

PPE “Plan B” (No mission scenario) – possible methods and tools¹

Method or tool	Strengths	Weaknesses
Harness project documentation (PCR, MTR, Supervision reports)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides comprehensive picture of project activities and achievements • MTR often highlights important shortcomings and delays 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variable quality • Potential biases • Limited focus on project outcomes
Analyse project M&E data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data on outreach and physical progress can be analysed by PPE • Gender differentiated data, if available • Some projects have collected more information than the one used in the PCR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Often limited granularity (e.g. by gender, location, age)
Explore the use of subnational data or information from other donors active in the same area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could provide benchmarks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subnational data scarce and of poor quality • IFAD interventions often dispersed and stretched over several administrative units
Harness impact assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some projects have RIA studies, which are more rigorous (e.g. Bangladesh) • Impact level data can be analysed by PPE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not all projects have conducted rigorous impact studies • Variable quality • Lack of baseline studies
Satellite images	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can be used to locate physical structures and changes in resource managements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GPS data not consistently logged for all projects or interventions • Quality of satellite images available is not consistent (particular in areas with steep gradient) • Satellite images do not reflect the quality and significance of interventions, e.g. introduction of higher-yield variety of the same crop or livestock; use of physical structures; rehabilitation of existing structures. • Natural phenomena affecting quality of images (persistent cloud

¹ For a broader discussion of the ethical and methodological limitations in evaluation during COVID-19, please refer to the following World Bank blog: <https://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/blog/conducting-evaluations-times-covid-19-coronavirus>

		cover esp. before harvest period or in higher altitudes)
Online/virtual interviews or meetings with project staff and key stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide feedback and first-hand insights that can be used to triangulate findings from documents review • Some informants may be “grounded” and easier to reach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outreach to key stakeholders and resource persons might be difficult in emergency situations • Virtual meetings less likely to induce “social proximity” or trust (compared to face-to-face encounters) • Connectivity and communication/ language issues • Stakeholders at the local / field level hard to reach • Bias against marginalized and poorer parts of the population • Online discussions more difficult to facilitate
Online surveys or phone surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enables broader outreach and feedback • Some informants may be “grounded” and easier to reach • Could be used either as an entry point, to explore broader perceptions and views, or for validation of emerging hypotheses or findings • Might help to identify other key issues to explore through desk review or additional interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires careful design (and some pilot testing) • Variable response rates • Readiness to respond may be particularly low by stakeholder absorbed by the crisis • Higher transaction costs for evaluators in terms of follow-up time required (multiple reminders)
Field visits by local consultants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helps to gain first-hand insights and close data gaps • Engagement with beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National restrictions and ethical considerations (do no harm) would have to be observed • Requires careful sampling and planning of interviews and meetings (checklists, guidelines or similar) • Field visits should be documented (field notes or recordings and photos of focus group discussions and physical structures)
(Short) validation mission conducted at a later point of time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideal to validate findings through stakeholder meetings and, where possible, selected field visits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National restrictions and ethical considerations (do no harm) would have to be observed! • Unlikely to happen until travel restrictions are lifted (late 2020?)

Virtual validation meeting – presentation of draft findings and conclusions; discussion with IFAD staff, project partners and key stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Useful to address potential biases or gaps and fine-tune conclusions and potential recommendations• Learning opportunity	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Availability of key partners and stakeholders may be limited during crisis
---	---	--