













World Bank

Key: Comparison between perceived performance in 2008 and 2005






 higher performance	 slightly higher performance	 similar performance	 slightly lower performance	 lower performance
--	---	---	---	---



I. Areas of observation	II. MOPAN Survey 2005 ¹	III. MOPAN Survey 2008 ¹	IV. Comparison between 2008 and 2005
(1) Partnership behaviour towards <i>national stakeholders</i>			
a. Policy dialogue	<p>“The World Bank is seen as a major player in policy dialogue especially at the central government level. ... It does actively support participatory approaches and consults widely on the development of its country and sector strategies.”</p>	<p>“MOPAN country teams perceive the World Bank as a major contributor to policy dialogue with the host government. It appears that the Bank is making efforts to support civil society participation in policy dialogue. In comparison, the private sector seems to get more support than NGOs. Regarding consultation with civil society on World Bank policies, strategies and analytical work, the views expressed are mixed.”</p>	<p> As in 2005, MOPAN country teams perceive the World Bank as a major contributor to policy dialogue with the central government. While efforts to support civil society participation in policy dialogue are again acknowledged, consultations with civil society on its own policies and strategies appears to have slightly weakened over the past 3 years.</p>
b. Capacity development	<p>“Most of the country reports note room for improvement in the World Bank’s performance in supporting capacity development, particularly with NGOs, the private sector and local government. ... The quality of the Bank’s international technical advice is generally considered to be good; some country teams however note that it does not always fit local needs.”</p>	<p>“Overall, MOPAN country teams are of the view that the World Bank contributes to developing capacities in public institutions, but limited to the central level. They have insufficient information to make informed judgements about World Bank capacity development of civil society, in particular NGOs. Furthermore, it appears that the Bank does not sufficiently promote government ownership. In general, the MOPAN country teams view technical advice (TA) provided by the World Bank to be of high quality, but not always appropriate for national needs. Moreover, there seems to be room for better use of national TA.”</p>	<p> As in 2005, it appears that the World Bank is mainly developing capacities in public institutions at central level, but not at local level or of civil society actors. While the quality of TA appears to have slightly improved (from “good” to “high quality”), it is still not always appropriate aligned to national needs.</p>





I. Areas of observation	II. MOPAN Survey 2005 ¹	III. MOPAN Survey 2008 ¹	IV. Comparison between 2008 and 2005
c. Advocacy	"The World Bank is perceived as a strong advocate on economic policy issues. Country teams do not see the World Bank as an important actor in wider advocacy campaigns."	"The views of the MOPAN country teams regarding the World Bank advocacy role vary considerably. It appears from the Survey that its strength depends on the particular subject in question."	 <p>According to the two Surveys, no major shift in the World Bank advocacy role can be detected. It remains limited to selected issues.</p>
d. Alignment with national poverty reduction strategies, policies and procedures	<p>"The MOPAN country teams perceive the World Bank as playing a strong role in supporting national PRSs, as becoming more responsive to government proposals and as beginning to align its country and sector strategies to national priorities. ... However, the World Bank is still perceived by country teams as pursuing its own institutional goals and procedures, especially when it comes to developing new operations. ...</p> <p>The World Bank is reported to be overly centralized, with many decisions still having to be referred to regional offices or Washington headquarters."</p>	<p>"According to the Survey, the World Bank actively supports partner country national development strategies, and its own country programmes and sector strategies are well aligned. The country reports show a mixed picture regarding alignment with national systems and procedures. While the World Bank appears to align in some areas (e.g. sector-wide approaches) in others alignment is still limited (e.g. parallel project implementation structures). The MOPAN country teams' perceptions point to limited decision-taking authority of the World Bank at country level."</p>	 <p>The World Bank support to national development strategies remains strong. However, while in 2005 the World Bank was only beginning to align its priorities, they appear to be well aligned in 2008. Moreover, it appears that there is also some progress in terms of aligning business procedures (although it remains a challenge). Decision-taking authority at country level still appears to be limited.</p>
(2) Partnership behaviour towards <i>other international development agencies</i>			
a. Information sharing	"In information sharing the World Bank's behaviour is considered to be generally positive, although selective, e.g. it is seen as forthcoming on general information, but is less good at sharing critical reports."	"The MOPAN country teams' perceptions of the World Bank sharing and seeking of information show a mixed picture. Some of the shortcomings raised by country teams relate to information sharing on missions or consultation of development partners on the Bank's own strategies and programmes."	 <p>There is no noticeable improvement between the 2005 and 2008 performances.</p>
b. Inter-agency coordination	"The country reports indicate mixed perceptions of the World Bank's performance in the area of inter-agency coordination, although the positive views	"According to the Survey, the World Bank appears to contribute significantly to local donor coordination. In general, MOPAN country teams also recognize the	 <p>Comparing the 2005 and 2008 perceptions suggests a significant improvement in the World Bank contribution</p>


I. Areas of observation	II. MOPAN Survey 2005 ¹	III. MOPAN Survey 2008 ¹	IV. Comparison between 2008 and 2005
	tend to outweigh the critical ones."	Bank's efforts to coordinate at the project/ programme level, however, in practice, with some discrepancy between sectors. The country teams acknowledge the contribution of local senior management to coordination within the donor community."	to local donor coordination.
c. Harmonization	"The World Bank is perceived to actively support harmonization efforts at country level, but has not yet made significant headway in terms of implementation. It is seen as supporting the idea of harmonization in order to avoid overlapping with other donors' programmes and to improve the efficiency of public investment. ... Its cooperation with UNDP and other UN agencies, while having somewhat improved, is reported as limited."	"Overall, MOPAN country teams perceive the World Bank to be positively contributing to local donor harmonization efforts. The Survey provides very little information regarding the World Bank contribution to harmonization within the UN system."	 <p>The World Bank contribution to donor harmonization seems to have gained momentum over the past 3 years. However, the World Bank contribution to coordination/harmonization within the UN still appears limited.</p>

Key: Comparison between perceived performance in 2008 and 2005

 higher performance	 slightly higher performance	 similar performance	 slightly lower performance	 lower performance
--	---	---	--	---

I. Areas of observation	II. MOPAN Survey 2005 ¹	III. MOPAN Survey 2008 ¹	IV. Comparison between 2008 and 2005
(1) Partnership behaviour towards <i>national stakeholders</i>			
a. Policy dialogue	<p>“Overall, UNFPA is perceived to have a comparative advantage in the area of national policy dialogue. According to the country reports, UNFPA is generally perceived to have a comparative advantage in fostering the participation of NGOs on issues relating to government policy and its own work. The picture appears less clear as far as the private sector is concerned.”</p>	<p>“Overall, MOPAN country team perceptions of UNFPA contribution to policy dialogue with the government are positive. Allowing for limited data due to a lack of information, UNFPA appears to involve civil society - and largely NGOs - in government and UNFPA corporate policy dialogue. In comparison, however, bilateral interaction with government stakeholders generally seems stronger.”</p>	<p> Similar to 2005, MOPAN country teams appreciate the UNFPA role in national policy dialogue and acknowledge the involvement of NGOs in policy dialogue. UNFPA engagement with private sector actors continues to be limited.</p>
b. Capacity development	<p>“The country teams perceive that UNFPA's performance in terms of capacity development is mixed and that it varies from country to country. Generally speaking, UNFPA is perceived to focus more on public institutions and to a lesser extent on national NGOs; it works little with the private sector. References to UNFPA's use of international expertise are few and very varied. By and large, UNFPA is considered to make good or best use of national expertise when providing TA and support. ”</p>	<p>“Overall, insufficient information affects perceptions of UNFPA capacity development. Based on the findings in the country reports, UNFPA does not seem to be a particularly strong partner in capacity development of public institutions. In comparison, it seems to be slightly more effective at the central than at the local level. UNFPA's capacity development of NGOs and the private sector generally seems to be weaker than that of public institutions. Furthermore, the country reports do not provide a consistent picture as regards government ownership of UNFPA supported projects/programmes. Finally, where MOPAN country teams have expressed views, they generally consider UNFPA's</p>	<p> As in 2005, UNFPA capacity development does not appear to be a strength. Views on the quality and use of TA continue to be favourable.</p>

I. Areas of observation	II. MOPAN Survey 2005 ¹	III. MOPAN Survey 2008 ¹	IV. Comparison between 2008 and 2005
		TA as positive."	
c. Advocacy	"Overall, the country reports perceive UNFPA as having a comparative advantage in advocacy. The MOPAN country teams almost unanimously recognize UNFPA to be a strong and lively advocate on specific issues relevant to its mandate."	"A great majority of the MOPAN country teams appreciate UNFPA's advocacy role on issues relevant to its mandate."	 <p>Both the 2005 and 2008 Surveys show UNFPA as a strong advocate on issues relevant to its mandate.</p>
d. Alignment with national poverty reduction strategies, policies and procedures	"There are mixed views regarding UNFPA's alignment with national strategies, policies and procedures. There is also a view that UNFPA is still focused on its own projects and appears to be predominantly using its own procedures for reporting, accounting and procurement. In terms of decentralization of decision-taking power to the country level, UNFPA country offices are perceived to be rather dependent on their headquarters."	"A majority of MOPAN country teams perceive UNFPA to provide effective support to national development strategies and to align its priorities well. In terms of aligning its business practice, country reports illustrate a shift in aid modality approach away from project execution to participation in government-led programme-based approaches. No country team indicates instances of direct budget support. No consistent pattern emerges from the limited findings in the country reports on the delegation of decision-taking authority to UNFPA country offices."	 <p>The much more favourable assessment in 2008 seems to signal a significant positive change in terms of UNFPA support to partner countries' national development strategies, as well as alignment of UNFPA priorities and business practices.</p>
(2) Partnership behaviour towards <i>other international development agencies</i>			
a. Information sharing	"The country reports reflect mixed views on information sharing with other development agencies, and there would seem to be room for improvement."	"Almost all MOPAN country teams agree that UNFPA shares and/or seeks information in one way or another, but at the same time note some shortcomings."	 <p>As in 2005, there seems to be room for UNFPA to improve its information sharing with other international development partners.</p>
b. Inter-agency coordination	"UNFPA is perceived to be an active and regular participant in local donor coordination groups, but less good at operational coordination."	"A great majority of MOPAN country teams value the quality of UNFPA's contribution to local donor working groups, especially in the gender and health areas. Perceptions of efforts to coordinate with other international development agencies at the	 <p>MOPAN country teams continue to value UNFPA involvement in local donor working groups. In comparison with 2005, coordination at the programme/project level seems to have improved.</p>

I. Areas of observation	II. MOPAN Survey 2005 ¹	III. MOPAN Survey 2008 ¹	IV. Comparison between 2008 and 2005
		programme/project level are also largely positive. Perceptions of local senior management contribution to coordination are mixed, but overall on the positive side."	
c. Harmonization	"The MOPAN country reports lack information about UNFPA's attempts to harmonize strategies and procedures with other aid agencies in their countries of operation. However, the limited information available suggests a perception of cautious progress towards harmonization. ... As regards inter-agency coordination within the UN system, perceptions of MOPAN country teams indicate a better picture at the policy level than at the operational level."	"Regarding harmonization with other international donors, the views expressed by MOPAN country teams vary. Overall, country teams with sufficient knowledge to judge perceive UNFPA to make a considerable contribution to harmonization within the UN system at country level."	 <p>As regards coordination/harmonization within the UN system, MOPAN country teams are far more appreciative than in 2005. On the other hand, UNFPA contribution to donor harmonization in general does not appear to have gained the anticipated momentum over the past 3 years.</p>