in practice?

Are deficiencies recognized at the end?

• ICR’s: substantial review of M&E in less than 1/3 of the cases; majority criticism is more negative:
  • M&E systems too complex in design
  • Lack of institutional capacity
  • Lack of baseline values
  • Outcome indicators not realistically attributable to project
Does monitoring induce learning?

What indicators?

• only around half of CDD projects have explicit local/community participation indicators

• often broad:
  • “local governments undertake participatory planning”,
  • “% of communities have participatory practices”
  • ”women activity registered in local meeting”- collected through unspecified reports;

• if formulated more precisely such as
  • “30% of participants in decision making meetings during planning and implementation are women and voice their opinions”,
  • collection method is precise: “documentation of participatory process and focus groups in selected villages”

• often quantity instead of quality
  • “% of women participating in the meeting”,
  • rather than “% of women participating and raising their voices”
Evidence on community monitoring?

Community Monitoring Practiced in 50% of CDD projects

- 30% use grievance and complaints handling mechanism
- according to TTL’s, more than 2/3 of projects have such a built-in mechanism (most projects don’t provide detailed information on this in the PAD)
- 67% of TTL’s stated to document cases
- complaints often on
  - infrastructure quality,
  - transparency of criteria of project selection
  - lack of involvement in the selection
Are CDD projects evaluated against their impact?

**TTL opinion on IE:**

- only half of TTL’s deem it a useful exercise
- concerns of TTL’s (Bank’s OP’s set no incentive to make good M&E, not perceived as priority by senior management, project duration of conventional Bank projects not long enough to allow realizing CDD objectives);
- useful insights provided by new work of the Bank reviewing CDD impact evaluation results
Conclusions

• CDD projects need to have a key emphasis on learning through M&E because:
  • Heterogeneity of CDD projects
  • Diverse country and sector contexts
  • One successful project can serve as basis, but not as blueprint for others

• We found monitoring has gained in importance
• quality of information produced by M&E systems has improved

• what needs to be done in the future:
  • More baseline data
  • More precise/measurable formulation of objectives
  • Produce timely results – community monitoring can help
  • Make M&E data a useful decision instrument – community monitoring can help
  • Make M&E a priority for TTL’s, the beneficiaries and the counterparts
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