



Is the World Bank leaving no one behind?

Paula Lucci, Amina Khan, Jennifer Turner and Jacob Sims

June 2019



Key messages

- At a strategic level, the World Bank is partially aligned with the Agenda 2030 commitment to ‘leave no one behind’, through its twin goals of ending extreme poverty and boosting shared prosperity and its renewed emphasis on human capital. However, the World Bank needs to do more to account for group-based inequalities and discrimination, two of the major drivers of poverty.
- The World Bank’s results framework does not currently disaggregate data for vulnerable groups sufficiently to allow effective monitoring of the leave no one behind commitment. However, there are plans to improve disaggregation for critical groups, for example refugees and internally displaced people (IDPs), in line with the World Bank’s increasing focus on fragility.
- Of the three left-behind groups called out in the 2030 Agenda and analysed in this study, it is clear that the World Bank is increasing its focus on refugees and people with disabilities in its financial portfolios, however, neither group yet receives as much attention as indigenous peoples.
- The World Bank’s high priority on social protection is welcome, given this is a particularly poorly funded sector. But earlier analysis by others suggests more could be done to match the Bank’s country and subnational allocations to the places most at risk of being left behind.
- The International Development Association replenishment (IDA-19) provides an opportunity to redress these issues.

Readers are encouraged to reproduce material for their own publications, as long as they are not being sold commercially. ODI requests due acknowledgement and a copy of the publication. For online use, we ask readers to link to the original resource on the ODI website. The views presented in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views of ODI or our partners.

This work is licensed under CC BY-NC-ND 4.0.

About the authors

Amina Khan is a Senior Research Officer at the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) in the Growth, Poverty and Inequality Programme, focusing on poverty and inclusive growth. Paula Lucci was formerly a Research Fellow at ODI in the Growth, Poverty and Inequality Programme and focuses on policy analysis and urban economic development. Jacob Sims is AidData's Associate Director of Sustainable Development Intelligence, leading work on migration, global health, education and development finance. Jennifer Turner is a Programme Manager at AidData, leading research on migration, inequality and sustainable development finance.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Catherine Blampied, who developed the conceptual note and analytical framework used in this paper. Our peer reviewers provided very helpful feedback and advice: Annalisa Prizzon (Overseas Development Institute, ODI), Andrew Rogerson (ODI), Elizabeth Stuart (ODI), Marcus Manuel (ODI) and Samantha Custer (AidData). Further comments were provided by Andres Londono (World Bank), Nazmul Chaudhury (World Bank), and Susan Nicolai (ODI).

We also thank Anna Hickman for support with communications, Alasdair Deas for his editing and Caelin Robinson for design and layout.

We would like to acknowledge the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation for their generous financial support of this research. The report's findings and conclusions do not necessarily reflect the funder's views.

Contents

About the authors	3
Acknowledgements	3
List of tables and boxes	5
Acronyms	6
Executive summary	7
1 Introduction	9
1.1 The commitment to ‘leave no one behind’	9
1.2 A focus on multilateral organisations	10
1.3 The aim of this working paper	11
2 Review of existing assessments	13
2.1 DFID’s 2016 Multilateral Development Review	13
2.2 The MOPAN Review	13
3 Analytical framework	15
3.1 Our approach	15
3.2 Selection of ‘reference’ groups	17
4 Assessment of the World Bank	20
4.1 Strategy and policy	20
4.2 Data	26
4.3 Finance	30
5 Conclusion and future directions	35
References	37
Annex 1 Inclusion and equity in diagnostic tools	41
Annex 2 Methodology: searching the World Bank’s project repository	43

List of tables and boxes

Tables

Table 1	Assessment of organisations' commitment to leave no one behind	18
Table 2	Assessment of alignment to leave no one behind in the World Bank's strategies and policies	25
Table 3	World Bank projects and financing for statistical strengthening	29
Table 4	Assessment of alignment to leave no one behind in the World Bank's use of data	29
Table 5	World Bank projects and financing including and primarily targeting selected vulnerable groups	31
Table 6	Top 10 financed sectors, 2010–2016	32
Table 7	Assessment of alignment to leave no one behind in the World Bank's financing of projects	34

Boxes

Box 1	Defining leave no one behind	10
Box 2	The World Bank's IDA and IBRD	12
Box 3	Safeguarding and grievance mechanisms (Table 2: 1.c/1.d)	23
Box 4	A focus on core social services to leave no one behind	32
Box 5	Giving a greater share of IDA resources to leaving no one behind?	33

Acronyms

CGA	Country Gender Assessment
CPF	Country Partnership Framework
CPIA	Country Policy and Institutional Assessment
CPR	Country Performance Rating
CSC	Corporate Scorecard
DAC	Development Assistance Committee (OECD)
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
ESF	Environmental and Social Framework
FCS	fragile and conflict-affected states
FCV	fragility, conflict and violence
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
IDA	International Development Association
IDPs	internally displaced people
IPP	Indigenous Peoples Plan
IRAI	IDA Resource Allocation Index
ISAI	IDA Special Allocation Index
KPI	key performance indicator
LNOB	leave no one behind
MDB	multilateral development bank
MDR	Multilateral Development Review (DFID)
MO	multilateral organisation
MOPAN	Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network
MPA	Multiphase Programmatic Approach
ODA	official development assistance
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
P4R	Program-for-Results
PAD	project appraisal document
PCPI	Post-Conflict Performance Indicator
PSIA	Poverty and Social Impact Analysis
RPBA	Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessments
RMS	Results Measurement System
SCD	Systematic Country Diagnostic
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SORT	Systematic Operations Risk-Rating Tool
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

Executive summary

Background

The commitment to ‘leave no one behind’

In the 2030 Agenda, countries pledged that ‘no one will be left behind’ (UN, 2015), an underpinning principle that binds together the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). But there is a risk that the promise by governments and development partners to leave no one behind becomes an empty signifier. There is no agreed approach to conceptualising and monitoring the leave no one behind commitment, so countries are free to operationalise this for themselves. Consequently, there are no mechanisms to assess how development assistance providers contribute to that end. This working paper offers an operational definition for the commitment based on Stuart and Samman (2017) and devises a set of good-enough indicators of progress for it, which could also be applicable to development cooperation actors.

A focus on multilaterals

The commitment to leave no one behind will require United Nations Member States to change how they engage in bilateral (Engen et al., forthcoming) and multilateral cooperation. Actions required to achieve this include: identifying individuals and groups who are left behind, so that they can be targeted effectively; following the progress of those individuals, using results frameworks; and assessing the extent to which resource allocation formulae cover equity considerations, among others.

Multilaterals are a major component of the global development system: 41% of official development assistance (ODA), or \$63 billion, was spent through multilateral organisations in 2016, with core contributions making up 29% of ODA (OECD, 2018). Importantly, they play a distinctive role in influencing the strategic priorities of the broader development ecosystem. Further, our discussions with a number of donor countries

that have a strong interest in this agenda revealed a key analytical gap in terms of the multilaterals’ alignment with and performance against the leave no one behind commitment.

Aim of our research

This working paper seeks to develop a new analytical framework to analyse whether and how well multilateral organisations are progressing towards meeting the commitment to leave no one behind in three core areas: strategy and policies, data and finance. It also analyses the extent to which three of the groups that the 2030 Agenda specifically identifies as vulnerable and therefore left behind – people with disabilities, refugees and internally displaced people (IDPs), and indigenous peoples – are included in these three core areas. We acknowledge that the focus on these three left-behind groups is restrictive and endeavour to capture other important dimensions of marginalisation, such as ethnicity and geography, in future work. Note that gender was excluded as it is already covered by a significant body of work.

The framework is tested using one selected multilateral organisation: the World Bank. Through its two main financing windows/entities – the International Development Association (IDA) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) – the World Bank provides an exemplar case study given that its twin goals of ending extreme poverty and promoting shared prosperity are closely related to the leave no one behind commitment, as is its increasing focus on basic health and education outcomes, through the Human Capital Project (WBG, 2018a). As such, rather than being illustrative of the mainstream approach of a multilateral organisation, we would expect the World Bank to be a leader in this area. Importantly, the IDA-19 replenishment has put the World Bank’s policies and performance in the spotlight, as partners meet to raise funds.

Key findings

This working paper finds a mixed picture in terms of the World Bank's alignment with the commitment to leave no one behind.

- At the strategy level, the World Bank is partially aligned with the commitment to leave no one behind through its twin goals of ending extreme poverty and boosting shared prosperity and its renewed emphasis on human capital. However, the twin goals only consider income poverty and inequality (rather than multidimensional measures), and do not account for group-based inequalities and discrimination.
- At the policy level, while the IDA's and IBRD's policy documents include broad references to inclusion (perhaps stronger in IDA documents) and the three selected reference groups, these are not consistently included across the documents, and indigenous peoples tend to be referenced most frequently. This could be explained by historical reasons, as indigenous peoples were among the first to be affected by infrastructure projects, given their ancestral claims to land. That said, it is important to acknowledge the World Bank's increasing focus on fragile states and conflict prevention, including addressing the needs of refugees and IDPs and its plans to incorporate disability into future work.
- Currently, the data disaggregation within the World Bank's results framework is limited. This issue has been acknowledged and plans are in place for improvements. For instance, there are calls to disaggregate results for refugees and IDPs, in line with the World Bank's increasing focus on fragility.
- The assessment of the financing component found that a significantly larger share of World Bank funding is focused on indigenous populations than on migrants or people with disabilities. The assessment also suggests that

projects are far more likely to 'include' groups than to make them 'primary beneficiaries'. This is largely because most aid delivery, including through World Bank projects, is multisectoral and targets different types of beneficiaries.

- The World Bank's IDA allocates substantial resources to core social sectors relevant to the leave no one behind commitment – health, education and social protection, particularly the latter. However, earlier analysis by others suggests that more could be done to match the World Bank's country and subnational allocations to places that are most at risk of being left behind.

The IDA-19 replenishment presents an opportunity to redress some of these issues. Based on our findings, this paper makes the following recommendations:

- Group-based inequalities and discrimination, as major drivers of poverty, should feature more prominently in World Bank strategy and policy.
- Policies that assess project impacts on vulnerable groups, such as the use of Indigenous Peoples Plans, should be expanded to cover other marginalised groups. This would provide a critical mechanism to prevent these groups from being left behind. This could force an analysis of who might *not* benefit from specific projects, in the absence of specific mitigation action.
- Efforts to improve disaggregation of data on vulnerable groups in the results framework (in line with SDG 17.18), and to support national statistical systems to do so, should be ramped up.
- Subnational allocations should be matched more closely to the areas of highest deprivation. Equity weights could be applied where cost-benefit analysis leads to underfunding of areas that have been left behind.

1 Introduction

1.1 The commitment to ‘leave no one behind’

In the 2030 Agenda, countries pledged that ‘no one will be left behind’ (UN, 2015). This promise to leave no one behind can be seen as the underpinning principle that binds together the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). But what does this mean in practice for governments and their development partners?

Without doubt, one vital aspect is the **ending of extreme poverty** (income and multidimensional). This involves ensuring that the minimum living standards of societies are met, especially in countries where large swathes of people continue to live in absolute deprivation (Box 1). A second vital aspect is the **inclusion** of all poor, vulnerable and marginalised people, so they are not locked out of the process, benefits and opportunities of sustainable development.

However, the commitment goes further still. Leave no one behind is an explicitly *relational* concept, highlighting the urgent need to tackle disparities and inequities that exist vertically (e.g. along the income distribution) and horizontally (e.g. group-based disparities). Indeed, the 2030 Agenda explicitly states that countries will ‘endeavour to reach the furthest behind *first*’ [emphasis added]. The commitment thus entails going beyond merely ‘rebadging’ virtually any interventions and activities that are in some way connected with poverty or sustainable development. It requires the **deliberate prioritisation and fast-tracking of actions for the furthest behind** (Stuart and Samman, 2017). To achieve this, there must be a reconceptualisation of what constitutes progress.

There is a risk that the leave no one behind promise made by governments and development

partners becomes an empty signifier. To militate against this, it is necessary to have a definition of what the principle means in practice and for progress against it to be monitored. But, at present, there is no agreed approach to conceptualising and monitoring the commitment to leave no one behind. There is also no way to *directly* assess the impact of aggregate development cooperation on the poorest and most marginalised people, and whether it is explicitly and effectively reducing disparities – at least in the face of current data constraints, which in many cases do not allow for detailed disaggregation for vulnerable populations.

We here propose and test an approach to assessing and monitoring multilaterals’ performance on leave no one behind. By taking an indirect approach, we can establish key questions and a set of proxy indicators for development partners’ alignment with and performance against the commitment to leave no one behind, which are sufficiently broad (or even universal) in their application but still concrete enough to capture meaningful information on the extent to which development cooperation is reaching the most marginalised. This paper suggests that the key questions to be asked for each development partner could include the following:

- Does the development partner have an explicit commitment to the leave no one behind agenda in its strategy and policies?
- Does the development partner’s results framework used for accountability, diagnosis and resource allocation disaggregate information for left-behind groups?
- Does the development partner allocate financial resources to left-behind groups and areas of high deprivation?

Box 1 Defining leave no one behind

In an analysis of the 2030 Agenda's outcome document (UN, 2015), Stuart and Samman (2017) define the leave no one behind concept as meaning:

- ending extreme poverty in all its forms, and reducing inequalities among both individuals (vertical) and groups (horizontal)
- stopping the group-based discrimination that has resulted in unequal outcomes for some disadvantaged or marginalised populations (e.g. based on social identity or geography), including a focus on how multiple dimensions of disadvantage interact, and
- reaching the furthest behind first.

In the spirit of the 2030 Agenda, Stuart and Samman's definition is not meant to be prescriptive. Instead, it leaves scope for implementers to adapt the goals to be relevant to their context and specificities. The definition sets out broad parameters that offer implementers concrete suggestions for approaches to take.

For example, where high levels of absolute deprivation persist, it would be appropriate to focus on ensuring that people living below the poverty line – in income or other dimensions of well-being – can attain minimum living standards, with an emphasis on the poorest of the poor (the specific markers and structural barriers for these groups, such as ethnic group, location and gender, are context specific). Where minimum standards are fulfilled, relative considerations will be more relevant. The bottom line is that the SDGs are unlikely to be achieved unless progress is made faster for the most marginalised groups.

The 2030 Agenda's outcome document lists the groups who are left behind as children, youth, persons with disabilities (of whom more than 80 per cent live in poverty), people living with HIV/AIDS, older persons, indigenous peoples, refugees and IDPs and migrants (UN, 2015). Elsewhere, the text also refers to women and the income poor as marginalised. Again, which specific groups are most marginalised will be context specific.

1.2 A focus on multilateral organisations

United Nations (UN) Member States have signed up to a commitment to ensure they prioritise actions for the poorest and most marginalised – both domestically and within their cooperation policy. In the case of the latter, this will entail changing not only the way they engage bilaterally (Engen et al., forthcoming), but also – and hugely importantly – the way they engage in multilateral cooperation. This means ensuring that the multilateral institutions of which they are members or which they fund are themselves prioritising outcomes for the poorest. The reasons for this are set out below.

First, multilateral development organisations have distinct roles and characteristics when compared with bilateral agencies. According to Gulrajani (2016) and Greenhill and Rabinowitz (2016), multilaterals are typically believed – with

good empirical justification – to be less politicised and more 'neutral' than bilateral donors, and to have a stronger orientation towards poverty and human rights. Partly for this reason and partly for transparency, multilaterals tend to make more use of formal country allocation formulae than most bilaterals. Based on this, it might be hypothesised that they are relatively well-oriented towards the goal of leaving no one behind.

Second, multilaterals are a major component of the global development system, with over 200 organisations, including UN agencies, the World Bank and global funds, among others. In volume terms, across the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) as a whole, close to 41% of official development assistance (ODA) (\$63 billion) was spent through the multilateral system in 2016 (OECD, 2018), or 29% (\$44 billion) if

only core contributions¹ are considered. Donors' contributions vary widely, with countries such as the United States (US), the United Kingdom (UK) and Germany providing the largest resources in absolute terms (core contributions ranging between \$5 billion and \$6 billion each), while some smaller donors contribute less than \$0.5 billion, but these contributions make up a large proportion of their ODA (over 80% in the case of Slovak Republic; *ibid.*). Furthermore, given that their nature is to represent a range of countries' collective interests, multilaterals have a distinctive role in influencing the strategic priorities of the broader development ecosystem.

Third, multinationals' alignment with and performance against the leave no one behind commitment has been identified as a key analytical gap.² While bilateral development agencies can look to evaluate their own bilateral work relatively straightforwardly, they allocate significant portions of their funding via the multilateral system. Greenhill and Rabinowitz (2016) found that donors appear to delegate more to multilaterals that share their own priorities. This suggests that bilateral donors for whom leave no one behind is a priority would expect or desire the same to be true of the multilaterals they are funding, but to date it has been difficult to assess if this is the case.

To our knowledge, only one assessment of multilateral agencies and their commitment to leave no one behind has been conducted to date – by the UK's Department for International Development (DFID), as part of its 2016 Multilateral Development Review (MDR) (DFID, 2016a), which we describe in Section 2.

Given all of the above, there is a strong rationale to better understand whether and how

investments in sustainable development through the multilateral system are geared towards the goal of leaving no one behind.

1.3 The aim of this working paper

This working paper presents a new analytical framework that we have developed to analyse whether and how well multilateral organisations (MOs) are progressing towards meeting the commitment to leave no one behind. The results obtained from testing the framework on one selected MO are also presented.

The World Bank was selected as the exemplar case study for testing our methodology.³ While the World Bank is not *explicitly* focused on the leave no one behind agenda per se, its twin goals of ending extreme poverty and promoting shared prosperity (that of the bottom 40%) are closely related, and it therefore should be *implicitly* focused on this agenda. The same can be said of its increasing focus on basic health and education outcomes through the Human Capital Project (WBG, 2018a). The Project has three components including a cross-country metric – the Human Capital Index, which measures the human capital that a child born today can expect to attain by age 18, given the risks to poor health and poor education that prevail in the country where (s)he lives (*ibid.*).

Further, the World Bank is unique in its cross-regional, cross-thematic approach, which means it casts a much broader shadow, and its leadership in methods and policies is tracked by many other multilaterals. As such, rather than being illustrative of the mainstream approach of a MO, we would expect the World Bank to be a leader in this area.

-
- 1 This is also the rationale behind the Overseas Development Institute's (ODI's) series of 'leave no one behind stocktakes', which examine specific sectors at country level; see Blampied et al. (2018) and Bhatkal et al. (2016). These are resources that the governing boards of MOs have the unqualified right to allocate within the organisation's charter. Sovereign states can also provide non-core or earmarked resources to MOs. These are resources earmarked for a specific country, project, region, sector or theme, over which the sovereign states retain some degree of control. These resources can be administered through single- or multi-donor trust funds. These resources 'bypass' multilateral governance, whereby decisions on spending priorities and the size of the portfolio are made, indicating a 'bilateralisation' of the multilateral development system (OECD, 2018).
 - 2 Informal discussions with donor countries with strong interest in the leave no one behind agenda conducted by ODI, February/March 2018.
 - 3 This does not include the International Finance Corporation (IFC) or Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA), which are part of the World Bank Group. These provide private sector operations, whereas our primary focus is on sovereign operations.

We focus on the World Bank's two main financing windows/entities – the International Development Association (IDA) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) (see Box 2) – which lend to sovereign governments and are more aligned with inclusion and equity concerns. These two financing windows represent different modalities. The IDA provides concessional lending and is based on donor contributions (replenishment) with a publicly available allocation formula. The IBRD's non-concessional lending is based on general and special capital increases from shareholders and the allocation criteria are not publicly available.

The World Bank accounts for a significant proportion of all core multilateral contributions by the DAC overall (25%; authors' calculations

based on OECD, 2018), and its strategic priorities and frameworks have a strong influence on the multilateral system more broadly. Critically, the IDA-19 replenishment is putting its policies and performance in the spotlight.

The rest of this working paper is structured as follows:

- Section 2 reviews existing frameworks related to assessing MOs' commitment to leaving no one behind
- Section 3 presents our analytical framework
- Section 4 tests our framework using the World Bank as an exemplar case study, and
- Section 5 concludes and discusses future directions.

Box 2 The World Bank's IDA and IBRD

The World Bank's International Development Association (IDA) is its financing window for the poorest countries. It is one of the largest providers of both concessional lending and non-concessional grants (the latter for more indebted countries). IDA provides 100% grants to countries with high risk of debt distress, 50% grants/50% loans to countries with moderate risk, and 100% loans to countries with low risk. The last replenishment round (IDA-18), which concluded in October 2016, raised \$75 billion for the World Bank's work between 2018 and 2020. For the first time, it was agreed that the IDA could access capital markets, using future repayments as equity, enabling it to borrow over \$20 billion. This might have implications for its concessionality and country allocations, although these are still not clear. For instance, the IDA may need to tailor its bond content according to its investors' preferences (OECD, 2018).

Formal negotiations to renew the IDA commenced in April 2019, but the start of the IDA-18 Mid-Term Review in Zambia in November 2018 set the scene for the future of the IDA. Specific themes covered by IDA-18 have included: Jobs and economic transformation; Gender and development; Climate change; Fragility, conflict and violence; and Governance and institutions. According to practice, these typically inform the upcoming replenishment round (Morris et al., 2018). One of the key characteristics of IDA-18 has been its continued focus on fragility (which had already started with IDA-17; WBG, 2018b), including a specific window to support refugees, a particular left-behind group.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) supports countries graduating from IDA assistance and its lending is on non-concessional terms. In April 2018, it increased significantly its lending capacity, with paid-in capital increases of \$7.5 billion and \$52.6 billion in callable capital (OECD, 2018).

The IDA and the IBRD have different financing models. The IDA is largely based on donor contributions (replenishment) and has a publicly available allocation formula. The IBRD is based on general/special capital increases from shareholders (most recently in 2018). Its allocation decisions are not made publicly available, but are more focused on country risk assessments and the Bank's capital exposure.

Source: Morris (2018), WBG (2018b), IDA (2017).

2 Review of existing assessments

In this section, we review two existing, publicly available frameworks that are relevant to assessing MOs' commitment to leave no one behind: DFID's 2016 MDR framework and the Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network's (MOPAN's) review methodology, although only the first of these refers explicitly to the leave no one behind commitment.

2.1 DFID's 2016 Multilateral Development Review

As part of its 2016 MDR, DFID assessed whether MOs are taking 'action to meet the Global Goal to leave no-one behind' (DFID, 2016a: 42). This question – one of 16 components making up the overall framework – was a new addition to the methodology used for the 2011 Multilateral Aid Review, with the explicit aim of reflecting the new global development agenda of the SDGs. To our knowledge, it is the first and only other attempt to assess the alignment and performance of MOs with their commitment to leave no one behind. Although published at the end of 2016, the analysis was undertaken mostly in 2015, around the time the SDGs were first agreed, so is now a few years out of date. Further, DFID's findings on leave no one behind were converted into a single numerical score – an approach that was necessary to integrate the results into a wider composite index for the MDR.

DFID assessed a total of 38 multilateral organisations that annually receive more than £1 million in core funding from the UK, including the World Bank (DFID, 2016a). For the

leave no one behind component, DFID assigned each MO under review an overall score from 0 to 4, based on a set of benchmarks across several dimensions. While the scores are available in the public domain, details of the dimensions are not.

On the leave no one behind component, the World Bank scored 2.5/4 and was rated as 'weak+', indicating less than satisfactory performance even though on the overall index it performed well (DFID, 2016b). Interestingly, DFID found that the multilateral development banks (MDBs) and development finance institutions as a group scored lowest on this component, suggesting that the MDBs more generally are not well aligned with the leave no one behind agenda.⁴

These results also show the challenges in applying a common framework and rating system to very different organisations, as some organisations' mandates will be more closely aligned with the leave no one behind agenda than others.

2.2 The MOPAN Review

The Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) is a network of donors, with a secretariat hosted at the OECD, that monitors the performance of multilateral development organisations. Its methodology, MOPAN 3.0, covers five areas of performance: strategic management; operational management; relationship management; performance management; and results.

The current MOPAN assessment framework does not include analysis of performance on

⁴ Scores for MDBs: African Development Bank: 2; Asian Development Bank: 2; Caribbean Development Bank: 2.5; European Bank for Reconstruction and Development: 2.5; Inter-American Development Bank: 2.5

leave no one behind. However, one of its key performance indicators (KPIs) assesses the ‘structures and mechanisms in place and applied to support the implementation of global frameworks for cross-cutting issues’ (MOPAN, 2017a).

The four cross-cutting issues covered under MOPAN 3.0 are: gender equality; environmental sustainability and climate change; governance; and fragility, conflict and violence. There are also disaggregated results-based KPIs that reflect gender-focused and climate results (e.g. KPIs 9 and 10).

These are based on actual evaluated results, not on the statements of policy referred to under KPI 2.

As such, MOPAN 3.0 provides an interesting example of a methodology for assessing a MO’s readiness to tackle a broad development agenda where there is global normative commitment, yet the reality of which may look very different to organisations operating in different contexts (analogous to the leave no one behind commitment). MOPAN’s challenge has been to devise a set of indicators that meaningfully capture (and differentiate) performance, but which are universally applicable across organisations.

For each of the four cross-cutting issues, MOPAN examines the following six elements:

1. Is there a dedicated policy statement?
2. Have targets and indicators been incorporated into the strategic plan and corporate objectives?
3. Do accountability systems reflect the targets and indicators?
4. Are screening checklists or similar tools used for each new intervention?
5. Are human and financial resources (exceeding benchmarks) available to address the issue?
6. Has capacity development of staff engaged on the issue been conducted, or is it underway?

The strengths of the MOPAN methodology lie in its application of clear and explicit operating principles, building on existing bilateral frameworks. It uses multiple sources of data (stakeholder surveys, document review, interviews) against each single indicator to ensure analysis and ratings are robust (MOPAN, 2017a). The extent to which it can assess different MOs on these cross-cutting issues depends on the availability of data; for instance, in the case of the World Bank’s 2014–2015 Review (MOPAN, 2017b), given the lack of data disaggregation by gender, it was not possible to provide a rating for the World Bank’s performance relating to achieving results (KPI 9) on gender (Indicator 9.4 ‘Interventions assessed as having helped improve gender equality and the empowerment of women’).

As in the case of DFID’s MDR, one of the main limitations of MOPAN 3.0 (as identified by a methodology review) is the applicability of the indicators to different organisations (Stern and Andersen, 2018). One proposal put forward to address this challenge is to adopt a modular approach. This would involve using a core set of indicators for all organisations and then developing a set of modules applicable to different *types* of organisations. These modules could be classified by main focus, such as service and programme delivery, finance, capacity-building (e.g. of policy and governance systems), standard setting and coordination (ibid.). Another identified challenge relates to its purpose and how to strengthen its accountability/compliance function with other possible roles – fostering learning and self-improvement of assessed MOs and supporting system coherence and reform (Rogerson and Jalles D’Orey, 2018).

Building on these two existing frameworks, the next section presents our own analytical framework.

3 Analytical framework

In this section we present our analytical framework for assessing the performance of MOs on the commitment to leave no one behind. We first describe our approach, and then discuss the criteria used to select three left-behind ‘reference groups’ for use in our assessment.

3.1 Our approach

Developing an analytical framework to monitor performance on the commitment to leave no one behind faces a number of conceptual and methodological challenges.

- The principle to leave no one behind is highly context specific (see Section 1, Box 1). The framework therefore needs to be able to accommodate this context specificity, while at the same time being general enough to be applied to a range of organisations working on different developing regions.
- The assessment needs to be nuanced enough to account for the fact that not all multilaterals would want to, or are able to, focus on this agenda in the same way and to the same extent, given their different mandates.
- Data availability can be a real constraint; data needs to be available for all the different dimensions that are to be considered. For example, MOPAN could not assess the World Bank’s actual implementation of projects on gender equality because of lack of data/evidence. This is part of the problem itself.

To address these challenges and allow for a more nuanced consideration of context specificity and different organisations’ mandates, our approach – at least for now – does not seek to provide a hard-numerical rating system, in contrast to the approach used in DFID’s MDR methodology (DFID, 2016a). Instead, it provides a series of key questions that aim to elicit a more nuanced discussion on whether enough is being done to implement the SDG

commitment to leave no one behind. After this first exercise, we will consider developing a rating system that is consistent across organisations (or *types* of organisations with similar mandates) to help donors allocate their resources in support of the leave no one behind principle.

Our framework builds on those discussed in Section 2. It takes the MDR framework as one of its starting points, incorporating some of its components. We also build on MOPAN’s example, with the logical flow of the components of our framework being similar in that they begin at the strategic level and move onto accountability, use of data and diagnostic tools, and then to allocation of financial resources. Further, our framework includes the first four of these elements (or adaptations of them) plus a number of additional elements, but it does not look at the allocation and capacity development of human resources (this would be very difficult to measure and benchmark for an agenda as sectorally/thematically broad and cross-cutting as leave no one behind).

Critically, our approach also draws on the existing literature on leave no one behind. It is structured around three key areas that ODI has identified as requiring fast-track action to leave no one behind (Manuel et al., 2018a; Greenhill, 2017a; 2017b), namely: **Strategy and policy** (i.e. ensuring these reflect the commitment to leave no one behind); **Data** (i.e. that the data used to target resources and measure results disaggregates information for left-behind groups); and **Finance** (i.e. that resource allocation targets the most left behind). We explain each of the key components in turn below, with a summary in Table 1.

3.1.1 Strategy and policy

Our analytical framework begins by considering the extent to which the MO has an explicit strategic commitment to leave no one behind. If it does, the framework then considers whether this has been defined/translated for the particular context of the MO’s work and whether specific

targets and indicators to track performance on this commitment have been set. If the MO does not explicitly state a strategic commitment to leave no one behind then the framework looks at whether the MO has a related commitment, such as ending extreme poverty, reducing inequalities (income, non-income and ‘overlapping’ inequalities)⁵ or reducing discrimination. Source documents for this component include MO strategy documents,⁶ key speeches by the leadership of the MO and key website text (Table 1: 1.a).

The framework then goes on to analyse the MO’s policy documents, including sectoral ones, and whether they include dedicated statements targeting both vulnerable groups in general and selected marginalised groups in particular (Table 1: 1.b). Section 3.2 provides a discussion on and rationale for the selection of three specific reference groups for this study.

The last component of the Strategy and policy dimension looks at the operational level, drawing on the MO’s policy and operational documents to consider whether the MO has safeguarding policies and grievance mechanisms in place, both for vulnerable groups in general and for selected marginalised groups (Table 1: 1.c, 1.d).

To narrow down the scope of the exercise, we consider the latest documents available, ideally issued after the 2030 Agenda to capture alignment with the principle to leave no one behind as a result of the commitment to the implementation of this Agenda. However, in cases where these documents precede this Agenda, the assessment reflects on the extent to which the MO’s existing strategy and policies are implicitly aligned with this principle even if this is not a direct result of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

3.1.2 Data

This second key component of the framework focuses on the use of data on vulnerable groups for accountability purposes, diagnostic tools and resource allocation.

It assesses whether the MO’s results framework disaggregates data using the categories specified in SDG 17.18 (income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability and geographic location) and if there are plans to improve disaggregation in the results framework by 2020 (Table 1: 2.a). Relevant source documents include results measurement systems and country partnership framework documents.

It also looks at the extent to which the MO uses diagnostic tools that integrate key concepts related to leave no one behind, such as equity and social inclusion, to inform country programming, project design and implementation (Table 1: 2.b). It also considers the use of data and equity considerations in cost-effectiveness and value-for-money frameworks and in resource allocation (Table 1: 2.c and 2.d).

Finally, it assesses whether the MO is providing financial and/or technical support to strengthen national statistical systems and improve disaggregation of data (Table 1: 2.e).

3.1.3 Finance

Finally, the framework focuses on the MO’s allocation of financial resources. Publicly available and searchable project databases are used to assess the percentage of planned programmes and projects that aim to benefit selected vulnerable groups (Table 1: 3.a). The databases are examined using keyword searches for these groups (more details are provided in Section 3.2). A caveat to this approach is that few multilateral organisations make this data publicly available in a searchable format.

We also look at whether the MO allocates resources to sectors that are known to have a significant impact leave no one behind (Table 1: 3.b). In particular, for the purposes of this working paper, we focus on core social sectors known to be key to improving the living conditions of the most vulnerable groups: basic health coverage, basic education and social protection (Greenhill

5 In Bolivia, for instance, Lenhardt and Samman (2015) find that exclusion based on women’s ‘ethnicity’ and ‘place of residence’ can each explain around 25% of total inequality in their educational outcomes, but can explain close to 40% when taken together.

6 While we acknowledge that an MO’s sectoral strategy documents can also have sections on leave no one behind, we limited our review to organisation-wide strategy documents.

and Rabinowitz, 2017; OECD, 2016). Of course, this does not mean that other sectors are not also important. For example, the provision of basic infrastructure, including nutrition, access to energy, internet access and rural roads, will be important for leaving no one behind (Stuart et al., 2016; WBG, 2018a).⁷ Future applications and refinement of the methodology used could extend to cover these other sectors.

Finally, our assessment considers whether financial flows from the MO map with extreme poverty at national and subnational levels, by drawing on existing analyses in the literature (e.g. AidData geocoded data⁸) (Table 1: 3.c).

3.2 Selection of ‘reference’ groups

For the purposes of testing our approach, using the World Bank as an example (Section 4), we selected three left-behind groups as ‘reference’ groups, to narrow down the scope of our analysis. The groups we selected were:

- people with disabilities
- refugees and IDPs, and
- indigenous peoples.

These groups were selected for three key reasons. First, as stated in Box 1, these three groups are specifically called out in the 2030 Agenda.

Second, from a methodological point of view, our initial scoping suggested that it would be feasible to apply a keyword search methodology when looking for references to these groups in documents and project databases. Keyword searches need to be sufficiently bounded – e.g. not all youth and children, or all migrants (many of whom may not be marginalised) – but specific keywords can be used to identify relevant projects to be reviewed within the scope of this paper.

This is one of the reasons why we were unable to include ‘income poor’ as a reference group (as the number of projects to be reviewed would make the task too onerous within the time frame for this working paper). Also, potentially sensitive

terms, such as ‘ethnic minorities’, are less likely to be recorded in project documents – rather, named minorities might be recorded, which would be different for every country. Further, we did not include gender, as gender mainstreaming is already well established and better researched in the literature on donors’ leave no one behind performance – and is tracked in, for example, the cross-cutting component of MOPAN reviews.

Third, while data availability remains limited, it appears these groups experience relatively high incidences of poverty. Available data shows that the proportion of persons with disabilities living under the national or international poverty line is higher than, and in some countries double, that of persons without disabilities (UN, 2018). While there is no global data on income poverty among refugees, some examples suggest this group faces deep socioeconomic deprivations in addition to lack of legal rights and the trauma of displacement. For instance, an assessment of Syrian refugees in Jordan and Lebanon suggests that 7 in 10 could be considered poor (Verme et al., 2016). While we are unaware of poverty figures disaggregated for indigenous peoples, examples in the Latin American context show this is a key marker of deprivation. In the case of Guatemala, a household from the poorest indigenous group was 2.5 times more likely than a non-indigenous household to be in poverty, a ratio that did not change between 2000 and 2011 (Rodriguez Takeuchi and Mariotti, 2016). While other groups, such as women or those living in rural areas, are known to experience high levels of poverty (Bhatkal et al., 2016), they would not have met the methodological criterion mentioned above – i.e. allow us to perform a manageable keyword search.

Finally, most of these three groups are relevant in a wide range of contexts. We acknowledge that this is not the case for refugees – this vulnerable group is particularly relevant in hotspots in the Middle East and sub-Saharan Africa.

We envisage expanding the number of reference groups included in future iterations of this analytical framework.

7 The OECD purpose code used for basic health care in Section 4 does include some aspects of nutrition (OECD, 2016).

8 Available at: www.aiddata.org/data/world-bank-geocoded-research-release-level-1-v1-4-2

Table 1 Assessment of organisations' commitment to leave no one behind

Dimension	Source documents
1. Strategy and policy	
<p>1.a.1 Does the MO have an explicit overarching strategic commitment to the LNOB agenda? If yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the MO explicitly defined or translated what the LNOB agenda means for the context of its work? • Has the MO set specific targets and indicators associated with this commitment? If yes, is there a corporate accountability mechanism in place to track performance (internally and/or independently)? 	<p>MO strategy documents</p> <p>Key speeches by leadership of MO</p> <p>Other central discourse, e.g. key website text</p>
<p>1.a.2 If no: Does the MO have a strategic commitment/targets and indicators/tracking and accountability mechanism for achieving aspects of the LNOB agenda? For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ending extreme poverty • reducing economic or group-based inequalities • reducing discrimination 	
<p>1.b.1 Does the MO have a dedicated policy statement on inclusion of vulnerable groups in general?</p>	MO policy documents
<p>1.b.2 Does the MO have a dedicated policy statement on inclusion specifically for selected vulnerable groups (see Section 3.2 for rationale)? For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • people with disabilities • refugees and IDPs • indigenous peoples 	
<p>1.c.1 Does the MO have robust safeguarding policies in place with respect to vulnerable and marginalised groups in general?</p>	MO policy and operational documents
<p>1.c.2 Does the MO have robust safeguarding policies in place with respect to selected vulnerable groups? For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • people with disabilities • refugees and IDPs • indigenous peoples 	
<p>1.d.1 Does the MO have effective grievance mechanisms in place with respect to vulnerable and marginalised groups in general?</p>	
<p>1.d.2 Does the MO have effective grievance mechanisms in place with respect to selected vulnerable groups? For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • people with disabilities • refugees and IDPs • indigenous peoples 	
2. Data	
<p>2.a.1 Does the MO's results framework disaggregate data for selected vulnerable groups?⁹ For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • people with disabilities • refugees and IDPs • indigenous peoples 	M&E/results measurement documents
<p>2.a.2 Does the MO have plans to improve disaggregation of the results framework by 2020, in line with SDG 17.18?</p>	

⁹ Note that SDG 17.18 also has a category for 'other characteristics relevant in national contexts'. We have excluded this from the framework to narrow down the analysis and, to the extent possible, make it applicable to varying contexts.

Table 1 Assessment of organisations' commitment to leave no one behind (cont'd)

Dimension	Source documents
2.b. Does the MO use diagnostic tools that integrate key concepts for LNOB, such as equity and inclusion, to inform its country programming/project design and implementation?	Diagnostic tools
2.c. Does the MO incorporate an equity criterion in its cost-effectiveness and value-for-money analyses underpinning project financing?	Value-for-money analyses
2.d. Does the MO explicitly consider indicators of equity and inclusion in determining resource allocation?	Resource allocation indices
2.e. Does the MO provide financial and/or technical support to governments or other organisations in developing countries to strengthen national statistical systems and improve data disaggregation, quality, openness and use?	MO projects database Existing analyses in the literature M&E/results measurement documents
3.a. What proportion (% of total financing and % of projects) of planned programmes and projects funded are explicitly targeted towards benefiting selected vulnerable groups? For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • people with disabilities • refugees and IDPs • indigenous peoples 	MO projects database
3.b. What proportion of total financing is allocated to core social sectors that evidence shows are particularly important for LNOB? These are identified in Stuart et al. (2016) as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • universal health coverage • universal basic education • social protection 	MO projects database OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS)
3.c. How well do financial flows from the MO map with extreme poverty [or other indicators of marginalisation relevant to the MO's work, where data is available] at national and subnational levels?	Existing analyses in the literature (e.g. AidData geocoded data)

Notes: IDPs: internally displaced people; LNOB: leave no one behind; MO: multilateral organisation; M&E: monitoring and evaluation

4 Assessment of the World Bank

In this section, we test our analytical framework by using the World Bank as a case study, through its two main financing windows/entities: the IDA and the IBRD (Box 2).

The World Bank not only accounts for 17% of the DAC's core multilateral contributions, but its strategic priorities and frameworks also have a strong influence on the multilateral system more broadly. Further, the World Bank is one of the few MOs that has a searchable projects database. Moreover, the IDA-18 Mid-Term Review and the IDA-19 replenishment have put the World Bank's policies and performance in the spotlight.

The section is structured around the three main components of our framework: Strategy and policy, Data and Finance. Our analysis follows each of the questions in the framework in order (see Table 2).

4.1 Strategy and policy

1.a.1 Does the World Bank have an explicit overarching strategic commitment to the leave no one behind agenda?

The World Bank does not have an explicit strategic commitment to leave no one behind in its 2016 *Forward look: a vision for the World Bank Group in 2030* (WBG, 2016a). The strategy does not explicitly define or translate what leave no one behind means in the context of the Bank's work, and the Bank has not set up any specific targets or corporate accountability mechanisms to track its performance on realising this commitment. Similarly, a 2018

implementation update of the *Forward Look* does not indicate any alignment with this commitment (authors' analysis).

However, the Bank has a strategic commitment to achieve some of the aspects of the leave no one behind agenda (Table 2: 1.a.2) through its own twin strategic goals on ending extreme poverty and ensuring shared prosperity in a sustainable manner (ibid.). Because these goals are self-defined, there are specific targets and indicators as well as corporate accountability mechanisms in place to track performance, which are reported through the Corporate Scorecards (CSCs).¹⁰ Below we analyse how the twin goals relate to the three different aspects of the leave no one behind agenda: ending extreme poverty in all its forms, reducing inequalities and reducing discrimination.

- **Ending extreme poverty in all its forms:** The Bank's goal on eradicating extreme poverty aims to reduce the share of people living on less than \$1.90 a day to 9% by 2020 and to 3% by 2030. This indicates a vital but partial commitment to the first aspect of leave no one behind. First, ending poverty based on income measures is not going to be enough to end poverty in 'all its forms' (including multidimensionally). Identifying poverty lines in other dimensions, such as education, health and nutrition, and using multidimensional poverty indices to identify overlapping deprivations is also important for identifying the most vulnerable groups (Stuart and Samman, 2017). While a summary measure

¹⁰ The twin corporate goals were adopted in 2013; the first summary report of the CSCs covers fiscal years 2014 to 2017 and the next one will cover 2018 to 2020.

of multidimensional poverty is not considered at a strategic level, analytical work and policy dialogue – including the recent Human Capital Index – include dimensions beyond income such as health and education. Agencies such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) use multidimensional poverty indices to frame their strategic commitment to poverty reduction (UNDP, 2018). Leave no one behind also requires considering the depth or intensity of poverty and reaching the poorest first.

- **Reducing inequalities:** The Bank’s goal on ensuring shared prosperity aims to foster income growth among the bottom 40% of the population in every country, although there is no specific target in place for 2020 or 2030. This goal indicates a vital but only partial alignment with the second aspect of the leave no one behind commitment. Like the first goal, it is framed in monetary terms. It does not factor in inequalities in dimensions such as health, education and political participation (Stuart and Samman, 2017), or inequalities that hurt specific groups in society or which combine with each other to amplify the experience of deprivation, which Kabeer (2010) calls ‘intersecting inequalities’.¹¹
- **Reducing discrimination:** The Bank does not discuss reducing discrimination in the *Forward Look* strategy. This is the only aspect of the leave no one behind commitment the bank is not aligned with even partially.¹²

In short, even though the Bank has not made an explicit commitment to leave no one behind in its existing strategy it has a vital but partial alignment with two out of three crucial aspects of the commitment, those on ending extreme poverty in all its forms and reducing inequality, through its own twin goals. It does not mention reducing discrimination. We acknowledge that fulfilling all these elements of the leave no one behind

definition sets the bar high, with few donors likely to meet all these criteria. Given its mandate, the Bank is possibly among those with relatively better performance in this area – something that could be further explored if comparisons with other organisations are carried out in future analyses.

1.b.1 Does the World Bank have a dedicated policy statement on inclusion of vulnerable groups in general?

Looking at the policy for IDA-18 first – *Towards 2030: investing in growth, resilience and opportunity* (IDA, 2017) – we find two dedicated policy statements on the inclusion of poor, marginalised and vulnerable people. First, one of the IDA’s themes is about building ‘inclusive societies’. Second, the policy mentions that the IDA’s Equitable Growth, Finance and Institutions group has made ‘equity and inclusion’ the first of its five strategic priorities to identify policy reforms in client countries that are needed to address poverty and prosperity.

Most policies guiding the IBRD’s funding decisions do not have explicit policy statements on inclusion, aside from the Directive on Country Engagement (WBG, 2014a). This policy mentions the Bank’s Systematic Country Diagnostic procedure for analysing what drives or constrains ‘inclusive’ growth in client countries, a point we discuss further under component 2.b of our framework.

Meanwhile, other policies show an indirect commitment to inclusion, such as the Multiphase Programmatic Approach (MPA) paper (WBG, 2017a), which guides the use of the MPA financing instrument, and the Bank policy on Program-for-Results (P4R) financing (WBG, 2017b), relating to the P4R instrument. Both mention that environmental and social systems assessments are the basis for determining whether programmes funded by the IBRD ‘give due consideration to the cultural appropriateness of, and equitable access to, Program benefits,

11 Some argue that an inequality goal should focus on absolute gaps (i.e. the amount of income) rather than relative gaps (i.e. percentage growth relative to the mean) (Colenbrander and Norton, 2016).

12 Note that the focus of our analysis is the organisation-wide strategy. Discrimination might be included in sectoral/operational strategies.

giving special attention to the rights and interests of the Indigenous Peoples and to the needs or concerns of vulnerable groups' (WBG, 2017a: 39; WBG, 2017b: 4).

1.b.2. Does the World Bank have a dedicated policy statement on inclusion of vulnerable groups, specifically indigenous peoples, people with disabilities, and refugees and IDPs?

Moving on to examining policies on inclusion for specific groups, we find IDA-18 discusses only one of the three groups selected for our analysis. It refers to refugees in the context of increased resources for fragile states, including \$2 billion to support refugees and host communities, and the establishment of the Global Concessional Financing Facility for middle-income countries hosting refugees (WBG, 2018c). Two of the IBRD's policies discussed above, for MPA and P4R, have dedicated policy statements on the inclusion of indigenous peoples (WBG, 2017a; 2017b).

Additionally, some of the Bank's current and emerging thinking that is guiding its work on social development and on fragility, conflict and violence (FCV) also covers these groups and so merits a brief discussion, even though this thinking is not yet reflected in any specific policies.

In the Bank's work on social development,¹³ indigenous peoples feature particularly in the context of natural resource management and environmental issues. The Bank helps countries build capacity to engage effectively with indigenous peoples; it also supports indigenous peoples' organisations.

Further, the Bank's work on social development also covers the integration of disability into the Bank's analytical work,

data and good-practice policies, and into its operations across a wide range of sectors. There have been two specific initiatives of note. First, there have been efforts to 'prepare a new disability-inclusion and accountability framework for mainstreaming disability across WBG projects and practices' (WBG, 2018d). Second, there has been an appointment to the new role of Disability Advisor, who is responsible for analysing and articulating the Bank's policy on disability and development, and for establishing criteria and an operational results framework for monitoring the outcomes of the Bank's disability work. This means that, in the near future, we should expect a policy on the inclusion of people with disabilities (ibid.).

Refugees and IDPs are covered under the work of the Bank's Fragility, Conflict and Violence Group. The Bank is taking a broader approach to FCV, 'deepening its knowledge and expanding its "toolkit" for FCV' (WBG, 2018g). This approach also relates to the 'strategic shift' under IDA-18 mentioned earlier, with increased resources for fragile states and countries hosting refugees (WBG, 2018e).

In short, while our three selected groups are covered by different policies, they are not consistently included in all of them. We find an explicit commitment to refugees in the IDA's policy, and to indigenous peoples in two of the IBRD's policies. Even though it is not related to any policies (at least, not yet), the Bank's current and emerging thinking that is guiding its work on social development and on FCV covers all three groups.

Box 3 now focuses on questions 1c and 1d (Table 2) on the Bank's safeguarding and grievance mechanisms with respect to vulnerable groups in general, and the three selected groups.

13 See: www.worldbank.org/en/topic/indigenouspeoples

Box 3 Safeguarding and grievance mechanisms (Table 2: 1.c/1.d)

Safeguarding (1.c)

The Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) and its related vision for sustainable development – the Environment and Social Policy for Investment Project Financing, the Directive on Addressing Risks and Impacts on Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups, and the Environmental and Social Standards (ESSs) – together constitute the World Bank’s policy response to safeguarding and grievance redress for likely affected communities (WBG, 2017c).

These are aimed at addressing two risks: *preventing adverse impacts* and ensuring they do not fall disproportionately on individuals or groups who, because of their circumstances, may be disadvantaged or vulnerable; and *preventing prejudice or discrimination* toward such individuals or groups in providing access to development resources and project benefits.

The Bank holds itself responsible for reviewing information provided by a borrower, including its environmental and social assessment (checking whether it addresses the two relevant risks cited above), for providing guidance and tools to help the borrower provide better information, and for judging where independent, third-party assistance in the assessment may be necessary. Task teams sometimes also participate in borrowers’ consultations with identified vulnerable groups (*ibid.*).

As a safeguarding policy framework, we find the ESF has some weaknesses in terms of the leave no one behind commitment. Critically, the framework’s primary reliance on a borrower’s existing policy, legal and institutional framework/systems and information on disadvantaged or vulnerable groups is insufficient to ensure that these groups are going to be adequately protected at the appropriate times of the project cycle.

The ESF’s Environment and Social Policy for Investment Project Financing and the ESSs cover in sufficient detail what the Bank *must* do to protect indigenous peoples. ESS 7 refers specifically to indigenous peoples and the protection of their cultural identities. Other standards in the ESF protect people with disabilities. ESS 2 on labour and working conditions protects project workers who are vulnerable due to their disability.

In short, ESF policy and standards both explicitly mention indigenous peoples, and some of the standards discuss protection of people with disabilities. Meanwhile, neither the policy nor the standards discuss explicitly the protection of refugees and IDPs.

Grievance mechanisms (1.d)

Project financing uses several mechanisms to address concerns and grievances connected to a project. It requires the borrower to provide a grievance mechanism, process or procedure proportionate to the risks and impacts of the project, in particular related to the borrower’s environmental and social performance (*ibid.*: 11).

Project-affected parties have access, as appropriate, to project grievance mechanisms, local grievance mechanisms, the Bank’s corporate Grievance Redress Service and the Bank’s independent Inspection Panel. After bringing their concerns directly to the Bank’s attention and giving Bank management a reasonable opportunity to respond, project-affected parties can submit their complaint to the Panel to request an inspection to determine whether ‘harm’ has occurred as a direct result of the Bank’s non-compliance with its policies and procedures (*ibid.*: 11).

Grievance mechanisms that are in place for specific groups are listed in the ESF standards. ESS 7 has a clear and comprehensive grievance mechanism in place for indigenous peoples. ESS 7 states the borrower will ensure that a grievance mechanism is established for the project, which is culturally appropriate and accessible to affected indigenous peoples and takes into account the availability of judicial recourse and customary dispute settlement mechanisms among indigenous peoples.

Box 3 Safeguarding and grievance mechanisms (Table 2: 1.c/1.d) (cont'd)

The grievance mechanism under ESS 2 on labour and working conditions for all project workers also covers workers with disabilities. None of the grievance mechanisms in the standards mention refugees and IDPs.

Both safeguarding and grievance mechanisms appear to be more inclusive of indigenous peoples than the other two left-behind groups included in our analysis. One could speculate that this has to do with the fact that indigenous people living on ancestral lands can be displaced by World Bank infrastructure projects. Hence, they featured fairly prominently in early social safeguarding discussions, in a way that disabled people and refugees did not, since they do not have similar group-based claims to land. Further, in the past, the World Bank has also faced bad press relating to a lack of attention to indigenous peoples (Irin, 2014; Sarfaty, 2005), which may have also contributed to greater public pressure to prioritise this group in action as well as rhetoric.

Summary

Overall, our assessment of the Strategy and policy component finds that the World Bank is partially aligned with the commitment to leave no one behind, as summarised in Table 2.

At the strategy level, the World Bank demonstrates an important but partial alignment with two of three aspects of the leave no one behind commitment: ending extreme poverty and reducing inequality. This is indicated in its own goals to eradicate extreme poverty and boost shared prosperity. However, these goals only consider income poverty and inequality (rather than multidimensional measures), and do not account for group-based inequalities and discrimination.

At the policy level, IDA's policy, IBRD's directive on country engagement and the ESF's vision for sustainable development all have broad references to inclusion (perhaps strongest in the IDA's policy). Although the three selected reference groups are covered by the different policies, they are not consistently included in all of them.

The Bank has safeguarding and grievance mechanisms for vulnerable groups, with a focus on 'doing no harm'. Looking at these two mechanisms together (Box 3), the assessment shows that refugees and IDPs have the least coverage (i.e. fewer explicit mentions), while indigenous peoples have the most, and people with disabilities are in between. The uneven coverage may be explained by historical reasons. These mechanisms were developed much earlier than the SDGs, in response to the destruction of fragile habitats by large infrastructure projects, with indigenous peoples among the most affected, given their group-based claims to ancestral lands. This raises questions that will be relevant for future progress. In particular, what are the characteristics that lead some vulnerable groups but not others to be picked up by a donor's radar? These could include the degree to which groups are affected by specific projects, their levels of political organisation and how prominent they are in the public's awareness. This is an area that deserves further investigation.

Table 2 Assessment of alignment to leave no one behind in the World Bank's strategies and policies

Questions and indicators	Assessment
1.a.1 Does the World Bank have an explicit overarching strategic commitment to the LNOB agenda? If yes:	No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the World Bank explicitly defined or translated what the LNOB agenda means for the context of its work? 	No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the World Bank set specific targets and indicators associated with this commitment? If yes, is there a corporate accountability mechanism in place to track performance (internally and/or independently)? 	No
1.a.2 If no: Does the World Bank have a strategic commitment/targets and indicators/tracking and accountability mechanisms for achieving aspects of the LNOB agenda?	Partial
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ending extreme poverty 	Partial (income rather than multidimensional poverty/poverty depth considered at a strategic level; new emphasis on human capital in policy dialogue and analytical work covers some aspects of health and education deprivation)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing economic or group-based inequalities 	Partial (focus on income of bottom 40%; no consideration of inequalities in other dimensions or group-based inequalities)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing discrimination 	No
1.b.1 Does the World Bank have a dedicated policy statement on inclusion of vulnerable groups in general?	Yes
1.b.2 Does the World Bank have a dedicated policy statement on inclusion specifically for selected vulnerable groups?	Partial
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People with disabilities 	In social development work
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refugees and IDPs 	In IDA and fragility, conflict and violence work
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indigenous peoples 	In IBRD and social development work
1.c.1 Does the World Bank have robust safeguarding policies in place with respect to vulnerable and marginalised groups in general?	Yes
1.c.2 Does the World Bank have robust safeguarding policies in place with respect to selected vulnerable and marginalised groups?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People with disabilities 	Partial
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refugees and IDPs 	No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indigenous peoples 	Yes
1.d.1 Does the World Bank have effective grievance mechanisms in place with respect to vulnerable and marginalised groups in general?	Yes
1.d.2 Does the World Bank have effective grievance mechanisms in place with respect to selected vulnerable and marginalised groups?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People with disabilities 	Partial
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refugees and IDPs 	No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indigenous peoples 	Yes

4.2 Data

This section deals with the second component of our analytical framework. It focuses exclusively on the data that informs four main areas – the results framework; country programming, project design and implementation; value-for-money in project financing; and resource allocation – to assess how well the organisation aligns and performs on the commitment to leave no one behind.

2.a.1 Does the World Bank's results framework disaggregate data for selected vulnerable groups?

The main tools in the World Bank's results framework that track performance on achieving the goals on eradicating extreme poverty and boosting shared prosperity do not disaggregate data for the three reference groups.¹⁴

The current disaggregation of data for tracking results highlights the lack of a proper monitoring and evaluation policy at the Bank on data disaggregation (key informant interviews, 2018).¹⁵ Continual data limitations are faced by client countries, which in turn affect the Bank (IDA, 2017; World Bank, 2017; MOPAN, 2017b; key informant interviews, 2018). The range of challenges include: varied client capacity to produce data, diverse methodologies, uneven data quality, infrequent reporting, and flawed and incomplete data (ibid.).

2.a.2 Does the World Bank have plans to improve disaggregation of the results framework by 2020?

There are plans to improve disaggregation in the World Bank's results framework by 2020. The CSC is likely to see some adjustments in the new reporting cycle (2018 to 2020), including on disaggregation. For instance, the Bank notes that efforts are continuing to improve the level of gender reporting by projects (WBG, 2017d).

The IDA-18 RMS (covering 2018 to 2020) has already seen some changes since IDA-17 to reflect the SDGs (with at least one indicator being the same for 14 of the 17 SDGs). The major changes in the IDA-18 RMS relating to disaggregation will include the addition of indicators on the numbers of refugees and IDPs to support the IDA18 Special Theme of FCV and reflect the pressing challenges affecting a growing number of refugees and IDPs around the world; as well as the ratio of female to male labour force participation rate to reflect the emphasis on more and better jobs for women (IDA, 2017).

However, in the context of the new IDA sub-window on refugees, key informant interviews (2018) indicate that even though IDA is required to include more disaggregated indicators for refugees, IDPs and host populations, currently it is unclear what these would look like, and that it is possible these requirements will not apply across the board, but only to certain IDA projects (nine have a refugee focus).

This part of the assessment therefore shows that the Bank's results framework does not disaggregate information for the three selected reference groups. And even though improvements are being made, the emphasis in them is to continue to increase reporting based on existing fragile and conflict-affected states (FCS) and gender categories, rather than to include a whole range of other equally important categories that are fundamental to the leave no one behind commitment.

2.b. Does the World Bank use diagnostic tools that integrate key concepts for leave no one behind, such as equity and inclusion, to inform its country programming/project design and implementation?

The World Bank uses diagnostic tools that integrate key concepts for leave no one behind, such as inclusion and equity, to inform its country

14 The main tools we analyse here are the CSC and the IDA-18 Results Measurement System (RMS). We focus on the latest summary report of CSC results for the IDA and IBRD only, rather than for the World Bank Group as a whole, which cover fiscal years 2014 to 2017. The IDA-18 RMS is the most recent RMS for the IDA and will cover fiscal years 2018 to 2020. Note also that the IDA-18 RMS is a separate performance management system that is used to measure development results in IDA-supported countries. While it is highly harmonised with the CSC, there are some differences. A major difference is that the RMS has more indicators, to reflect better the IDA's context.

15 It exists as an internal document in the Bank and is therefore not in use by clients (key informant interviews, 2018).

programming/project design and implementation.¹⁶
The tools we analyse here analysed include:

- the **Systematic Country Diagnostic (SCD)** procedure, which serves as the analytical foundation of Country Partnership Frameworks (CPFs)
- the **Systematic Operations Risk-Rating Tool (SORT)**, which helps the World Bank assess and monitor risks across all operational instruments and country programmes
- the **Country Gender Assessments (CGAs)**, which feed into the CPFs
- the **Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessments (RPBAs)**, which provide an evidence-based assessment of recovery and peacebuilding requirements in countries emerging from conflict or political crisis
- the new **Jobs Diagnostic**, which helps countries identify their key jobs challenges and to prepare strategies for addressing them, and
- the **Poverty and Social Impact Analysis (PSIA)**, which assesses the distributional and social impacts of policy reforms on different groups, with an emphasis on the poor and vulnerable.¹⁷

Overall, we find that almost all of the tools cover inclusion in much more detail than they cover equity (Annex 1 provides more details).

2.c. Does the World Bank incorporate an equity criterion in its cost-effectiveness and value-for-money analyses underpinning project financing?

The World Bank conducts economic analyses of all investment projects, in which staff evaluate cost-effectiveness and value for money. However, these analyses do not incorporate equity as an evaluation criterion.

According to the Bank's Investment Project Financing Economic Analysis Guidance Note (WBG, 2013), an economic analysis must answer three questions. First, what is the project's development impact? Here, the analysis considers the expected stream of project benefits and costs, grounded in an explicit causal framework linking project activities to targeted outcomes. Second, is public sector provision or financing the appropriate vehicle? This question probes the rationale for public involvement with respect to financing and/or implementation and explicitly considers alternative modes of provision. Third, what is the Bank's value added? This part seeks to determine the benefit from Bank staff involvement and whether the proposed project maximises the development impact of staff effort. There is no discussion in the guidance on whether and how to include an equity criterion.

2.d. Does the World Bank explicitly consider indicators of equity and inclusion in determining resource allocation?

The World Bank explicitly considers indicators of equity and inclusion in determining the IDA's resource allocation, but it is not possible to determine from publicly available sources whether the same indicators also feature in the IBRD allocation approach. As a result, we focus here on the IDA.

Equity and inclusion feature prominently in the Bank's Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) ratings and in the Post-Conflict Performance Indicators (PCPI), which are used to create the IDA Resource Allocation Index (IRAI) and the IDA Special Allocation Index (ISAI), respectively. The IRAI applies to all IDA eligible countries, while the ISAI allows IDA eligible countries that are facing exceptional

16 We reviewed the documents that explain these tools (their purpose, methodology and application) to find whether there were explicit references to the terms 'equity' and 'inclusion' and, if so, in which contexts they were used: see Annex 1 for more details.

17 The sources we rely on are the Bank's policies and guidelines on using these tools, including the *Interim guidance note: Systematic Operations Risk-Rating Tool (SORT)* (WBG, 2014b), the *Operational policy on gender and development* (WBG, 2015a), the PSIA topic page (WBG, 2015b), the *Jobs Diagnostics guidance: why, what and how?* (WBG, 2015c), *Guidance for the preparation of Systematic Country Diagnostic* (WBG, 2016b) and the RPBA topic page and Q&A relating to its preparation on the Bank's website (WBG, 2016c).

circumstances to receive additional funds.¹⁸ We discuss in turn each of the ratings and the role of equity and inclusion indicators in them.

The CPIA rates countries against a set of 16 criteria grouped in four clusters; policies for social inclusion and equity comprise the third of the four clusters.¹⁹ Five indicators fall within this cluster: gender equality, equity of public resource use, building human resources, social protection and labour, and policies and institutions for environmental sustainability (WBG, 2018f).

Using the CPIA ratings, the Bank creates an overall score, which is the IRAI. The IRAI then makes up 92% of the Country Performance Rating (CPR).²⁰ Use of the CPR allows good performers to receive, in per capita terms, a higher IDA allocation: i.e. allocations are performance based. In fact, Carter (2016) argues that the use of CPR results in a higher weighting being given to performance/capacity to absorb aid effectively than if equity/needs formulae are used, such as that developed by Lea and Dercon (2016) for DFID, which incorporates estimates of future persistence of poverty. We pick up this point in section 4.3 (question 3.c) on finance.

The PCPI consists of 12 criteria, which are also grouped into four clusters; social inclusion and human development is the third of these four. The two criteria within this cluster are: human resource-building, and vulnerable groups, gender and social cohesion.²¹ The first focuses on the quality and coverage of the provision of services in health and education, including to vulnerable groups (e.g. the elderly, minorities and the poor). The second assesses the extent of progress made to address issues of equality, protection and social cohesion, and issues that are related to gender or are specific to vulnerable groups.

Using the PCPI ratings, the Bank creates an overall score, which is the ISAI. The ISAI then makes up 80% of an overall performance rating through which the Bank determines which countries are eligible for exceptional IDA allocations (WBG, 2017e).

2.e. Does the World Bank provide financial and/or technical support to governments or other organisations in developing countries to strengthen national statistical systems and improve data disaggregation, quality, openness and use?

The World Bank provides both financial and technical support to governments in developing countries to strengthen national statistical systems and improve data disaggregation, quality, openness and use. In an effort to quantify this financial investment, we searched the World Bank's project repository on 17 February 2018 for active or closed projects with an inception date from 2010 to 2017 that included the keywords 'statistical strengthening' (Table 3). Of 2,625 active or closed projects, an initial query revealed 52 projects with the keywords 'statistical strengthening'. After a review of documentation, 42 (comprising 1.6% of the World Bank's portfolio and totalling \$4.71 billion) were determined as 'inclusive' for this activity. Twelve of these projects (0.46%, \$527.5 million) targeted this activity as a key project objective.

'Inclusive' projects typically included elements of analytical capacity-building for national statistical offices or line ministries relating to larger health, infrastructure, education or social protection projects. Projects with a primary focus on this tended to address capacity-building

18 Although the majority of IDA resources are allocated through the Performance-based Allocation (PBA) system, countries warranting the delivery of exceptional IDA support – in particular, those countries facing a 'turn-around' situation – can, under certain conditions, be provided with additional resources (World Bank, 2018f).

19 For each of the 16 criteria, countries are rated on a scale of 1 (low) to 6 (high). The ratings depend on actual policies and performance, rather than on promises or intentions. The other three clusters in the CPIA are: economic management, structural policies, and public sector management and institutions.

20 The remaining 8% is based on its Portfolio Performance Rating (PPR).

21 The other three clusters are: economic management and structural policies, governance, and post-conflict risk. (see WBG, 2011).

Table 3 World Bank projects and financing for statistical strengthening

Year	Total World Bank projects: active and closed	Projects with 'statistical strengthening' related keywords	Projects including statistical strengthening	Inclusive projects	Projects primarily focused on statistical strengthening	Primary target projects
2010–2017	2,625	52	42 (\$4.7 bn)	1.6% (project count) 1.42% (financing)	12 (\$527.5 m.)	0.46% (project count) 0.16% (financing)

Notes: 'Including statistical strengthening' means that project documentation referred to this as a targeted activity. 'Primary target' projects differ from 'inclusive' projects in that the target activity was the sole or primary project objective as opposed to being one among many. Source: Authors' analysis of the World Bank's project repository (17 February 2018).

or budgetary support for national statistical offices. World Bank spending on statistical systems is high relative to other donors, given that only 0.33% of ODA is spent on statistical capacity (PARIS21, 2018). The Bank also manages several large multi-donor trust funds (not counted as core funding) on statistical systems strengthening.

Summary

First, we find there is currently limited data disaggregation in the World Bank's results framework. While plans to disaggregate further are in place, the emphasis is mainly on increasing disaggregation within the existing categories of FCS and gender, rather than on adding other categories of equal relevance to the leave no one behind commitment.

Second, in our review of the six diagnostic tools used to inform country programming and project design and implementation, we find there is a much greater focus on inclusion than on equity.

Third, by definition, economic analyses of cost-effectiveness and value for money at the Bank do not assess equity. Analyses that evaluate social returns could be considered in the future.

Fourth, while we found that equity and inclusion feature in the IDA's resource allocation decisions, Carter (2016) suggests that the weights used in the IDA's allocation rules could be adjusted to be more pro-poor.

Finally, we find that although less than 2% of projects between 2010 and 2017 were related to data strengthening, this is actually a relatively high proportion given that only 0.33% of ODA is spent on statistical capacity (PARIS21, 2018).

Table 4 Assessment of alignment to leave no one behind in the World Bank's use of data

Questions and indicators	Assessment
2.a.1 Does the World Bank's results framework disaggregate data for selected vulnerable groups? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People with disabilities • Refugees and IDPs • Indigenous peoples 	No
2.a.2 Are there plans to improve disaggregation of the results framework by 2020?	Yes
2.b. Does the World Bank use diagnostic tools that integrate key concepts for LNOB, such as equity and inclusion, to inform its country programming/project design and implementation?	Yes
2.c. Does the World Bank incorporate an equity criterion in its cost-effectiveness and value-for-money analyses underpinning project financing?	No
2.d. Does the World Bank explicitly consider indicators of equity and inclusion in determining resource allocation?	Yes (IDA); Unknown (IBRD)
2.e Does the World Bank provide financial and/or technical support to governments or other organisations in developing countries to strengthen national statistical systems and improve data disaggregation, quality, openness and use?	Yes

4.3 Finance

This section focuses on the third and final component of our analytical framework: Finance. It looks at three main areas:

- the proportion of total financing and projects targeted to benefit selected vulnerable groups
- the total financing allocated to social core sectors known to be critical to the leave no one behind commitment, and
- where data is available at subnational level, the extent to which financial flows map with extreme poverty/marginalisation indicators.

For the first two areas we analysed the World Bank's searchable database of projects. For the third, we relied on existing literature and analyses.

3.a. What proportion (% of total financing and % of projects) of planned programmes and projects funded are explicitly targeted towards benefiting selected vulnerable groups?

The analysis focused on the World Bank's project repository; Annex 2 provides more detail on the methodology, the searches performed and their limitations.

There were 2,625 active or closed projects with inception dates from 2010 to 2017 on 17 February 2018. Of these, we found 23 projects with keywords linked to migrants. After a review of documentation, 14 projects (0.53% of the total World Bank portfolio and totalling \$1.22 billion) were determined to be 'inclusive' of this population. These projects made explicit reference in project documentation to this vulnerable group as a targeted beneficiary of project outcomes. Seven of these projects (comprising 0.27% of the World Bank's portfolio and totalling \$711 million) targeted this population as the primary beneficiaries.

'Inclusive' projects contained specific language demonstrating an intent to reach displaced persons or an articulated monitoring framework with which to do so. They primarily comprised projects that offered shelter, health/education support, food, or employment training to vulnerable urban

populations, and which noted migrants living in the area as one target population among many. Projects targeting refugees and IDPs as primary beneficiaries tended to offer support in many of the same sectors, but focused specifically on displacement camps.

Of the 30 projects with keywords linked to persons with disabilities, 11 projects (0.42% of the total World Bank portfolio and totalling \$663 million) were determined to be 'inclusive' of this population after further review. These projects primarily focused on social protection and social safety nets. No projects targeted this population as primary beneficiaries.

Given the volume of projects found for indigenous populations, only projects from 2015 to 2017 were analysed.²² There were 964 active or closed projects with inception dates from 2015 to 2017 found in the World Bank's project repository on 17 February 2018. Of these, our query revealed 167 projects linked to the keyword 'indigenous'. After a review of documentation, 163 projects (comprising 17% of the World Bank's portfolio and totalling \$22.6 billion) were identified as inclusive of indigenous groups. Thirty of these projects (comprising 3% of the World Bank's portfolio and totalling \$3.5 billion) targeted indigenous groups as the sole primary beneficiary population. Projects tagged as 'inclusive' contained an Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) (for monitoring the project's impact on local indigenous populations) and covered a wide variety of sectors. Projects that targeted indigenous peoples as sole beneficiaries similarly covered a wide variety of sectors, including rural development, agriculture, forestry, education and health. These projects were disproportionately in Latin American countries, which accounted for 22 of the total 30 projects targeting indigenous peoples as primary beneficiaries.

Our analysis found that a significantly larger percentage of World Bank funding is focused on indigenous populations than on migrants or persons with disabilities. The fact that it is World Bank policy to include an IPP in any project that may impact an indigenous population may help to explain this greater level of inclusion.

22 Although using different time periods could potentially bias comparisons for project inclusion between indigenous groups and the other populations surveyed, we did not observe significant changes in inclusion patterns for persons with disabilities or migrants over the 2010–2017 time period.

Table 5 World Bank projects and financing including and primarily targeting selected vulnerable groups

Year	Total World Bank projects: active and closed	Projects with disability-related keyword	Projects including people with disabilities	Inclusive projects	Projects primarily focused on people with disabilities	Primary beneficiary projects
2010–2017	2,625	30	11 (\$663.25 m.)	0.42% (project count) 0.20% (financing)	0	0
Year	Total World Bank projects: active and closed	Projects with migrant-related keywords	Projects including migrants	Inclusive projects	Projects primarily focused on migrants	Primary beneficiary projects
2010–2017	2,625	23	14 (\$1.22 bn)	0.53% (project count) 0.37% (financing)	7 (\$711.1 m.)	0.27% (project count) 0.21% (financing)
Year	Total World Bank projects: active and closed	Projects with keyword 'indigenous'	Projects including indigenous peoples	Inclusive projects	Projects focused on indigenous peoples	Primary beneficiary projects
2015–2017	964	167	163 (\$22.58 bn)	16.91% (project count) 17.88% (financing)	30 (\$3.48 bn)	3.11% (project count) 2.76% (financing)

Notes: 'Including' selected vulnerable population means that project documentation referred to this group as a targeted beneficiary. 'Primary beneficiary' projects differ from 'inclusive' ones in that the target vulnerable population group was the sole or primary project beneficiary as opposed to one among many.

Source: Authors' analysis of the World Bank's project repository (17 February 2018).

We also found that projects are far more likely to 'include' the selected groups than to make them 'primary beneficiaries'. World Bank projects are often multisectoral and target many different types of beneficiaries. This finding reinforces the idea that universally applied policies to monitor impacts on vulnerable groups (such as IPPs) may serve as a critical mechanism to prevent these groups from being left behind.

Finally, we found the IDA to be typically more inclusive of the three selected marginalised groups than the IBRD. This is consistent with the fact that concessional borrowing is more likely to favour inclusion, which can be costly in the short term and can take time to realise fiscal benefits.

3.b. What proportion of total financing is allocated to core social sectors that evidence shows are particularly important for leave no one behind?

Aside from projects and financing specifically targeted at an individual vulnerable group, certain subsectors and policy areas have been identified as particularly important for leaving no one behind. For the purposes of a preliminary analysis, we focus on core social sectors – health, education and social protection (Box 4). These sectors also

tally with the World Bank's increasing focus on human capital, which focuses on health and education outcomes (WBG, 2018a).

That said, we do not imply these are the only sectors relevant to the leave no one behind commitment. Water and sanitation, rural roads and energy are among other sectors identified as key to achieving the commitment and deserve further consideration in future analyses (Stuart et al., 2016). We also acknowledge that, given the varied mandates of multilateral organisations, this focus on social sectors implies an inherent negative bias against multilaterals that focus on infrastructure projects, and a positive bias for those with social mandates. Therefore, the analysis is only indicative and needs to be interpreted with caution.

A look at the sectors that received the most funding between 2010 and 2016 (Table 6) shows that the World Bank provides significant resources for education, health and social protection. In particular, the share of resources that the World Bank has devoted to social protection is striking (this is also observed using the OECD Creditor Reporting System). Given that Manuel et al. (2018b) found social protection to be less well funded than education and health, it is welcome that the World Bank is correcting that imbalance.

Box 4 A focus on core social services to leave no one behind

The importance of social services in eradicating extreme poverty is well established. This includes core areas such as basic health coverage, basic education and financial assistance for the poorest (social protection).

Every year, 100 million people are pushed into poverty by catastrophic health payments – that is, when families need to spend more than 30% of household income on health costs (Xu et al., 2007, in Stuart et al., 2016). Making health services free at the point of delivery is critical to lowering barriers to access. It is estimated that around one billion people do not receive the health care they need each year (Brearley et al., 2013). Unfortunately, the World Bank’s project repository database does not disaggregate health by subsectors that typically target the most marginalised groups, such as primary health care and basic nutrition programmes.

In the case of education, the evidence points to the importance of pre-primary schooling for early development, and to the need to address access to and a learning crisis in primary education in the poorest countries (Blampied et al., 2018; Stuart et al., 2016). Inclusive education provides long-term social mobility opportunities.

A wealth of evidence has been generated over the past 15 years on the role of various social protection programmes in reducing poverty and the vulnerability of the poorest people. Positive impacts include increasing household expenditure on food and other basic needs, better diets, improving access to health care and education (particularly family investment in girls’ education) and reducing child labour, as well as improving household productivity and labour market participation (Bastagli et al., 2016, in Stuart et al., 2016; Glewwe and Maralidharan, 2015; Mathers and Slater, 2014).

Table 6 Top 10 financed sectors, 2010–2016

World Bank sector	Total funding (\$ billion)	Share of total financing (%)
Rural and inter-urban roads	24	8.4
Central government*	21.6	7.5
Social protection	21.3	7.5
Health	15	5.3
Energy transmission and distribution	14.9	5.2
Subnational government	14.2	4.9
Education**	11.9	4.1
Other industry, trade and services	11	3.9
Other energy and extractives	10.8	3.8
Banking institutions	10.3	3.6

Notes:

* Central government: administrative units (ministries, departments and agencies) that are financed, regulated and controlled by the central or national government. Examples of coded activities include: reforms to civil service laws and regulations; results-based management and performance incentives; open data and transparency initiatives; human resource management information systems; among others (WBG, 2016d).

** Includes pre-primary, primary and secondary schooling. If the whole sector is considered (including tertiary, vocational education and other) it ranks second.

Source: Authors’ analysis of the World Bank’s project repository (17 February 2018).

23 World Bank projects were only analysed through 2016 to enable comparisons and cross-checks with OECD Creditor Reporting System data, which at the time of this study was only available through 2016.

Our sectoral analysis is limited and only indicative of selected leave no one behind sectoral priorities. As mentioned above, it does not consider other relevant sectors, or whether the allocations indeed reach those groups most in need, the effectiveness of the spending or the different levels of spending required for each sector (e.g. Manuel et al., 2018b, show how the costs of education and health differ, therefore diverse levels of finance are to be expected).

3.c. How well do financial flows from the World Bank map with extreme poverty [or other indicators of marginalisation relevant to the World Bank's work, where data is available] at national and subnational levels?

Section 4.2 (question 2.d) discussed the resource allocation formula used by the bank to allocate IDA resources across countries. Carter (2016) finds that a benchmark allocation formula developed by DFID's economists is more pro-poor, resulting in more resources for countries where poverty is likely to persist (Box 5).

Beyond directing resources at left-behind groups, World Bank policy, as detailed in Section 4.1, explicitly aims to reduce income poverty. Since different regions within countries often have strikingly different average income

levels, looking at how the World Bank allocates resources subnationally can also provide evidence for how it targets left-behind populations. In 2017, AidData used its geocoded database of all World Bank projects from 1995 to 2014 to analyse the Bank's subnational investment patterns. Using satellite imagery on economic development and road access,²⁴ it found that World Bank financing appears to be disproportionately allocated within countries to richer areas with larger populations and better infrastructure (Custer et al., 2017).

AidData analysed the World Bank's portfolio in Tanzania in more detail, as this country was the recipient of the largest number of World Bank investments in sub-Saharan Africa between 1995 and 2014. As with the global findings, the majority of the approximately 100 projects Tanzania received during this period were located in the country's richest areas (ibid.).

These results raise questions about whether the World Bank's decisions on projects are contributing to increasing subnational inequality. The Bank appears to be prioritising projects in easier to access locations, and neglecting sparsely populated and harder to reach areas, whose populations tend to be poorer. Many densely populated areas have large populations living

Box 5 Giving a greater share of IDA resources to leaving no one behind?

According to Carter (2016), IDA-18 increased the quantity of resources allocated to poorer countries because the size of the overall pot increased, rather than because the allocation mechanism gave a larger share to poorer countries.

The World Bank Group is committed to the idea of performance-based allocation, where funds are not just allocated in proportion to recipient need, but are adjusted to account for how effectively the recipient is expected to make use of funds it is allocated (absorption constraints), through the CPIA ratings.

Carter argues that a benchmark allocation created by DFID economists, Lea and Dercon, that incorporates absorption constraints, is more aligned with the leave no one behind commitment. This allocation takes into account how long poverty is expected to persist in a country, as well as the country's ability to self-finance its own efforts to eliminate poverty. This benchmark results in more resources going to countries where poverty is expected to persist.

Carter suggests that a way for the IDA to approximate this benchmark allocation, while retaining its existing performance-based allocation system, would be to increase its responsiveness to poverty and decrease the weight placed upon CPRs.

24 Measured by night-time lights and physical proximity to road infrastructure.

in poverty, so targeting aid at these regions may be efficient in reaching the largest number of poor people at the lowest cost (ibid.). However, this pattern means that already disadvantaged areas are at risk of falling even further behind.

Summary

The assessment of the financing component found that a significantly larger percentage of World Bank funding appears to be focused on indigenous populations than on migrants or persons with disabilities – possibly because it is World Bank policy to include an IPP in any project that may impact an indigenous population. As mentioned in earlier sections, this may partly be for historical reasons, as infrastructure projects could disrupt their habitat and claims to land. We also find that projects are far more likely to ‘include’ groups than to make

them ‘primary beneficiaries’. World Bank projects are often multisectoral and target many different types of beneficiaries.

In terms of sectors that are particularly important for the leave no one behind commitment, we found that social protection, health and education all make it into the top 10 of the World Bank’s most financed sectors. In particular, the share of resources that the World Bank has devoted to social protection is noticeable. Given that social protection appears to be less well funded than education and health (Manuel et al., 2018b), it is welcome that the World Bank is correcting that imbalance.

However, in terms of geographical targeting of left-behind areas, earlier analysis by others suggests that World Bank intra-country financing is disproportionately allocated to richer areas with larger populations and better infrastructure.

Table 7 Assessment of alignment to leave no one behind in the World Bank’s financing of projects

Questions and indicators	Assessment
<p>3.a. What proportion (% of total financing and % of projects) of planned programmes and projects funded are explicitly targeted towards benefitting selected vulnerable groups?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People with disabilities • Refugees and IDPs • Indigenous peoples 	<p>1% or less</p> <p>1% or less</p> <p>3%–14% (14% of projects were found to ‘include’ this group, 3% targeted this group as primary beneficiaries)</p>
<p>3.b. What proportion of total financing is allocated to core social subsectors that evidence shows are particularly important for LNOB?</p>	<p>Health and education make it to the top five, with roads and social protection seeing higher allocations</p>
<p>3.c. How well do financial flows from the World Bank map with extreme poverty [or other indicators of marginalisation relevant to the World Bank’s work, where data is available] at national and subnational levels?</p>	<p>Existing analysis shows that country allocations could be more pro-poor. There is a mismatch between subnational poverty and financial flows.</p>

5 Conclusion and future directions

This paper sought to develop a methodology to assess the extent to which multilateral organisations are aligned to the commitment to leave no one behind, drawing on existing frameworks (as developed for DFID's 2016 Multilateral Development Review and MOPAN's reviews). To narrow the scope, we selected for our analysis three left-behind reference groups that are relevant in most operating regions and are applicable to different multilateral organisations' mandates: people with disabilities, refugees and IDPs, and indigenous communities. We tested our approach using the World Bank as an exemplar case study, being one of the few MOs that has a searchable project database.

Considering the three components within our analytical framework – Strategy and policy; Data; and Finance – we found a mixed picture.

At the strategy level, the World Bank is partially aligned with the commitment to leave no one behind through its twin goals of eradicating extreme poverty and boosting shared prosperity and its renewed emphasis on human capital. However, the twin goals only consider income poverty and inequality (rather than multidimensional measures), and do not account for group-based inequalities and discrimination. Although a summary measure of multidimensional poverty is not considered at a strategic level, analytical work and policy dialogue – including the recent Human Capital Index – cover dimensions such as health and education. At the policy level, while the IDA's and the IBRD's policy documents have broad references to inclusion (perhaps stronger in IDA documents) and to the three selected reference groups, these are not consistently included in all of them. Further, in safeguarding and grievance mechanisms for vulnerable groups, indigenous

peoples are the group most covered. These mechanisms were developed much earlier than the SDGs in response to the destruction of fragile habitats by large infrastructure projects, where indigenous peoples were among the most affected.

When it comes to data, we found that there is currently limited data disaggregation in the Bank's results framework. While plans to disaggregate further are in place, the emphasis is mainly on increasing disaggregation within existing categories (of FCS and gender), rather than adding new categories of equal relevance to leave no one behind. Further, in our review of the six diagnostic tools used to inform country programming/project design and implementation, we noted a much more explicit focus on inclusion than on equity. The latter is also excluded in economic analyses of cost-effectiveness and value for money, and there are no separate assessments of social returns to complement these. Finally, we find that a small proportion (up to 2%) of projects between 2010 and 2017 were related to data strengthening (which is important to being able to monitor the commitment to leave no one behind), although this is high compared to ODA devoted to this area.

The assessment of the financing component found that a significantly larger percentage of World Bank funding is focused on indigenous peoples than on migrants or persons with disabilities – possibly because it is World Bank policy to include an IPP in any project that might impact an indigenous population. The assessment also suggests that projects are far more likely to 'include' groups than to make them 'primary beneficiaries'. This is largely because aid projects, including World Bank projects, are often multisectoral and are likely to target different types of beneficiaries.

The World Bank's IDA allocates substantial resources to core social sectors relevant to leave no one behind – health, education and social protection. As social protection is particularly poorly funded by other donors (Manuel et al., 2018b), the Bank's decision to provide the most funds to this sector is welcome. We recognise, however, that an analysis that just considers sectoral allocation is insufficient, because it ignores the effectiveness of such spending. The Bank's recent renewed focus on measuring the effectiveness of spending through the Human Capital Project is therefore timely. Both more spending and more effective spending are critical to leave no one behind.

Furthermore, we found that while both equity and inclusion feature as criteria for IDA resource allocation at the country level, the weights used in the IDA's allocation rule could be adjusted to be more pro-poor (Carter, 2016). At the subnational level, financing appears to be disproportionately allocated to richer areas, with larger populations and better infrastructure (Custer et al., 2017).

The IDA-19 replenishment presents an opportunity to redress some of these issues. Based on our findings, this paper makes the following recommendations:

- Group-based inequalities and discrimination, as major drivers of poverty, should feature more prominently in World Bank strategy and policy.
- Policies that assess project impacts on vulnerable groups, such as the use of

IPPs, could be expanded to cover other marginalised groups. This would provide a critical mechanism to prevent these groups from being left behind. This could force an analysis of who might *not* benefit from specific projects, in the absence of specific mitigation action.

- Efforts to improve disaggregation of data on vulnerable groups in the results framework (SDG 17.18), and to support national statistical systems to do so, should be ramped up.
- Subnational allocations should be matched more closely to the areas of highest deprivation. Equity weights could be applied where cost-benefit analysis leads to underfunding of areas that have been left behind.

This paper does not seek to present a finished product. Rather, it is a work in progress. It aims to stimulate debate and new thinking on how well multilaterals are aligning with and performing against the commitment to leave no one behind. Going forward, we would like to further refine the methodology to: allow for comparisons between organisations, either by using traffic lights or a composite numerical ranking system; provide more nuanced analysis of sectoral allocations and relevant thresholds; and expand coverage of left-behind groups (particularly by ethnicity and geography).

Similar assessments could then be conducted for other MOs with upcoming replenishments: the African Development Bank, the Global Fund and Gavi in 2020 and the Asian Development Bank in 2021.

References

- Bhatkal, T., Blampied, C., Chattopadhyay, S., Jalles D'Orey, M.A., Greenhill, R., Hart, , ... Thapa, A. (2016) *Leaving no one behind in the health sector: an SDG stocktake in Kenya and Nepal*. London: Overseas Development Institute (www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/11224.pdf)
- Blampied, C., Chattopadhyay, S., Greenhill, R., Aziz, I., Ellison, C., Thompson, R., ... Salifu, A. (2018) *Leaving no one behind in the health and education sectors: an SDG stocktake in Ghana*. London: Overseas Development Institute (www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/12145.pdf)
- Brearily, L., Marten, R. and O'Connell, T. (2013) 'Universal health coverage: a commitment to close the gap.' New York: Rockefeller Foundation, Save the Children and UNICEF (<https://www.savethechildren.org.uk/content/dam/global/reports/health-and-nutrition/universal-health-coverage.pdf>).
- Carter, P. (2016) *The allocation of World Bank Group resources to leave no one behind*. ODI Report. London: Overseas Development Institute (www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/10910.pdf)
- Colenbrander, S. and Norton, A. (2016) 'How serious are the SDGs about tackling inequality?' Blog. IIED, 4 October (www.iied.org/how-serious-are-sdgs-about-tackling-inequality)
- Custer, S., DiLorenzo, M., Masaki, T., Sethi, T. and Wells, J. (2017) *Beyond the tyranny of averages: development progress from the bottom up*. Williamsburg, VA: AidData at the College of William & Mary (http://docs.aiddata.org/ad4/pdfs/beyond_tyranny_of_averages_-_development_progress_from_the_bottom_up_-_web_optimized.pdf)
- DFID – Department for International Development (2016a) *Raising the standard: the Multilateral Development Review 2016*. London: DFID (https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/573884/Multilateral-Development-Review-Dec2016.pdf)
- DFID (2016b) *World Bank assessment summary*. London: DFID (https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/573509/World-Bank-Review.pdf)
- Engen, L., Henttinen, A. and Stuart, E. (forthcoming) 'How can donors deliver on leaving no one behind?' London: Overseas Development Institute
- Glewwe, P. and Muralidharan, K. (2015) *Improving school education outcomes in developing countries: evidence, knowledge gaps, and policy implications*. RISE Working Paper 15/001. Oxford: University of Oxford
- Greenhill, R. (2017a) 'The "leave no one behind" index'. ODI Briefing Note. London: Overseas Development Institute (www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/11656.pdf)
- Greenhill, R. (2017b) 'The "leave no one behind" index. Annex: methodology, policy analysis and references'. ODI Briefing Note. London: Overseas Development Institute (www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/11657.pdf)
- Greenhill, R. and Rabinowitz, G. (2016) *Why do donors delegate to multilateral organisations? A synthesis of six country case studies*. London: Overseas Development Institute (www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/11088.pdf)
- Greenhill, R. and Rabinowitz, G. (2017) *Financing 'leave no one behind': policy options in the social sectors*. ODI Working Paper 522. London: Overseas Development Institute (www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/12168.pdf)
- Gulrajani, N. (2016) *Bilateral versus multilateral aid channels: strategic choices for donors*. London: Overseas Development Institute (www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/10393.pdf)

-
- IDA – International Development Association (2017) *Additions to IDA resources: eighteenth replenishment. Towards 2030: investing in growth, resilience and opportunity*. Washington, DC: IDA Resource Mobilization Department (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/348661486654455091/pdf/112728-correct-file-PUBLIC-Rpt-from-EDs-Additions-to-IDA-Resources-2-9-17-For-Disclosure.pdf>)
- IRIN (2014) ‘Concern over World Bank proposals to roll back safeguards for indigenous people’. Bangkok, IN, 3 September 2014 (<http://www.irinnews.org/feature/2014/09/03/concern-over-world-bank-proposals-roll-back-safeguards-indigenous-people>)
- Kabeer, N. (2010) *Can the MDGs provide a pathway to social justice? The challenge of intersecting inequalities*. Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies, MDG Achievement Fund (<http://www.ids.ac.uk/files/dmfile/MDGreportwebsiteu2WC.pdf>).
- Karr, V.L., van Edema, A., Sims, J. and Brusegaard, C. (2017) ‘No one left behind: a review of social protection and disability at the World Bank’ *Disability and the Global South* 4(1): 1112–1142 (<https://disabilityglobalsouth.files.wordpress.com/2012/06/dgs-04-01-04.pdf>)
- Lea, N and Dercon, S. (2016) *Benchmarking aid allocation: Is the global and multilateral aid allocation poverty-focused?* DFID, Chief Economist’s Office
- Lenhardt, A. and Samman, E. (2015) *In quest of inclusive progress: exploring intersecting inequalities in human development*. Development Progress Research Report 4. London: Overseas Development Institute
- Mathers, N. and Slater, R. (2014) *Social protection and growth: research synthesis*. Barton ACT: Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
- Manuel, M., Grandi, F., Manea, S., Kirbyshire, A. and Lovell, E. (2018a) ‘“Leave no one behind” index 2018’. ODI Briefing Note. London: Overseas Development Institute (www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/12304.pdf)
- Manuel, M., Desai, H., Samman, E. and Evans, M. (2018b) *Financing the end of extreme poverty*. ODI Report. London: Overseas Development Institute (www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/12411.pdf)
- MOPAN – Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (2017a) *MOPAN 3.0 methodology manual* (www.mopanonline.org/ourwork/ourapproachmopan30/Methodology%20Manual-%20FINAL.pdf)
- MOPAN (2017b) *MOPAN 2015-16 assessments. the World Bank institutional assessment report* (www.mopanonline.org/assessments/worldbank2015-16/Mopan%20World%20Bank%20%5Binteractive%5D%20%5Bfinal%5D.pdf)
- Morris, S. (2018) ‘Answering the World Bank’s \$75 billion question’. Center for Global Development, 9 November 2018 (www.cgdev.org/blog/answering-world-banks-75-billion-question)
- Morris, S., Lu, J. and Fisher-Post, C. (2018) ‘Mapping the concessional financing landscape: key data on the role of multilateral institutions and funds’. Background Note. Washington, DC: Center for Global Development (www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/mapping-concessional-financing-landscape.pdf)
- OECD – Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2016) ‘The list of CRS Purpose Codes’. Paris: OECD (www.oecd.org/dac/stats/documentupload/2015%20CRS%20purpose%20codes%20EN_updated%20April%202016.pdf)
- OECD (2018) *Multilateral development finance: towards a new pact on multilateralism to achieve the 2030 Agenda together*. Paris: OECD (https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/multilateral-development-finance_9789264308831-en)
- PARIS21 (2018) ‘Press 2018: global trends in funding for statistics’. Paris: PARIS21 Secretariat (www.paris21.org/sites/default/files/inline-files/Trends%20-%20PRESS%202018_1.pdf)
- Rodriguez Takeuchi, L. and Mariotti, C. (2016) *Who is being left behind in Latin America? An illustration in Brazil and Guatemala*. ODI Report. London: Overseas Development Institute (www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/10282.pdf)

- Rogerson, A. and Jalles D'Orey, M.A. (2018) 'MOPAN strategic review'. London: Overseas Development Institute (www.mopanonline.org/otherproducts/items/MOPAN%20STRATEGIC%20REVIEW%202017%2019%20March-FINAL.pdf)
- Sarfaty, G. A. (2005) 'The World Bank and the internationalization of indigenous rights norms' *Yale Law Journal* 114 (7): 1790–1818 (<http://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/ylj/vol114/iss7/6>)
- Stern, E. and Andersen, O.W. (2018) 'MOPAN methodology review 2017-2018'. Report prepared by ELESCO Consulting Limited (www.mopanonline.org/otherproducts/items/Methodology%20Review_2018%20Final.pdf)
- Stuart, E. and Samman, E. (2017) 'Defining “leave no one behind”'. Briefing Paper. London: Overseas Development Institute (www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/11809.pdf)
- Stuart, E., Bird, K., Bhatkal, T., Greenhill, R., Lally, S., Rabinowitz, G., ... with Lynch, A. (2016) *Leaving no one behind: a critical path for the first 1,000 days of the Sustainable Development Goals*. Development Progress Research Report. London: Overseas Development Institute (www.odi.org/publications/10489-leaving-no-one-behind-critical-path-first-1000-days-sustainable-development-goals)
- UN – United Nations (2015) *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. New York, NY: United Nations (www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/1&Lang=E)
- UN (2018) *Realization of the Sustainable Development Goals by, for and with persons with disabilities*. New York, NY: United Nations (www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/wpcontent/uploads/sites/15/2018/12/UN-Flagship-Report-Disability.pdf)
- UNDP – United Nations Development Programme (2018) 'Annex 4: theory of change' in *UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021*. New York, NY: UNDP (www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Executive Board/2018/Annual-session/dp2018-10_Annex 4.docx)
- Verme, P., Gigliarano, C., Wieser, C., Hedlund, K., Petzoldt, M. and Santacroce, M. (2016) *The welfare of Syrian refugees: evidence from Jordan and Lebanon*. Washington, DC: World Bank (<https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/23228>)
- WBG – World Bank Group (2011) 'Post Conflict Performance Indicators 2010 criteria and guidelines'. Washington, DC: World Bank Group (<http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/310751531314751676/PCPIcriteria.pdf>)
- WBG (2013) 'Investment project financing economic analysis guidance note'. Washington, DC: World Bank Group (http://siteresources.worldbank.org/PROJECTS/Resources/40940-1365611011935/Guidance_Note_Economic_Analysis.pdf)
- WBG (2014a) *World Bank Group directive: country engagement*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group (<https://policies.worldbank.org/sites/ppf3/PPFDocuments/Forms/DispPage.aspx?docid=3630>)
- WBG (2014b) 'Interim guidance note: Systematic Operations Risk-Rating Tool (SORT)'. Washington, DC: World Bank Group (http://www.worldbank.org/content/dam/Worldbank/document/SORT_Guidance_Note_11_7_14.pdf)
- WBG (2015a) 'Operational policy on gender and development'. Revised June 2015. Washington, DC: World Bank Group (<https://policies.worldbank.org/sites/ppf3/PPFDocuments/090224b08306822f.pdf>)
- WBG (2015b) 'Poverty and Social Impact Analysis (PSIA)'. Washington, DC: World Bank Group (<http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/poverty/brief/poverty-and-social-impact-analysis-psia>)
- WBG (2015c) 'Jobs Diagnostics guidance: why, what and how?' Washington, DC: World Bank Group (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/250131468182343926/pdf/96328-WP-PUBLIC-Box391449B-Jobs-Diagnostic-Guidelines-PUBLIC.pdf>)
- WBG (2016a) *Forward look: a vision for the World Bank Group in 2030*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group (<http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/545241485963738230/DC2016-0008.pdf>)
- WBG (2016b) *Guidance for the preparation of Systematic Country Diagnostic*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group.

-
- WBG (2016c) 'Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessments (RPBA): FAQs'. Washington, DC: World Bank Group (www.worldbank.org/en/topic/fragilityconflictviolence/brief/recovery-peacebuilding-assessments-faqs)
- WBG (2016d) 'Sector taxonomy and definitions'. Washington, DC: World Bank (<http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/538321490128452070/Sector-Taxonomy-and-definitions.pdf>)
- WBG (2017a) 'Multiphase Programmatic Approach'. Washington, DC: World Bank Group (<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/203081501525641125/pdf/MPA-07192017.pdf>)
- WBG (2017b) 'Bank policy: Program-for-Results financing' Washington, DC: World Bank Group (<https://policies.worldbank.org/sites/ppf3/PPFDocuments/Forms/DispPage.aspx?docid=f9e36a3b-72e0-4edb-9fdc-96bf555c7208>)
- WBG (2017c) *World Bank Environmental and Social Framework*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group (<http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/837721522762050108/Environmental-and-Social-Framework.pdf>)
- WBG (2017d) 'World Bank Group Corporate Scorecards'. Washington, DC: World Bank Group (<http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/708101514916144314/Scorecard-October-2017.pdf>)
- WBG (2017e) 'Definition of fragility, the IDA exceptional regimes and the Post-Conflict Performance Indicators framework – Q&A'. Washington, DC: World Bank (<http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/451071531314750264/PCPI-QA-2017.pdf>)
- WBG (2018a) *The Human Capital Project*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group (<https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/30498/33252.pdf>)
- WBG (2018b) *IDA17 Retrospective: maximizing development impact: leveraging IDA to meet global ambitions and evolving client needs*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group (<http://ida.worldbank.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/ida17-retrospective-april-2018.pdf>)
- WBG (2018c) *Forward look: a vision for the World Bank Group in 2030 implementation update*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group (http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DEVCOMMINT/Documentation/23775499/DC2018_0005ForwardLookupdate_329.pdf)
- WBG (2018d) 'IDA Special Allocation Index (ISAI)'. Washington, DC: World Bank Group (<https://ida.worldbank.org/financing/resource-management/ida-special-allocation-index-isai>)
- WBG (2018e) 'Disability inclusion'. Washington, DC: World Bank Group (<http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/disability#2>)
- WBG (2018f) 'CPIA Criteria 2017'. Washington, DC: World Bank Group (<http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/600961531149299007/CPIA-Criteria-2017.pdf>)
- WBG (2018g) 'Fragility, conflict and violence'. Overview. Webpage. World Bank Group (<http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/fragilityconflictviolence/overview#2>)
- World Bank (2017) *Data for development: an evaluation of World Bank support for data and statistical capacity*. Washington, DC: World Bank, Independent Evaluation Group

Annex 1 Inclusion and equity in diagnostic tools

Inclusion

The clearest articulation of inclusion in the broadest sense is evident in three of the six tools mentioned under 2.b: the Systematic Country Diagnostic (SCD), the Poverty and Social Impact Analysis (PSIA) and the new Jobs Diagnostic.

The SCD frames the challenges that countries face with respect to achieving goals that are aligned with the World Bank's goals, as well as those identified by the countries themselves, in terms of the current trends and patterns appearing in poverty reduction, inclusion and sustainability. They also identify the critical factors that determine the inclusiveness of growth, namely the increase in the welfare of the poor and the less well-off.

The discussion on inclusion in the PSIA focuses on identifying pathways to more inclusive reforms. By analysing the potential poverty and social impacts of reforms, the PSIA offers insights into different policy options and helps mitigate potential negative impacts.

The new Jobs Diagnostic identifies the key constraints a country faces in creating more, better and more inclusive jobs, and which actions to prioritise at country level to address these constraints.

Given their remit, the focus on inclusion in the remaining three tools is narrow in comparison with the above. The assessments are made using a risk lens in the case of the Systematic Operations Risk-Rating Tool (SORT), a gender lens (by design) in the case of the Country Gender Assessments (CGAs), and a recovery and peacebuilding lens (also by design) in the case of the Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessments (RPBAs).

The SORT identifies the potential negative impacts of the Bank's operation or operational engagement on poverty, gender, indigenous peoples, fragility and conflict.

RPBAs make an effort to provide an inclusive process to support political dialogue and participation of stakeholders with a view to helping governments identify, prioritise and sequence recovery and peacebuilding activities and to coordinate international support through a joint exercise and monitoring system.

CGAs, which are standard practice at the Bank, examine gender as a driver of poverty and development challenges. The content of a Country Partnership Framework can include specific measures when the analysis in the CGA identifies the need for gender-responsive interventions, and when there is country ownership and demand.

Equity

Unlike for inclusion, there is generally no explicit focus on equity in the assessments, except in the SORT. It is discussed indirectly in PSIAs, and from a process point of view in the SCD.

The SORT discusses equity, as it does inclusion, by looking at the social risks, taking into account the potential negative impacts of the operation or operational engagement on equity.

PSIAs discuss equity indirectly in their recognition that all reforms have costs and benefits, which are usually distributed unequally across different groups of the population, hurting poor and vulnerable groups the most.

The Bank's Poverty and Equity Global Practice plays an important role in supporting and acting as a resource for teams preparing SCDs, which suggests that equity considerations would feature in the diagnostics.

The remaining three tools, the Jobs Diagnostic, RPBA and the CGAs do not discuss equity explicitly.

Annex 2 Methodology: searching the World Bank's project repository

The research team sought to identify the number of IDA/IBRD financed projects and financial outlay of the World Bank's portfolio (as accounted for in the World Bank's online project repository) targeted at vulnerable populations. A general search using keywords such as 'vulnerable', 'marginalized', 'excluded', etc. yielded little in terms of usable results. Such searches generally resulted in projects where the topic word (e.g. 'vulnerable') was used as a descriptor during the baseline demographic study, but not in the project documentation itself. This is likely to be because the World Bank tends to target its projects based on specific populations, rather than vulnerable or marginalised people as a broad category. Similarly, we initially sought to use 'income poor' as one of the target populations, but this was too broad a search to make it feasible for the research team to analyse all project documentation.

Thus, we started by visiting the World Bank project database on 17 February 2018 and performed searches for keywords related to each of the three target vulnerable populations. Keywords used for persons with disability mirrored those used in Karr et al. (2017): 'disability(ies)'; 'disabled'; 'blind'; 'deaf'; 'autism'/'autistic'; 'handicap(ped)'. For migrants, the following keywords were used: 'migrant(s)'; 'refugee(s)'; 'internally displaced person'; 'displaced'; 'asylum seeker(s)'; 'emigrant(s)'/ 'immigrant(s)'. For indigenous peoples, only the word 'indigenous' was used.

Our search was further filtered by project status and inception date. For all target populations, active and closed projects with inception dates ranging from 2015 to 2017 and relevant keywords were analysed for inclusivity. Additionally, for persons with disabilities and migrants, active and closed projects with inception dates from 2010 to 2014 and relevant keywords were also analysed – this is because very few projects for the two groups were found between 2015 and 2017 compared with indigenous peoples. For the purpose of this study, we excluded projects classified as 'pipeline' (projects still under development, but not yet initiated) or 'dropped' (previously planned, but never initiated).

Selected projects were then analysed for inclusivity of the target population based on a review of project documentation. The project appraisal document (PAD) was the primary resource for determining the level of target population engagement in the project. However, for approximately 14% of indigenous-linked projects, 22% of migrant-linked projects and 20% of disability-linked projects identified through the keyword search, no PAD was available. In these cases, other project documentation was reviewed, primarily project information sheets.

After reviewing available documentation, each project was given one of the following codes:

(0) – not inclusive of target population. For example, the vulnerable population keyword (e.g. 'disability') was only found in project documentation in demographic baseline information or other background information. '0' projects included no reference to the vulnerable group as an actively targeted beneficiary group in the project planning, design, monitoring or evaluation process.

(1) – inclusive of target population. '1' coded projects made explicit reference in project documentation to the vulnerable group as a targeted beneficiary of project outcomes.

(2) – inclusive and target population was the primary intended project beneficiary. ‘2’ coded projects differ from ‘1’ coded in that the project design focused on the target vulnerable population group as the sole or primary project beneficiary, rather than as one among many targeted beneficiary groups.

Methodological limitations

One caveat to this approach appears in the treatment of projects linked to indigenous peoples. In practice, any project that included an Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) in the project documentation was counted at least as a ‘1-inclusive’ project because a proactive attempt was made to incorporate indigenous groups. However, for some of these projects, the IPP was triggered due to the potential presence of indigenous people in areas being affected by the project, but when the IPP was created the final sites had not yet been selected. As a result, some of these projects (coded as ‘1-inclusive’ in our review) were potentially inclusive in design, but not actually inclusive of any indigenous people given the final location decisions.

An additional caveat to this approach is the inherent unreliability/instability of the World Bank’s project repository. The number of projects in the database is in flux, and this variability does not appear to be restricted to recent projects. For instance, in Karr et al.’s 2015–2016 study – which used identical keywords and a nearly identical approach, but a search date of 12 January 2016 – 43 disability-inclusive projects (our ‘1-inclusive’ code) were identified in the 2010–2015 date range. On 17 February 2018, our team only identified 21 projects. Even during the course of our review, we found differing numbers of projects while using the same keyword searches. Occasionally, we were unable to consistently relocate projects identified in the original search. This issue was encountered across all three target populations and across the full date range. Such instability makes any research referencing this database problematic.

However, it is important to note that the World Bank project repository offers more data and more documentation, over a wider date range, than any other major development partner or publicly available source. As such, even with the above noted deficiencies, it represents a best-in-class data source for such a study.



**Evidence.
Ideas.
Change.**

ODI is an independent, global think tank, working for a sustainable and peaceful world in which every person thrives. We harness the power of evidence and ideas through research and partnership to confront challenges, develop solutions, and create change.

ODI
203 Blackfriars Road
London SE1 8NJ

+44 (0)20 7922 0300
info@odi.org

odi.org
odi.org/facebook
odi.org/twitter