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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method or tool</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Harness project documentation (PCR, MTR, Supervision reports)                 | • Provides comprehensive picture of project activities and achievements  
• MTR often highlights important shortcomings and delays | • Variable quality  
• Potential biases  
• Limited focus on project outcomes |
| Analyse project M&E data                                                      | • 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 | • 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 | • Could provide benchmarks | • Subnational data scarce and of poor quality  
• IFAD interventions often dispersed and stretched over several administrative units |
| Harness impact assessments                                                    | • Some projects have RIA studies, which are more rigorous (e.g. Bangladesh)  
• Impact level data can be analysed by PPE | • Not all projects have conducted rigorous impact studies  
• Variable quality  
• Lack of baseline studies |
| Satellite images                                                              | • Can be used to locate physical structures and changes in resource managements | • 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:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Online/virtual interviews or meetings with project staff and key stakeholders</strong></th>
<th><strong>Online surveys or phone surveys</strong></th>
<th><strong>Field visits by local consultants</strong></th>
<th><strong>(Short) validation mission conducted at a later point of time</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • 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 | • 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 | • Helps to gain first-hand insights and close data gaps  
• Engagement with beneficiaries | • Ideal to validate findings through stakeholder meetings and, where possible, selected field visits |
| • 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 | • 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) | • 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) | • 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 | • Useful to address potential biases or gaps and fine-tune conclusions and potential recommendations  
• Learning opportunity | • Availability of key partners and stakeholders may be limited during crisis |