ANEXO 4

IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETION AND RESULTS REPORT

GUIDELINES

OPCS

August 2006

Last updated on: 07/22/2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AUS	Activity Update Summary
BP	Bank Procedure
CAS	Country Assistance Strategy
CD	Country director
CPF	Country Partnership Framework
CPS	Country Partnership Strategy
DPF	Development policy financing
ERR	Economic rate of return
FRR	Financial rate of return
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GEO	Global environmental objective
GP	Global Practice
ICR	Implementation Completion and Results report
IEG	Independent Evaluation Group (of the World Bank, formerly OED or Operations Evaluation Department)
ILI	Intensive Learning Implementation Completion and Results report
IO	Intermediate outcomes
IP	Implementation Performance
IPF	Investment Project Financing
ISR	Implementation Status and Results Report
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NCO	Note on Cancelled Operation (Formerly PCN–Project Completion Note)
NPV	Net present value
OP	Operational Policy
OPCS	Operations Policy and Country Services
PAD	Project Appraisal Document
PPF	Project Preparation Facility
PCN	Project Concept Note
PD	Program Document
PDO/DO	Project/program development objective
PPAR	Project Performance Assessment Review
QAG	Quality Assurance Group
QEA	Quality at Entry Assessment (by QAG)
QSA	Quality of Supervision Assessment (by QAG)
SGPD	Senior Global Practice Director

1. WHAT IS THE IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETION AND RESULTS REPORT?

1.1 Purpose and Types of ICRs

Implementation Completion and Results reports (ICRs) are **an integral part of the World Bank's drive to increase development effectiveness**, through a continuous process of self-evaluation, lesson learning and application, sharing of knowledge, and being accountable for results. The lessons learned from ICRs improve the quality and effectiveness of Bank loans/credits, especially for follow-on operations, while borrower/stakeholder participation in the ICR process enhances later designs, preparation, and implementation.

More specifically, the ICR system is intended to:

(a) **Provide a complete and systematic account** of the performance and results of each operation. Results for individual operations in a country should provide in aggregate a key measure of whether or not higher-order CAS/CPF/CPS objectives are being effectively served by a lending program;

(b) **Capture and disseminate experience** from operation design and implementation to (i) improve the selection of future interventions to achieve CAS/CPF/CPS goals; (ii) improve the design and implementation of future interventions through lessons learned; and (iii) help ensure greater development impact and sustainability of operations;

(c) **Provide accountability and transparency** at the level of individual operations with respect to the activities of the Bank, borrower, and involved stakeholders;

(d) **Provide a vehicle for realistic self-evaluation** of performance by the Bank and borrowers; and

(e) **Contribute to databases** for aggregation, analysis, and reporting, especially by the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG), on the effectiveness of lending operations in contributing to development strategies at the sector, country, and global levels.

- **Audiences for ICRs** are both internal—Board members and Bank managers and staff—and external—governments and their agencies, stakeholders and beneficiaries in partner countries, as well as the general public with an interest in development effectiveness. The **final ICR is automatically disclosed to the public** when submitted to the Board from the Operations Portal, unless otherwise decided in exceptional circumstances see the updated Policy on Access to Information (July 2013). See also the Access to Information Staff Handbook (June 2010).

Two types of ICRs are used to meet the objectives stated above:

- A **Core ICR**, or
- An **Intensive Learning ICR (ILI)** for selected operations.

The Core ICR is prepared to satisfy accountability needs and provide lessons from completed operations. The ILI has the same structure and content as the Core ICR, but provides more extensive analysis and lesson learning based on the findings of a **stakeholder workshop** (to gather information, discuss the experience, and derive lessons), and/or a **beneficiary survey** where practicable. The ILI uses the same electronic template as the Core ICR. More information on ILI is provided in Appendix D of the ICR Guidelines.

1.2 Responsibilities

Global Practices

The Global Practices (GPs) are responsible for completion reporting for all Bank-assisted operations. GP responsibility entails the following:

(a) Ensuring the **overall quality, completeness, and transparency** of the ICR process in its entirety for all GP operations, including the synthesis of lessons learned, and their dissemination and reflection in future work;

(b) Ensuring that ICR work is keyed to the **Bank's results agenda** in that each completed ICR serves as an input to documenting the achievement of corporate and global goals;

(c) Soliciting and recording in the ICR the **views of the borrower, implementing agency, cofinanciers, stakeholders,** and any other partners;

(d) Ensuring that the **lessons learned** are taken into account in Country Strategies (CASs/CPFs/CPSs) and the design of new lending operations; and

(e) Through the ICR process, encouraging and assisting the **development of the borrower's independent evaluation capacity**, including capacity for impact evaluation.

In the case of **ILIs**, the GPs' responsibilities also include:

(a) **Selecting suitable projects** in consultation with the Regions, IEG, and borrowers as appropriate;

(b) Organizing with the borrower a **survey of beneficiaries** in appropriate cases, such as when the commitment of beneficiaries is essential for project sustainability or where beneficiary views may shed light on key lessons learned; and

(c) Holding with the borrower a **stakeholder workshop** to discuss the lessons learned and the future operation of the project.

Borrowers

The Bank supervision team and implementing agency should discuss the **borrower's ICR responsibilities** during implementation, reviewing them in detail in the year before the ICR is due. Special attention should be given to the data requirements of ICRs, including that cost-and-benefit data is assembled sufficient for accountability and to meet analytic requirements.

Borrowers should be encouraged to assign the task of organizing and overseeing the preparation of its own completion report to a senior official familiar with the operation, and to designate this official as the formal contact with the Bank and cofinanciers during the preparation and review of the Bank's ICR.

The **borrower is responsible for** the following:

(a) **Preparing and submitting to the Bank its own completion report**. The completion report/summary should include:

(i) Assessment of the **operation's objective, design, implementation, and operational experience**;

(ii) Assessment of the **outcome** of the operation against the agreed objectives;

(iii) Evaluation of the **borrower's own performance** during the preparation and implementation of the operation, with special emphasis on lessons learned that may be helpful in the future;

(iv) Evaluation of the **performance of the Bank**, any cofinanciers, or of other partners during the preparation and implementation of the operation, including the effectiveness of their relationships, with special emphasis on lessons learned; and

(v) Description of the **proposed arrangements for future operation of the project**.

(vi) **Assisting the preparation of the Bank's ICR**.

(b) **Providing information** to the Bank on the economic, financial, social, institutional, and environmental conditions in which the operation was implemented, and on implementation and operation results (according to the timing specified in the legal documents). This typically entails:

(i) **Providing feedback** on the quality of the Bank's contribution, from identification to supervision;

(ii) **Participating in ICR discussions** among the Bank, the implementing agency, cofinanciers and other partners;

(iii) **Providing comments** on the Bank staff's draft ICR; and

(iv) In the case of an ILI, organizing with the Bank a **survey of beneficiaries** in appropriate cases and/or a **stakeholder workshop** to discuss the lessons learned and the future operation of the project.

Cofinanciers and Other Partners

Cofinanciers and any other partners respond to requests from the Bank for comments on the draft ICR and participate in stakeholder workshops.

Independent Evaluation Group

IEG reviews each ICR produced by the GPs. The main purpose of IEG's ICR Review is to independently assess the project experience as well as the quality of the Bank's self-evaluation contained in the ICR. The ICR Review is desk-based. The ICR is expected to be a self-contained document that provides a thorough self-evaluation of the project experience. IEG assesses the quality of the ICR's self-evaluation using the following criteria: quality of evidence; quality of analysis; extent to which lessons are based on evidence and analysis; ICR's results-orientation (the ICR should be outcome-driven, not an implementation narrative); internal consistency; consistency with ICR guidelines; and conciseness.

IEG sends the draft ICR Review for comment to the concerned GP and copied to the Region. Comments, if received, are incorporated as appropriate and the final ICR Review is shared with the GP and Region for information.

For a sample of about 25 percent of closed projects each year, **IEG conducts Project Performance Assessments Reports (PPARs),** which involve field visits and interviews of multiple stakeholders. The PPAR sample is nonrandom. Projects are selected for PPARs for one (or more) of the following reasons: (i) requested by Executive Directors, cofinanciers, or Regions; (ii) cluster/country sector review; (iii) input into IEG sector/thematic study; (iv) input into Country Assistance Evaluation; (v) potential impact evaluation; (vi) innovative project/new instrument; (vii) disagreement with the ICR and/or poor ICR quality; (viii) underevaluated country/sector/theme; and (ix) major safeguard compliance issue.

Ratings data from ICR Reviews and PPARs are reported in the Bank's Business Warehouse. Aggregate results (trends, etc.) from ICR Reviews and PPARs are discussed annually in **IEG's Annual Review of Development Effectiveness (ARDE)**. Individual ICR Reviews are maintained in IEG databases and are available on IEG's website.

Operations Policy and Country Services (OPCS)

OPCS oversees compliance with completion reporting policy and execution, and provides guidance and support to staff on ICRs by managing policy and process guidelines, resolving related policy and process issues, and monitoring aggregate ICR delivery through the Bank's ICR database.

2. PROCEDURES FOR THE ICR

2.1 Completion Reporting Policy and Application

Bank policy requires an ICR for each completed lending operation (Operational Policy [OP]/Bank Procedure [BP] 10.00*, Investment Project Financing;* and OP/BP 8.60, *Development Policy Financing*). As a general rule, **a separate ICR is prepared for each investment and nonprogrammatic development policy financing (DPF) operation** with a distinct Project ID (its "P-number") (see templates in MS-WORD for IPF and DPF operations). For a **programmatic DPF**, a single ICR is prepared on completion of the program, after the closing of the last operation in a prespecified series, and it includes a separate assessment of the contribution of each individual operation to the program (see Appendix C of the ICR Guidelines for more information).

Exceptions are: (i) additional or supplemental financing, and (ii) trust funds that are blended with IBRD/IDA operations (such as Global Environment Facility [GEF]), when a single ICR is prepared under the "parent" operation.

For **GEF operations** (both stand-alone and blends) an ICR provides an assessment of the project's contribution to global environmental objectives. Stand-alone GEF operations have the same structure as that for investment operations, with the exception that the project development objectives (PDOs) are replaced with the global environmental objectives (GEO) (see a template in MS-WORD for GEF stand-alone operations). GEF blend operations have a similar structure but some sections and ratings are duplicated to accommodate both IBRD/IDA and GEF parts (see a template in MS-WORD for GEF blend operations).

An ICR is not required for an operation that fails to become effective or is cancelled before significant implementation is initiated (OP 10.00). Instead, a **Note on Cancelled Operation (NCO)** (formerly known as a Project Completion Note) is sent to the Board describing the operation and explaining why it was not implemented.

- An NCO is a shortened and adapted version of the ICR, and is reviewed by IEG. The ICR Guidelines also cover NCO requirements (for details see Appendix E and a template in MS-WORD for NCOs).

- The **cut-off point for "significant implementation"** is defined for Investment Lending Operations as final actual disbursement of less than five percent of the initial commitment or US$ 1 million (whichever is smaller), excluding any Project Preparation Facility and front-end fees.

- The **cut-off point for "significant implementation"** is defined for Development Policy Financing as declaration of effectiveness. All Development Policy Financing Operations which become effective require an ICR regardless of disbursement.

- As with ICRs, **NCOs are disclosed to the public** (except in extraordinary circumstances) at the time they are sent to the Board, in accordance with updated Policy on Access to Information (July 2013). See also the Access to Information Staff Handbook (June 2010).

2.2 Timing

Bank procedures require that ICRs are completed shortly after completion of an operation and are **circulated to the Board no later than six months after its closing date** (see BP 10.00), but there are **significant advantages to earlier preparation and submission of ICRs,** which is encouraged especially for investment operations and, for obvious reasons, when there is a follow-on operation.[1] Consequently, ICR preparation for investment operations should begin several months before the expected closing date or completion of project activities. An ICR may be submitted to the Board before the closing date, but GPs must ensure that implementation is essentially complete and that there are no outstanding or foreseeable issues (especially fiduciary).

For **development policy financing**, it is not feasible to advance preparation of ICRs to the same extent, because of the fast-disbursing nature of the lending instrument. In the case of **programmatic DPF**, a single ICR is prepared at the end of the program and provides a comprehensive evaluation based on the overall programmatic series. The ICR for programmatic DPF is prepared within twelve months after the closing of the last operation in the series or within twelve months after a programmatic series lapses. A programmatic series is considered to have lapsed 24 months after the Board approval of the previous operation in the series, thus at the latest an ICR is due no later than 36 months after the Board approval of the previous operation in the series. See Appendix C of the ICR Guidelines for more information.

A **Note on Cancelled Operation (NCO)** is completed soon after an agreement is reached with the borrower to cancel the operation and should be circulated to the Board no later than six months after cancellation of the loan/credit/grant balances.

2.3 ICR Processing and Quality Assurance

Normally the **ICR process begins** when the team leader in charge of an operation's supervision reminds the borrower in writing of its obligations for preparing its own completion report and for assisting the Bank in ICR preparation, and the practice manager or team leader designates the ICR task team to prepare the ICR.

The **data and formal analytic base** needed for effective completion reporting is provided by: (i) the CAS/CPF/CPS and relevant analytic and advisory activities; (ii) preparation and appraisal documentation; (iii) legal documents; (iv) the supervision record during implementation (especially archived ISRs, aide memoire, management letters, and any mid-term review report); (v) project-related data available in the system (e.g., SAP, ARCS, loan accounting system); and (vi) any monitoring and evaluation data and performance-related reports produced under the operation.

The ICR preparation process normally involves an **ICR mission** (that may be combined with the last supervision mission), beneficiary surveys and/or stakeholder workshops as appropriate (required for ILIs), and an **ICR review meeting**. While ICR review meetings are not an institutionally mandatory step, they may be beneficial depending on particular project issues or circumstances, especially if there are serious issues and/or disagreements during report drafting and clearance. **Comments on the draft ICR** should be sought from the borrower and implementing agencies, and from cofinanciers and/or partners as applicable, and should be included in the final ICR.

The **GP is responsible for the quality of ICRs** submitted to the Board and for the processes needed to ensure quality and timeliness (including providing resources). Factors that influence ICR quality usually include the following: selection of an appropriate ICR team with the necessary expertise (e.g., technical, economic/financial, fiduciary, safeguards, legal, etc. as

[1] Early preparation of ICRs increases the chances that those familiar with the project (Bank, borrower, and

stakeholders) will be available to contribute while their memories are fresh.

needed); oversight and quality assurance support from a practice manager; review by a country management unit and inputs from a country team; and as needed/desired, inputs from a GP shared operational support team and peer reviewers.

OPCS provides guidance on questions of ICR process and the ICR Guidelines, while **IEG's experience** reviewing all ICRs can be drawn on with respect to ICR quality factors (see Appendix J for IEG Guidance on ICR Reviews).

The **ICR production process is complete** when a final report is approved by the GP senior director, submitted to the Board, and disclosed to the public. **IEG reviews all ICRs** to validate performance ratings, rate ICR quality, and select operations for its own assessments (both PPARs and as inputs to broader evaluation studies). The GP responds to IEG's review of the ICR, as required.

2.4 ICR Style and Length

Text elements in the ICR are intended to be **concise and to focus on effectiveness issues and their resolution**, factors affecting performance, and the results and outcomes of interventions in the context of objectives. A **detailed chronology of events is not required**, except when explaining an issue. Authors are encouraged to use, as appropriate, bullet points, lists, and small tables in the text, rather than lengthier narrative–with the emphasis on clarity and the accessibility of information. The main text should normally not exceed 15 pages.[2] The statistical data in ICR Annexes provides the essential background on operational design, implementation, outcomes, and performance issues. The default font in the Portal is Times New Roman 12 points.

3. BASIC FUNCTIONALITY OF THE ICR IN THE OPERATIONS PORTAL

3.1 How to Create or Access the ICR

As of FY07, a **new ICR in the Operations Portal** replaces the ICR in the Notes–based Project Document System (PDS). To create or access ICRs in the Portal, follow the steps below:

- From the World Bank Intranet Home Page, go to the Operations and Knowledge Tab; type the ID number for the desired operation ("P-number") in the box under and press enter.

- Click the operation you want.

- Once in the "**Overview**" page of the desired operation, go to the Roadmap Tab, go to the Completion Stage and click on ICR (or NCO) step, then click on Prepare ICR (or NCO).

- The ICR as previously created or finalized appears on screen. If no ICR has been created, a message indicates that an ICR does not exist for this operation. To create an

[2] In special cases (e.g., very large or complex operations) a longer treatment is warranted to provide a full accounting of the operation with all critical information needed to explain the outcome and justify performance ratings.

ICR, click "**Create**". (To create or edit an ICR in the Portal, a SAP profile of the team leader/project specialist is required.) Based on the information in SAP, the system will automatically assign an appropriate template (e.g., investment, development policy, or GEF) and download information available in the system. It takes a moment to generate the document.

- Once the window shows the document was successfully created, click "**Close**".

The ICR created is a web-based Data Sheet and a main document in Microsoft Word that users can check in and out of the Portal.

3.2 Basic Functions and Editing the ICR Data Sheet

The following are the **basic functions provided on the ICR screen**:

- **View All**: View all sections of the Data Sheet
- **Edit All**: Edit the Data Sheet, provided you have the team leader/project specialist profile in SAP
- **Save**: Save changes made in the Data Sheet as a draft (while remaining in edit mode)
- **Check entries**: Identifies mandatory fields in the Data Sheet that are not yet completed or do not meet requirements
- **Send Draft**: Send a draft ICR—both Data Sheet and Main Document—in two MS-WORD files via email
- **Submit Final**: Submit a final ICR to the GP senior director (SGPD) for approval (in two MS-WORD files), and for onward submission to the Board upon SGPD's approval
- **Print**: Prepare the ICR as two MS-WORD files for printing
- **Exit**: Exit from the ICR program. You can choose either "Save & Exit", "Exit without saving" or "Cancel".

3.3 Accessing and Editing the ICR Main Document

The ICR's main document is provided in a MS-WORD format that users can "check in and out".

To access the **main document**, click the "Main Document" tab. Initially, the Portal assigns edit access for the main document to the ICR's initial creator and the task team leader. Either could give additional edit access to others (who have a TL profile in IRIS) by clicking "**Edit Access Control**".

To edit the main document, click "**Edit**" in the Document tab. A new window will open and an ICR main document is provided in a MS-WORD format (the document is now "checked out").

You can edit it in the MS-WORD environment, save it in your local or network drive, and/or share it with other users. Until the user who checked out the document "checks in" again (by checking in a revised document or "discard changes"), the other users only can see the version checked out in the Portal as a read-only file.

NOTE: It is recommended to check in a revised ICR from time to time. If you manually cut-and-pasted the Data Sheet into the main document, please delete it before you check it back in. The Data Sheet is generated by system each time you use "Print", "Send Draft" or "Submit Final" functions, using the information entered in the Portal. Therefore, any changes in the Data Sheet information must be directly entered into the Portal.

Other functions available under the Document tab are:

- **View**: View the main document last checked in as a read-only file.
- **Discuss:** Have a discussion or exchange comments on line
- **Create URL to document:** Create a URL link to the last checked-in ICR (read-only) in another document (e.g., email) by clicking it and pasting (Ctrl-V) it.

3.4 Procedures for Approval and Board Submission

When the ICR is ready for approval, click "**Submit Final**". The system will take you to the Control Point section where additional documents (supporting documents, if needed) can be uploaded (the Control Point section can also be accessed through the Roadmap step by clicking on Obtain the Decision on ICR). The sender can add names to the cc list.

Once the final ICR/NCO is submitted in the Portal, the PM and CD will receive a system-generated email, which contains a final ICR/NCO as two MS-WORD files and a link to the Control Point in the Portal. By clicking on the Portal link the PM and CD will have the option to Concur or send for Revision. Once both PM and CD have concurred, the SGPD will receive an email with a link to the Control Point where he/she will be able to "Decide" on the ICR/NCO.

Once Approved, the system automatically records the actual "ICR/NCO to SGPD date" as well as the actual "ICR/NCO to SECPO date" as milestones in SAP AUS (team should still send formally to SECPO the ICR as described below).

4. SENDING A FINAL ICR TO SECPO for distribution (eSubmission)

Approved ICR are now submitted to the Board through SECPO's eSubmission website. After the SGPD approves the ICR and the notification is sent to SECPO electronically (see section 3.4 above), the team:

i) Prints out the Data Sheet and the Main Document separately as they were sent to SECPO.
ii) Inserts the Data Sheet between the Table of Contents and Section 1 of the main document.

iii) Goes to SECPO's eSubmission website to upload the final ICR, by following the necessary steps there, and provide the map number – if any – provided by the Map Design Unit (see below "how to obtain maps for the ICR).

For further guidance on how to complete the eSubmission form a guide is available in the help section of the website.

HOW TO OBTAIN MAPS FOR THE ICR

Maps for attaching to ICRs can be obtained from the **Map Design Unit of GSD (Ext. 31482)**. **A minimum of a one week turnaround is required**.

Two basic options are:

1) The GP may obtain clearance from the Map Design Unit to use one of three types of existing maps:

(i) the original project map(s) used in the original PAD (to be reprinted as is, without changes). Provide IBRD map numbers when ordering, if known.

(ii) a recent general map of the country, provided by the Map Design Unit, which will not have any reference whatsoever to the project;

(iii) a map produced outside the Bank's Map Design Unit (clearance by GSD is not guaranteed, as maps in official Bank documents must meet the Bank's boundary and nomenclature standards).

2) A new or updated map can be created (based on the task team's inputs/directions) by:

(i) adapting the original project map(s) with changes and additions;

(ii) adapting a recent general map of the country and adding the project's title to the map;

(iii) adapting a recent general map of the country, adding the project's title, and any project info such as project areas/locations, provinces, districts, cities, etc.; or

(iv) combining data from several different source maps.

A new or updated map is cleared by GSD automatically.

Disputed border/nomenclature issues, if any, will be identified by Map Unit staff while handling mapping requests.

5. GUIDELINES BY ICR SECTION

DATA SHEET

Section A: BASIC INFORMATION

Most data in this section are system-generated from existing sources (e.g., SAP/AUS, ISR). Check if the information is correct; contact ITS(x32121) if you find any system-generated information is incorrect.

For programmatic DPF and GEF blend operations, this section will have multiple entries, where applicable, to include relevant data on each individual loan/credit/grant.

Project (or Program) Name: Displays the title entered under "Legal Name" in SAP Activity Update Summary (AUS); any editing can be done in the AUS, which will be reflected in the ICR.

ICR (or NCO) date: Updated each time the ICR (or NCO) is saved.

ICR type: A **Core ICR** is prepared for most of the Bank operations to satisfy accountability needs and provide lessons from completed operations. An **Intensive Learning ICR (ILI)** may be prepared, comprising the core ICR plus additional surveys of beneficiaries and/or stakeholder workshops. More information on the ILI is provided in Appendix D of the ICR Guidelines.

Implementing Agencies: Enter formal name(s) of main entities/organizations responsible for implementation. The system pulls the information from SAP AUS. If necessary, it can be edited or new agencies added. Contact information details can also be added/edited; the details will be added to the system master list but not printed in the ICR.

Cofinanciers and Other External Partners: Enter formal name(s) of any cofinanciers and other partner organizations contributing to the operation. Relevant organization(s) can be selected from the master list in the system or new organizations can be added. Contact information details can also be added/edited; these will be added to the system master list but not printed in the ICR.

Section B: KEY DATES

All data in this section, except restructuring(s), are system-generated from SAP as read-only. For restructuring(s), the date(s) included in *Section H: Restructuring* of the ICR are displayed as read-only. Some of these entries will not apply to a Note on Cancelled Operation (NCO).

For programmatic DPF and GEF blend operations, this section will have multiple entries, where applicable, to include relevant data on each individual loan/credit/grant.

Section C: RATINGS SUMMARY

C.1 Performance Ratings by ICR

Enter the key performance ratings for this operation: i.e., *Outcome* (and/or GEO rating for GEF operations), *Risk to Development Outcome* (and/or Risk to Global Environmental Outcome rating for GEF operations), *Bank Performance* and *Borrower Performance*. The same ratings should be manually typed in respective sections in the ICR main document along with justifications.

The *Outcome* and *Risk to Development Outcome* ratings do not apply to a Note on Cancelled Operation (NCO).

For programmatic DPF, this section will display the key performance ratings at the program level based on the overall programmatic series. See Appendix C of the ICR Guidelines for more information.

Please refer to Appendix A of the ICR Guidelines, ***Harmonized Evaluation Criteria for ICR and IEG Evaluations***. These criteria are to be used to rate performance in both ICRs and by IEG in its assessments.[3] Staff should take care to understand fully and follow carefully this guidance so that ratings criteria are consistently applied in ICRs.

C. 2 Detailed Ratings of Bank and Borrower Performance

Enter subratings for the overall Bank and Borrower Performance ratings. These ratings do not apply to a Note on Cancelled Operation (NCO).

For programmatic DPF, this section will display the key performance ratings at the program level based on the overall programmatic series. See Appendix C of the ICR Guidelines for more information.

Please refer to Appendix A of the ICR Guidelines, ***Harmonized Evaluation Criteria for ICR and IEG Evaluations***. These criteria are to be used to rate performance in both ICRs and by IEG in its assessments. Staff should take care to understand fully and follow carefully this guidance so that ratings criteria are consistently applied in ICRs.

C.3 Quality at Entry and Implementation Performance Indicators

All data in this section is system-generated.

For programmatic DPF, this section will have multiple entries, where applicable, to include relevant data on each individual operation in the programmatic series.

Potential Problem Project at any time: shows whether the operation was flagged as a potential problem project (i.e., satisfactory ISR ratings but with a certain number of portfolio risk flags) at any time during implementation.

Problem Project at any time: shows whether the operation was rated less than satisfactory for PDO/GEO or Implementation Performance (IP) ratings in the ISR at any time during implementation.

PDO/GEO rating before Closing/Inactive status: shows the PDO/GEO rating in the last ISR before the operation became an "inactive" status (i.e., the loan/credit was closed or fully disbursed). If the operation is still "active," the PDO/GEO rating of the most recently archived ISR is displayed.

QAG Assessments—Quality at Entry (QEA): shows the rating by QAG's Quality at Entry Assessment (QEA) for the operation, if any.

[3] The Harmonized Evaluation Criteria were announced in October 2005 and apply to both investment and development policy financing. They were developed by a working group comprising staff from OPCS, IEG, and the Regions.

QAG Assessments—Quality of Supervision (QSA): shows the rating by QAG's Quality of Supervision Assessment (QSA) for the operation, if any. If multiple QSA ratings exist, the latest rating is displayed.

Section D: SECTOR AND THEME CODES

The Sector Codes indicate the percentage allocation of the Bank financing in one or more sectors, while the Theme Codes indicate primary and secondary thematic areas on which the Bank financing focuses. One operation can have up to five Sector Codes (totaling 100 percent) and five Theme Codes.

The original column shows the allocation at approval as entered in SAP AUS (ready-only). The actual column should be entered in the ICR to either confirm the allocation at approval or make any changes. Only the original column is displayed in a Note on Cancelled Operation (NCO).

If any of the original codes are no longer relevant, enter "0 (zero)" for a Sector Code or "Not Applicable" for a Theme Code. New codes can be added (and deleted), but the original codes cannot be deleted. The codes added in the ICR can be deleted, while the original codes cannot be deleted.

For programmatic DPF and GEF blend operations, this section will have multiple entries, where applicable, to include relevant data on each individual loan/credit/grant.

Section E: BANK STAFF

The section shows the names of staff and managers responsible for the operation at the time of loan approval and ICR. Confirm the names entered by the system, or enter appropriate names by selecting the look-up button ("magnifying glass"). Names can be selected from the Bank's directory or manually typed if not in the directory.

For programmatic DPF, this section will have multiple entries, where applicable, to include relevant data on each individual operation in the programmatic series.

Section F: RESULTS FRAMEWORK ANALYSIS

Project and program design is guided by a Results Framework, which is intended to assist the borrower and Bank during implementation, and for assessment of an operation's outcome and contribution to higher-level goals. The framework focuses on the PDO/GEO to be achieved and indicators demonstrating progress toward the PDO/GEO, and helps to identify any changes that may be necessary in the operation during implementation.

The indicators and information in this Section should be the same as the PAD/PD. If any indicators and target values have been changed or modified from those in PAD/PD, this should be noted and clearly explained here or elsewhere in the ICR (e.g., Section 1), including the reasons and processes followed (e.g., Board or Management approval, and borrower consultations). The PDOs, indicators, baseline and target values are pulled from the last archived ISR for convenience. A minimum of one PDO indicator and one Intermediate Outcome indicator are required by the system.

For programmatic DPF, the PDO should include a set of objectives for the overall program and specific objectives of each intermediate operation in relation to the overall program. The measurable indicators for monitoring progress and evaluating results on completion of the program should be the same as or consistent with the program documents of operations included in the programmatic series. See [Appendix C of the ICR Guidelines](#) for more information.

For each indicator, enter as applicable:

> **Baseline Value:** Quantitative value(s) or qualitative starting point(s) and the corresponding date(s) to indicate pre-project/program status.
>
> **Original Target Value:** Quantitative value(s) or qualitative end point(s) to be achieved and the corresponding target date(s) as a result of the operation's interventions, as envisaged in PAD/PD.
>
> **Formally Revised Target Value:** If the Original Target Value(s) were formally revised because of restructuring or changes during implementation, quantitative value(s) or qualitative end point(s) to be achieved and the corresponding target date(s) as a result of the operation's interventions, as approved by the Board or Management.
>
> **Actual Values Achieved:** Quantitative value(s) or qualitative status actually achieved and the corresponding date(s) as a result of the operation's interventions.
>
> **Comments:** Brief comments or remarks, as needed, including percentage of the targets achieved and reasons for revised targets.

Section G: RATINGS OF PROJECT/PROGRAM PERFORMANCE IN ISRs

This section lists the information of all archived ISRs for their archived dates, DO/GEO/IP ratings, and the actual disbursement amount on the ISR date. All data in this section are entered by the system.

For programmatic DPF, this section will have multiple entries, where applicable, to include relevant data on each individual operation in the programmatic series.

Section H: RESTRUCTURING (if any)

The system will pull out all the restructuring date(s) entered in the ISR, as well as the IP/DO or GEO ratings and the amount disbursed at the time of restructuring. For each restructuring date, briefly summarize the reason(s) for restructuring and key changes made. If any restructuring date(s) are missing, add them by clicking the button "Add Restructuring."

If the PDO/GEO were formally revised with an approval by the Board, click the check-box next to the relevant restructuring date; then a table opens up to enter outcome subratings (against the original PDO/GEO and key outcome targets and against the revised PDO/GEO and key outcome targets). See Appendix B of the ICR Guidelines for detailed guidelines on evaluation of operations with formally revised PDO/GEO.

Section I: DISBURSEMENT PROFILE (for IPF & GEF only)

The system displays a figure that shows the original disbursement forecast, a formally revised forecast (if any), and the actual disbursement amount, based on the data in the system.

For GEF blend operations, this section will have multiple figures to include relevant data on each individual source of funding.

MAIN DOCUMENT

Cover Page

Edit a standard text for the cover page provided by the system and add any information specific to the operation. List all financing provided through the Bank for the operation (i.e., total commitment made) in the currency of the loan/credit/grant, and, if it is not in US dollars, provide in bracket the US$ equivalent (a final amount using actual exchange rates). A **report number** is automatically assigned by the system when an ICR is created.

Since the ICR or NCO is normally disclosed to the public, any issues relating to confidential or sensitive content must be identified and resolved prior to finalization of the ICR/NCO. Only in extraordinary circumstances, Bank Management may decide not to disclose an ICR/NCO to the public (see The World Bank Policy on Access to Information, 2013. In such cases, the cover page should indicate "Official Use Only" and include a text box on restricted circulation. (Please contact OPCS Advisory Service for detailed procedures.)

Currency Equivalent

Enter **exchange rates** against the US dollar for the local (or relevant) currency used in the ICR with an effective date. Normally, the exchange rate at the time of completion is entered here; however, if there are significant fluctuations during implementation that affected the project, the rates at appraisal and/or on any intervening dates when significant realignments affected the project may also be included. Enter the **Borrower's financial year** (e.g., July 1-June 30). This information will appear on the page behind the ICR cover.

Abbreviations and Acronym

Enter a list of abbreviations and acronyms used in the ICR and fully spell out formal titles and meanings.

SECTION 1: PROJECT/PROGRAM CONTEXT, DEVELOPMENT [or GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL] OBJECTIVES, AND DESIGN

This section is descriptive only, comprising factual statements or references to other documents, such as the CAS/CPF/CPS, relevant analytic and advisory activity reports, the PAD/PD, legal documents, and ISRs to describe the operation as designed or modified during implementation. **Evaluative comments should be reserved for the appropriate assessment section**.

For a **Note on Cancelled Operation,** drawing from PAD, briefly describe the country and sector background, rationale for Bank assistance, development objectives, components, costs and funding, implementation arrangements, risk analysis, and quality at entry.

Context at Appraisal

Briefly summarize the **country, macroeconomic and/or sector background** of relevance to the operation's objectives and design. Describe the **rationale for Bank assistance** at the time of approval and how the operation was to contribute to **higher-level objectives** (in the CAS/CPF/CPS or country's overall strategies/programs; and global objectives for GEF projects). For DPF, refer to the Government's program supported by the operation and Bank team's assessment of the macroeconomic policy framework.

Original Project/Program Development Objectives (PDO) [or Global Environmental Objectives (GEO) for GEF] and Key Indicators (as approved)

Enter the original objective statement(s) and key associated performance indicators, exactly as set out in the PAD or PD (and as reflected in the legal documents). If not embodied in the PDO/GEO and their indicators, briefly describe, drawing on the PAD/PD, the changes and benefits that the operation was expected to achieve.

For programmatic DPF, enter a set of objectives for the overall program and specific objectives for each intermediate operation in relation to the overall program. See Appendix C of the ICR Guidelines for more information.

Revised PDO [or GEO for GEF] and Key Indicators (if applicable), and Reasons/Justifications

If the PDO/GEO, and/or key associated outcome targets,[4] were revised during implementation with approval of the Board, enter the revised objectives as approved, including how the change affected the originally expected outcome targets.

Briefly describe the changes and reasons for the changes, distinguishing in particular between the different types of causes which dictated the changes:

(a) Where an **operation was performing poorly** because of inherent internal design flaws, low capacity, weak commitment, and/or other implementation problems ("**corrective restructuring**");

[4] Key associated outcome targets refers to measurable or observable outcomes expected by completion (in terms of types of benefits or progress expected for primary target groups), as well as any indications of their scale and scope (which are normally captured in key indicators in the PAD/PD).

(b) Where an operation had to be restructured to **retain or improve its relevance as external circumstances changed** (e.g., a new government and its policies, natural disasters changing priorities, and markets forces) ("**adaptive restructuring**"); and

(c) Last, even when implementation is proceeding on course, **growing knowledge** of the development problems being tackled and of local conditions, and the early response of beneficiaries, may suggest opportunities for making changes that can further improve outcomes and impacts ("**opportunistic restructuring**").

Ensure that these changes are recorded as a restructuring date in *Section H: Restructuring*, in which "Board approved PDO" is marked and sub-ratings for Outcomes are entered both against the original PDO/targets and the revised PDO/targets (refer to Appendix B of the ICR Guidelines for details on how to evaluate PDO-changed projects).

Main Beneficiaries (for IPF & GEF only)

Describe the "the primary target group" (people and organizations) as identified in the PAD and captured in the PDO/GEO (refer to PAD Guidelines), as well as any other significant individuals and organizations ("secondary beneficiaries") expected to benefit directly from project activities. The section should establish clearly the causal link between project investments and the benefits expected to flow to the beneficiaries, including identifying any associated investments from other sources which are a necessary co-contributor to those benefits.

If the major beneficiaries were modified by type or number (by a PDO/GEO change or some other change), explain here with cross reference to the changes discussed in other sections.

Original Components (as approved) (for IPF & GEF only)

List and summarize the project components as originally planned in the PAD. Indicate the causal linkages between component activities/outputs and the PDO/GEO outcomes to be achieved.

Revised Components (for IPF & GEF only)

If components were modified during implementation, state the revised components as recorded at the time, and explain the changes and reasons for the revisions (a text table to summarize the original and revised components may be helpful). Also indicate whether the revisions were approved by the Board; if they were not, indicate the reasons.

Original Policy Areas Supported by Program (as approved) (for DPF only)

List and summarize the main policy areas where particular Government actions were supported by the operation or a programmatic series of operations as originally planned in the respective PD(s). Indicate the main issues and linkages to the Government's program.

Revised Policy Areas (if applicable) (for DPF only)

If the policy areas were modified during implementation (approved by the Board), state the revised policy areas and explain the nature and reasons for the revisions.

Other Significant Changes (if applicable)

Describe any other changes in design, financing, and/or implementation arrangements, if any, that are not described above—e.g., in scope and scale, implementation arrangements and schedule, and funding allocations including cofinancing, supplemental/additional financing, reallocation, and cancellation. State the reasons for the changes and their justification, and indicate whether changes were approved by the Board or Management (e.g., Regional Vice President, Country Director).

SECTION 2: KEY FACTORS AFFECTING IMPLEMENTATION AND OUTCOMES

This section provides analysis of the key factors and events throughout the operational cycle which accounted for the operation's achievements and any shortcomings. A **chronology of events during implementation is not required**, unless it relates to performance issues.

For a **Note on Cancelled Operation**, the section title is: **Post-Approval Experience and Reasons for Cancellation**. Discuss the main events leading to cancellation, steps taken to resolve problems, exogenous factors, identification of causes, and responsible parties if the operation failed, and implications of failure.

Project Preparation, Design and Quality at Entry (for IPF & GEF only)

Summarize **key factors during the preparation stage or issues related to quality at entry that affected implementation and outcomes**, including:

- **Soundness of the background analysis** supporting the project, lessons learned incorporated, and the rationale for the Bank's intervention;

- **Assessment of the project design**—objectives, components, and organization—including its realism and the degree of complexity (e.g., the number of organizations involved, the number of project components and their geographic dispersion, novelty or innovations in approaches, capacity of the implementing agencies, the number of cofinanciers and partners, and social and environmental factors such as the extent of the Bank safeguard policies involved).

- **Adequacy of government's commitment**, stakeholder involvement ,and/or participatory processes;

- **Assessment of risks** (as determined by such factors as the range of policy and institutional capacity) and mitigation measures.

A chronology of implementation events is not required, unless it relates to performance issues.

Any ***Quality at Entry*** **rating by QAG** should be noted here but discussed in Section 10.1, Bank Performance.

Appendix F of the ICR Guidelines provides additional guidance, including categories of factors that have commonly explained performance.

Implementation (for IPF & GEF only)

Describe the **factors that contributed to successful implementation or gave rise to problems**,[5] including:

- Effects of any project **restructuring** or other significant changes (including cancellation of funding) in terms of their causes, rationale, and effectiveness;
- The **mid-term review** (if any); and
- **Actions taken in response to problems** and how they were resolved, as applicable.

A chronology of events during the lending process is not required, unless it relates to design or performance issues.

Any performance **ratings by the Quality Assurance Group (QAG) for *Supervision* or *Projects at Risk*** should be noted here and reviewed briefly from the GP's perspective, consistent with the discussion on Bank and Borrower Performance in Section 10.

Appendix F of the ICR Guidelines provides additional guidance, including categories of factors that have commonly explained performance.

Program Performance (for DPF only)

This section is supported by a table derived from an operation's policy matrix. Include the information about the operation tranche(s) and tranche disbursement condition(s), where applicable. For **programmatic DPF**, include relevant data on each individual operation in the programmatic series.

Provide additional details about the policy areas and actions supported by the operation, or a series of operations in case of programmatic DPF, any adjustments that needed to be made to the operation(s) as it evolved, to take into account the latest country developments, stakeholder support, etc. Explain how the progress of the implementation of the operation(s) was determined, focusing on the impact outcomes of the program.

Major Factors Affecting Implementation (for DPF only)

[5] If deficient performance of contractors, consultants or suppliers was a factor, see guidance in ICR Appendix I, *Commenting on Consultants, Contractors, and Suppliers in ICRs*.

Summarize key factors that contributed to successful implementation of the operation, or a series of operations in case of programmatic DPF, or led to problems (and how the problems were resolved), including:

- **Adequacy of government's commitment**, stakeholder involvement, and/or participatory processes;
- **Soundness of the background analysis** supporting the operation(s), lessons learned incorporated, and the rationale for the Bank's intervention;
- **Assessment of the operation's design**, including its realism and the degree of complexity (e.g., the number of organizations involved, the number and complexity of policy areas supported by the operation(s), novelty or innovations in approaches, capacity of the implementing agencies, the number of cofinanciers and partners, and social, environmental, and fiduciary aspects of the operation).
- Relevance of the **risks identified** at appraisal and effectiveness of mitigation measures.

If the operation(s) was subject to **restructuring**, describe the effects of restructuring or other significant changes, in terms of their causes, rationale, and effectiveness.

Appendix F of the ICR Guidelines provides additional guidance, including categories of factors that have commonly explained performance.

Any performance **ratings by QAG for *Supervision* or *Projects at Risk*** should be noted here and reviewed briefly from the GP's perspective, consistent with the discussion on Bank and Borrower Performance in Section 10.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Design, Implementation, and Utilization

This section should include **separate assessments** of:

(a) **M&E design**—the extent to which adequate indicators were identified to monitor progress toward PDO/GEO using effective collection methods, given the specific PDO/GEO and already available data;

(b) **M&E implementation**—the extent to which appropriate data was actually collected using appropriate collection methods (to ensure data quality); and

(c) **M&E utilization**—where possible to assess this, the extent to which appropriate data was evaluated and used to inform decision-making and resource allocation.

Pay particular attention to the methodological soundness of the M&E arrangements, quality and reliability of the evidence/data used in the ICR, and sustainability of the M&E arrangements beyond the operation's implementation period (e.g., utilization and strengthening of the existing M&E systems and capacity).

Safeguard and Fiduciary Compliance (for IPF & GEF only)

Summarize key **safeguard and fiduciary issues** in the operation, compliance with the Bank policy and procedural requirements, and any problems that arose and their resolution, as applicable.

Record any significant **deviations or waivers** from the Bank safeguards/fiduciary policies and procedures. See related OP/BP:

OP/BP 11.00, *Procurement*
OP/BP 4.00, *Piloting the Use of Borrower Systems to Address Environmental and Social Safety Issues in Bank-Supported Projects*
OP/BP 4.01, *Environmental Assessment*
OP/BP 4.03 Performance Standards for Private Sector Activities
OP/BP 4.04, *Natural Habitats*
OP/BP 4.09, *Pest Management*
OP/BP 4.10, *Indigenous Peoples*
OP/BP 4.11, *Physical Cultural Resources*
OP/BP 4.12, *Involuntary Resettlement*
OP/BP 4.36, *Forests*
OP/BP 4.37, *Safety of Dams*
OP/BP 7.50, *Projects on International Waterways*
OP/BP 7.60, *Projects in Disputed Areas*

Post-completion Operation/Next Phase (for IPF & GEF only)

This section addresses **transition arrangement to post-completion operation** of investments financed by the present operation, operation and maintenance arrangements, and means of sustaining reforms and institutional capacity. It also briefly outlines the **next phase/follow-on operation**, if any.

The section should:

(a) **Describe and evaluate the transition arrangements** for the project's future operation. Depending on the nature of the operation, aspects should include:

- (i) **appropriate technical, financial, commercial, and institutional provisions** to ensure effective project operation;
- (ii) the timely provision of all necessary **inputs**;
- (iii) adequate **budget** provisions;
- (iv) adequate **staffing and management** (including training);
- (v) the implementation of financial, economic ,and other **policies** required for effective operation and maintenance; and
- (vi) the **marketing** of the project's output.

(b) List the **performance indicators** by which the project can be monitored and evaluated in the future and indicate whether an M&E system is or will be in place.

(c) Recommend any **follow-up by the Bank** that might contribute to sustaining benefits, including further monitoring of the project's operation; discuss the desirability of follow-on projects; and suggest the priority and optimum timing of any future impact evaluation.

Expected Next Phase/Follow-up Operation (for DPF only)

This section addresses **transition arrangement to the expected next phase**, if any. Recommend any follow-up by the Bank that might contribute to sustaining benefits, including further monitoring of the program; discuss the desirability of follow-on operations; and suggest the priority and optimum timing of any future impact evaluation.

SECTION 3: ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES

This section assesses and rates the outcomes of operations using the criterion described in Appendix A of the ICR Guidelines, ***Harmonized Evaluation Criteria for ICR and IEG Evaluations***. These criteria are to be used to rate performance in both ICRs and by IEG in its assessments. Staff should take care to understand fully and follow carefully this guidance so that ratings criteria are consistently applied in ICRs.

The outcome rating encompasses institutional development impact, precluding the need for the former separate "Institutional Development Impact" rating.

The **definition of the *Outcome* rating criterion** is: *the extent to which the operation's major relevant objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, efficiently.*

As **the Bank is an objectives-based institution,** achievements against the PDO/GEO are paramount, while restructuring provides opportunity to internalize positive unintended results, or they can be taken into account as additional achievements when convincingly documented.

For programmatic DPF, this section provides outcome ratings for the program based on the overall programmatic series. See Appendix C of the ICR Guidelines for more information.

Relevance of Objectives, Design, and Implementation

The relevance test in the outcome rating definition above requires that **the achievement of objectives is judged by the development priorities and circumstances prevailing *at the time of the ICR*, not those at the time of loan approval**. Relevance refers to the extent to which an operation's objectives, design, or implementation are consistent with the country's current development priorities (and current global priorities for GEF projects) and with current Bank country and sectoral assistance strategies and corporate goals (expressed in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers, CASs/CPFs/CPSes, Sector Strategy Papers, and OPs.)

High overall relevance of objectives confirms that the project/program design reflected proper diagnosis of a development priority that remains relevant. Or, if circumstances changed, the design was changed accordingly to keep objectives fully relevant. **Poor relevance of objectives** may reflect original objectives that differed from those in Poverty Reduction Strategy

Papers, CASs/CPFs/CPSes, Sector Strategy Papers, and OPs at the time of approval,[6] or that some or all the objectives became irrelevant during implementation as priorities changed.[7] **Poor relevance of design** may reflect a project design (e.g., in terms of project components and/or implementation arrangements) that is not consistent with the project's stated objectives.

The assessment of the relevance of objectives ensures, with respect to both accountability and lesson-learning, that the evaluation takes into account whether the Bank's implementation assistance was responsive to changing needs and that **the operation remained important** to achieving country, Bank, and global development objectives (which may change over time). If circumstances have changed significantly during implementation, the ICR should explain whether and how these changes were taken into account (through restructuring or other means) to retain relevance of objectives and design.[8]

Achievement of Project/Program Development Objectives [or Global Environmental Objectives]

Describe the extent to which the operation achieved its development objectives; if the operation has multiple objectives, indicate their relative importance,[9] and describe the achievements objective-by-objective. When the operation has both an overall objective and specific objectives, achievement of each of the specific objectives should be discussed with a comment on (and reasons for) the likelihood of achievement/non-achievement of the overall development objective.

For IPF and GEF operations, focus on the contribution of outputs to achieving the PDO outcomes, with the details of outputs presented in *ICR Annex 4: Outputs by Component.*

For evaluation purposes, **an operation's objectives encompass both the PDO/GEO stated in the PAD/PD and (explicit and implicit) key associated outcome targets**.[10] This means that whenever the stated PDO/GEO are so broad and/or vaguely worded as to preclude any meaningful evaluation, intended objectives are inferred by the evaluator from key associated outcome targets (and/or the operation's design features as most relevant).

While the **Results Framework** provides the grounds for judging achievements, it may be helpful to expand in the text on **causal relationships between the Bank's intervention and outcomes as distinct from other causal factors** (e.g., other interventions, policy changes unrelated to the operation, natural events, and market factors). A common weakness of past

---

[6] For example: (i) the main objective of an agricultural storage project was to modernize and expand the government's storage system, although the agreed sector strategy was to privatize these activities, which thus negated the objective of the project; and (ii) a forestry project expanded government forestry plantations although a sector review had identified that the poor performance of government forest plantations was a major constraint on forestry output.

[7] For example, an industrial credit project aimed to expand the intermediation role of the public bank but subsequent reorganization of the financial sector made public credit unnecessary such that the relevance of the project objectives were rated negligible at evaluation.

[8] The extent to which the Bank's implementation assistance was responsive to the need to make changes during implementation in the interests of relevance is a positive factor in rating Bank Performance in the ICR.

[9] This may not be represented by relative costs; for instance, institutional costs may be small, but the importance of institutional objectives may be high.

[10] Key associated outcome targets refers to measurable or observable outcomes expected by completion (in terms of types of benefits or progress expected for primary target groups), as well as any indications of their scale and scope (which are normally captured in key indicators in the PAD/PD).

ICRs has been failure to establish causal linkage between the operation and claimed benefits—to the exclusion of other events that might have generated benefits for the same target groups.

Efficiency (for IPF and GEF only)

Efficiency in the Outcome rating for operations asks **whether the costs involved in achieving project objectives were reasonable in comparison with both the benefits and with recognized norms ("value for money").** Details may be presented in *ICR Annex 5: Economic and Financial Analysis*.

The analysis should discuss both the traditional measures of efficiency (as applicable and practical)—e.g., net present value, economic rate of return, cost effectiveness, unit rate norms, service standards, least cost analysis and comparisons, and financial rate of return—and aspects of design and implementation that either contributed to or reduced efficiency. The ICR should also indicate the components, and the percentage of total project costs, covered by any such analyses (noting any differences from the analyses at appraisal).

Further guidance is found in Appendix G of the ICR Guidelines.

Justification of Overall Outcome Rating

Using the evaluation criteria and guidance in Appendix A of the ICR Guidelines, rate the overall Outcome of the operation in the six-point scale—**combining relevance of objectives/design, achievement of development objectives, and (in the case of IPF and GEF) efficiency**—and provide justification. The outcome rating should be consistent with the detailed achievements against key quantitative and qualitative performance indicators provided in *ICR Annex 1: Results Framework Analysis*.

The *Outcome* criterion includes the possibility of entering "*Not-rated,"* largely to allow for cases where IEG judges the ICR to lack information or to be so ambiguous as to make a regular rating unsound. This should not be the case for ICR ratings by ICR teams except in extraordinary circumstances (e.g., war, insecurity, and natural disasters).[11]

For programmatic DPF, this section provides Outcome ratings for the program based on the overall programmatic series. See Appendix C of the ICR Guidelines for more information. For GEF blend operations, provide justifications for both Outcome and GEO Outcome ratings.

For those operations where there was a **formal change in PDO/GEO or key associated outcome targets (approved by the Board),**[12] see Appendix B of the ICR Guidelines for the evaluation method for determining the outcome rating—taking into account both the original and formally revised objectives or targets. Record subratings in *ICR Annex 2: Restructuring*.

The outcome of restructured projects where neither the PDO/GEO nor key associated outcome targets have been formally revised will continue to be assessed against the (unchanged) original objectives and targets.

---

[11] The use of *Not-rated* in ICRs requires prior consultation with OPCS (contact "OPCS Advisory Service").

[12] Key associated outcome targets refers to measurable or observable outcomes expected by completion (in terms of types of benefits or progress expected for primary target groups), as well as any indications of their scale and scope.

Overarching Themes, Other Outcomes and Impacts (if any)

(a) Poverty Impacts, Gender Aspects, and Social Development

To the extent not previously covered, if any, assess **the operation's positive or negative effects on the population or its subgroup(s) (including unintended or unexpected) with regard to the Bank's social objectives**. Discuss whether the effects were foreseeable, identify causes of success or shortcomings, and assess how they will affect the future operation of the project.

An operation's **poverty reduction impact** is assessed by: (i) evaluating the extent to which project benefits reached the target group identified in the PDO/GEO; (ii) providing information on the operation's positive or negative effect on poverty, and (iii) examining possible leakage of benefits (i.e., what percentage of the actual beneficiaries are the "poor," "absolute poor," or "relative poor," or other terms used in the PDO/GEO) in comparison with the operation's objectives.

(b) Institutional Change/Strengthening

To the extent not previously covered, if any, discuss the operation's effect and impacts (intended or unintended, positive or negative) on **institutional development**, particularly longer-term development of the country's capacity and institutions.

(c) Other Unintended Outcomes and Impacts

To the extent not previously covered, if any, discuss other outcomes and impacts that were not intended, whether they are positive or negative. Unintended positive outcomes should be shown to be causally linked to the intervention being assessed, as distinct from positive changes in the operation's environment that can be linked to other factors at work or to other interventions.

Summary of Findings of Beneficiary Survey and/or Stakeholder Workshops

This section is required for an Intensive Learning ICR (ILI) (see Appendix D of the ICR Guidelines on ILIs) and optional for a Core ICR.

Briefly summarize the findings of beneficiary surveys and/or stakeholder workshops, with details in the respective *ICR Annexes*.

SECTION 4: ASSESSMENT OF RISK TO DEVELOPMENT OUTCOME

This section assesses and rates the ***Risk to Development Outcome*** of the operation using the criteria described in Appendix A of the ICR Guidelines, ***Harmonized Evaluation Criteria for ICR and IEG Evaluations.*** These criteria are to be used to rate performance in both ICRs and by IEG in its assessments. Staff should take care to understand fully and follow carefully this guidance so that ratings criteria are consistently applied in ICRs.

The *Risk to Development Outcome* rating replaced the earlier "Sustainability" rating.

The **definition of the *Risk to Development Outcome* rating criterion** is: *the risk, at the time of evaluation, that development outcomes (or expected outcomes) will not be maintained (or realized).*

The *Risk to Development Outcome* criterion includes the possibility of entering "*Non-evaluable,*" largely to allow for cases where IEG judges the ICR to lack information or to be so ambiguous as to make a regular rating unsound. This should not be the case for ICR ratings by ICR teams except in extraordinary circumstances (e.g., war, insecurity and natural disasters).[13]

Rating the *Risk to Development Outcome* requires an assessment of the uncertainties faced by an operation over its expected remaining useful life and whether adequate arrangements are in place to help avoid or mitigate the impact of those uncertainties. This rating helps to identify operations that require close attention in managing risks that may affect the long-term flow of net benefits.

For programmatic DPL, this section provides risk to development outcome ratings for the program based on the overall programmatic series. See Appendix C of the ICR Guidelines for more information. For GEF blend operations, provide justifications for both Risk to Development Outcome and Risk to GEO Outcome ratings.

SECTION 5: ASSESSMENT OF BANK AND BORROWER PERFORMANCE

This section assesses and rates ***Bank* and *Borrower Performance*** using the respective criteria described in Appendix A of the ICR Guidelines, ***Harmonized Evaluation Criteria for ICR and IEG Evaluations***. These criteria are to be used to rate performance in both ICRs and by IEG in its assessments. Staff should take care to understand fully and follow carefully this guidance so that ratings criteria are consistently applied in ICRs.

Bank Performance

Assess and rate Bank performance using the detailed guidance in Appendix A of the ICR Guidelines. For a **Note on Cancelled Operation**, only the rating for overall Bank Performance is entered and justified in the text.

The **definition of the *Bank Performance* rating criterion** is: *the extent to which services provided by the Bank ensured quality at entry of the operation and supported effective implementation through appropriate supervision (including ensuring adequate transition arrangements for regular operation of supported activities after loan/credit closing), toward the achievement of development outcomes.*

Bank Performance is rated by assessing **two dimensions**: (i) Bank performance in ensuring quality at entry; and (ii) quality of Bank supervision. Bank performance in ensuring Quality at Entry refers to the extent to which the Bank identified, facilitated preparation of, and appraised the operation such that it was most likely to achieve planned development outcomes and was

[13] The use of *Non-evaluable* in ICRs requires prior consultation with OPCS (contact "OPCS Advisory Service").

consistent with the Bank's fiduciary role. The quality of Bank supervision refers to the extent to which the Bank proactively identified and resolved threats to the achievement of relevant development outcomes and the Bank's fiduciary role.

Any performance ratings by QAG should be discussed here from the Region's perspective.

For programmatic DPF, this section provides Bank performance ratings for the program based on the overall programmatic series. See Appendix D of the ICR Guidelines for more information. For GEF blend operations, one common set of ratings are provided for both IBRD/IDA and GEF parts.

Borrower Performance

Assess and rate Borrower performance using the detailed guidance in Appendix A of the ICR Guidelines. For a **Note on Cancelled Operation**, only the rating for overall Borrower Performance is entered and justified in the text.

The **definition of the *Borrower Performance* rating criterion** is: *the extent to which the borrower (including the government and implementing agency or agencies) ensured quality of preparation and implementation, and complied with covenants and agreements, toward the achievement of development outcomes.*

Borrower Performance is rated by assessing two dimensions: (i) government performance (central and/or subnational government as applicable, which is normally the borrower of the loan/credit); and (ii) the performance of the implementing agency or agencies. In a limited number of cases **where the government and implementing agency are indistinguishable**, particularly for DPF operations, only an overall rating is necessary. When the implementing agency is a sector ministry or other government agency, "government performance" normally refers to the central apex authority which, for example, may have policy and financing responsibilities for the project, e.g., the ministry of finance. The implementing agency (although it may be a government entity itself) is distinguished from that central part of government by being responsible for the day-to-day management of project activities.

For programmatic DPF, this section provides borrower performance ratings for the program based on the overall programmatic series. See Appendix C of the ICR Guidelines for more information. For GEF blend operations, one common set of ratings are provided for both IBRD/IDA and GEF parts.

SECTION 6: LESSONS LEARNED

Drawing on the descriptions and analysis in earlier sections of the operation's design, implementation, and outcome, and on the assessments of Bank, borrower, and stakeholder performances, this section should present briefly the most **significant positive and negative lessons** learned from the operation's experience. The ICR should indicate how these lessons are reflected in the arrangements for post-completion operation of the investments financed, follow-up operations, and/or any other next steps. The ICR should also suggest which of the lessons have general applicability for similar operations in the sector/subsector, the country, or other countries.

A **Note of Cancelled Operation** should indicate lessons and implications to the future operations in the sector/country, or to any Bank operations or engagements in general.

Appendix H of the ICR Guidelines provides additional guidance for deriving lessons.

SECTION 7: COMMENTS ON ISSUES RAISED BY BORROWER/IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES/PARTNERS

This section responds to any issues raised in the comments of the borrower, implementing agency, cofinanciers, and other partners attached in the respective ICR Annexes.

6. GUIDELINES FOR ICR ANNEXES

Project Costs and Financing (for IPF & GEF only)

(a) Project Cost by Component

List the component(s), and enter the estimated total project costs at appraisal and the actual total costs (or the latest estimates) by component in US million dollars (including all sources of funds). Enter the amount of Physical and Price Contingencies (for appraisal estimate), Project Preparation Facility, and/or Front-end fee, as applicable. Calculate and enter the totals and percentages.

(b) Financing

Enter all sources of funds for the project/program, including the government ("Borrower"), IBRD, IDA, GEF or other trust funds, other types of cofinancing, as applicable, as well as the estimated financing at appraisal and the actual levels (or the latest estimates) by source in US million dollars. **The total of all financing should match the total in the previous section, *(a) Project Cost by Component*.**

Indicate a type of cofinancing if the source of funds is **cofinancing**—by donor governments and agencies, multilateral financing institutions (e.g., UN agencies, regional development banks), or private financiers (e.g., commercial banks, insurance companies).

Cofinancing is normally categorized in one of the following two ways: (i) **parallel cofinancing**, in which the Bank and cofinancier(s) finance different goods and services or different parts of a project; or (ii) **joint cofinancing**, in which the Bank and cofinancier(s) disburse in agreed proportions against a common list of goods and services (so-called "**pooled financing**" belongs to this category). (For more information see OP/BP 14.20, *Cofinancing).*

A cofinancier may make its grant funds available directly to the recipient country under a grant agreement or through a trust fund administered by the World Bank in accordance with the terms and an agreement with a donor (both channeling methods can be parallel or joint financing depending on what they finance). For more information on trust funds, see OP/BP 14.40, *Trust Funds*.

Outputs by Component (for IPF & GEF only)

This Annex provides a place for additional information and discussion on an operation's outputs to support the discussion in *Section 3: Assessment of Outcomes,* including any attribution issues between outputs and outcomes. Provide a comprehensive account of qualitative and quantitative information of all the outputs that have been realized (or have not been realized) under the project. Use of a table to list all the key outputs would be a good practice.[14]

Output targets should be assessed against those set out in the PAD or as modified under restructuring(s) of the operation. If the original outputs targets have not been realized, or the targets have been changed during the implementation, provide explanations.

Following previous custom, to assist analysis of achievement of objectives the discussion (and supporting data) may provide separate evaluations and ratings of achievements by components listed in PADs, as applicable, such as: (a) macroeconomic policies, (b) sector policies, (c) physical objectives, (d) financial objectives, and (e) institutional development and capacity building. However, achievements by component are not a substitute for the analysis of achievement of objectives.

Economic and Financial Analysis (for IPF & GEF only)

This Annex provides the details of the economic and financial analysis reported in *Section 8.3: Efficiency*, including on cost effectiveness measures or other indicators of efficiency. Further guidance is provided in Appendix G of the ICR Guidelines.

Bank Lending and Implementation Support/Supervision Process

(a) Task Team Members

This section provides a full list of task team members involved in the operation as well as their areas of specialty/responsibilities, as an indication of the Bank's inputs and staffing level.

List all the staff members who worked in the task teams during preparation (Lending), supervision, and completion reporting. Provide their specific areas of responsibilities/specialty, if not self-explanatory by their titles (e.g., task team leader, M&E, economic analysis, poverty targeting component). Some names are entered by the system as available in the system (e.g., the Task Team Members section of all archived ISRs), with their current unit and titles. Confirm or change the names entered by the system as appropriate.

For programmatic DPF, this section will have multiple entries, where applicable, to include relevant data on each individual operation in the programmatic series.

(c) Staff Time and Cost

[14] The IDA14 Results Measurement System includes aggregate progress on selected outputs in four sectors—health, education, transport, and water and sanitation. Outputs are aggregated from information presented in the ICRs. For more information, see *IDA14 Results Measurement System: Mid-Term Review Report* (November 2006).

As an indication of the Bank's financial and staff time inputs to the operation, this section shows the number of staff weeks and the amount of Bank's Administrative Budget spent for preparation and supervision/completion of this operation by fiscal year. At the time of creation of the ICR in the Portal, the system pulls data as available in the system.

For programmatic DPF, this section will have multiple entries, where applicable, to include relevant data on each individual operation in the programmatic series.

Beneficiary Survey Results (if any)

Beneficiary Survey and/or Stakeholder Workshop are required for an Intensive Learning ICR (ILI) (see Appendix D of the ICR Guidelines on ILIs) and are optional for a Core ICR.

If applicable, provide a short description of a beneficiary survey and discuss its major findings, and/or attach a file. In the final (or printable) ICR in MS-WORD, the attachment will be a separate file and should be inserted at the end of all the ICR Annexes.

Stakeholder Workshop Report and Results (if any)

Beneficiary Survey and/or Stakeholder Workshop are required for an ILI (see Appendix D of the ICR Guidelines on ILIs) but are optional for a Core ICR.

If applicable, provide a short description of a stakeholder workshop, including a list of participants and a summary of the results, and/or attach a file. In the final (or printable) ICR in MS-WORD, the attachment will be a separate file and should be inserted at the end of all the ICR Annexes.

Summary of Borrower's ICR and/or Comments on Draft ICR

The full text of the **borrower's completion report** is attached as a file if it is 10 pages or less, or the borrower's summary is attached. If the borrower's report is longer than 10 pages and does not contain a summary, the task team prepares a summary. The full text of any **borrower comments** on the draft ICR is also included in this Annex.

In the final (or printable) ICR in MS-WORD, the attachment will be a separate file, and should be inserted at the end of all the ICR Annexes. (Only one file can be attached to this Annex.)

Comments of Cofinanciers and Other Partners/Stakeholders

Summarize the feedback or comments on the draft ICR from cofinanciers and/or other partners/stakeholders, if any, or attach the full text as a file if it is 10 pages or less (one file can be attached). In the final (or printable) ICR in MS-WORD, the attachment will be a separate file and should be inserted at the end of all the ICR Annexes.

List of Supporting Documents

List the title and reference (date, report number, etc.) of key documents (e.g., PCN, PAD/PD, environmental assessments, resettlement plans, Letter of Development Policy, Tranche Release Document, technical reports/studies, evaluation reports) that provide more information on the operation and can be used as resources by ICR readers.

Additional Annexes (Optional)

If necessary, additional annexes could be added at the end of the standard ICR Annexes. Using the Style function of MS-WORD, the title of each additional Annex should be defined as “Heading 2” in order to be included in the Table of Contents, and the Table of Contents needs to be regenerated.

ICR GUIDELINES

APPENDICES

HARMONIZED EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETION AND RESULTS REPORT (ICR) AND INDEPENDENT EVALUATION GROUP (IEG) EVALUATIONS[1]

1. OUTCOME

Definition: *the extent to which the operation's major relevant objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, efficiently.*

Guidance

- The outcome rating completes the series of project/program development objective (PDO) ratings used in Implementation Status and Results Reports (ISRs).

- For evaluation purposes, an operation's objectives encompass both the PDOs stated in board documents and key associated outcome targets.[2] This means that whenever the PDOs stated in the board documents are so broad and/or vaguely worded as to preclude any meaningful evaluation, intended objectives are inferred by the evaluator from key associated outcome targets (and/or the operation's design features as relevant).

- The rating of O*utcome* should encompass the extent to which the operation's institutional objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, efficiently.

- Shortcomings in the achievement of objectives may have to do with either the *number* of objectives that are not achieved (or are not expected to be achieved) and/or the *extent* to which one or more objectives are not achieved (or are not expected to be achieved).

- Shortcomings in efficiency may have to do with the extent to which the operation fails to achieve (or is not expected to achieve) a return higher than the opportunity cost of capital, and is not the least cost alternative (this criterion may not apply for DPF operations).

- Shortcomings in relevance may have to do with the extent to which an operation's objectives, design, or implementation are inconsistent with the country's current development priorities and with current Bank country and sectoral assistance strategies and corporate goals (expressed in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers, Country Assistance/Partnership Strategies/Frameworks, Sector Strategy Papers, and Bank Operational Policies).[3]

---

[1] These guidelines apply to both investment and development policy lending. They were developed by a working group comprising staff from OPCS, IEG and the Regions.

[2] As the Bank is an objectives-based institution achievements against the PDO are paramount, while restructuring provides opportunity to internalize positive unintended results, or they can be taken into account as additional achievements if convincingly documented.

[3] The ICR Guidelines and IEG practice have been identical on this point for some years. It is important to ensure that achievement of objectives reflects continuing priorities at the PDO level, not out-of-date priorities that should have triggered restructuring.

- The evaluator must use judgment in weighing possible shortcomings in the achievement of the operation's objectives, in its efficiency, or in its relevance, and arrive at an assessment of how they affect the overall rating.

Rating Scale[4]

Highly Satisfactory	There were **no** shortcomings in the operation's achievement of its objectives, in its efficiency, or in its relevance.
Satisfactory	There were **minor** shortcomings in the operation's achievement of its objectives, in its efficiency, or in its relevance.
Moderately Satisfactory	There were **moderate** shortcomings in the operation's achievement of its objectives, in its efficiency, or in its relevance.
Moderately Unsatisfactory	There were **significant** shortcomings in the operation's achievement of its objectives, in its efficiency, or in its relevance.
Unsatisfactory	There were **major** shortcomings in the operation's achievement of its objectives, in its efficiency, or in its relevance.
Highly Unsatisfactory	There were **severe** shortcomings in the operation's achievement of its objectives, in its efficiency, or in its relevance.

In the rare instances where lack of sufficient information or other circumstances make it impossible to assign one of the above ratings, "*Not-rated*" should be recorded.

2. RISK TO DEVELOPMENT OUTCOME

Definition: *the risk, at the time of evaluation, that development outcomes (or expected outcomes) will not be maintained (or realized).*

Guidance

The *Risk to Development Outcome* rating has two dimensions:

(i) the likelihood that some changes may occur that are detrimental to the ultimate achievement of the operation's development outcome; and

[4] In the guidance for these evaluation criteria links will be provided to ICRs and IEG evaluations to demonstrate examples of the application of the ratings' definitions to real cases.

(ii) the impact on the operation's development outcomes of some or all of these changes materializing.

Some risks are internal or specific to an operation. They are primarily related to the suitability of the operation's design to its operating environment.

Other risks arise from factors outside the operation, be they country level such as price changes or global such as technological advances. The impact on outcomes of a change in the operating environment depends on the severity and nature of the change as well as the adaptability (or lack there of) of the operation's design to withstand that change.

The rating helps to identify operations that require close attention in managing risks that may affect the long-term flow of net benefits. Rating the *Risk to Development Outcome* requires an assessment of the uncertainties faced by an operation over its expected remaining useful life and whether adequate arrangements are in place to help avoid or mitigate the impact of those uncertainties. The impact will increase if the design or implementation of the operation is not well aligned with the operating environment, or mitigation measures are inappropriate to deal with foreseeable risks.

Whereas the *Outcome* rating reflects the evaluator's best estimate of the expected overall development outcome, the *Risk to Development Outcome* rating reflects the evaluator's judgment of the uncertainties faced by the operation's development outcomes over its expected remaining useful life, taking account of any risk mitigation measures already in place at the time of evaluation. *Risk to Development Outcome* says nothing about the absolute level of the expected net benefits. So, for example, an operation can have a high expected rate of return and a satisfactory outcome but the R*isk to Development Outcome* may be high in its particular operating environment.

Criteria

The overall *Risk to Development Outcome* is rated by assessing both the probability and likely impact of various threats to outcomes, taking into account how these have been mitigated in the operation's design or by actions taken during its initial implementation. The evaluator should take account of the operational, sector, and country context in weighing (in each case) the relative importance of these individual criteria of risk as it may affect planned outcomes.

- Technical (e.g., where innovative technology and systems are involved);
- Financial (including the robustness of financial flows and financial viability);
- Economic (both at country and global level);
- Social (e.g., in terms of the strength of stakeholder support and/or mitigation of any negative social impacts);
- Political (e.g., volatility of political situation);
- Environmental (including both positive and negative impacts);

- Government ownership/commitment (e.g., continuation of supportive policies and any budgetary provisions);
- Other stakeholder ownership (e.g., from private sector/civil society);
- Institutional support (e.g., from project entities, and/or related to legal/legislative framework);
- Governance; and
- Natural disasters exposure

Rating Scale

Taking into account the above, the overall *Risk to Development Outcome* ─ *the risk at the time of evaluation that development outcomes (or expected outcomes) will not be maintained (or realized)* ─ should be rated using the following four-point scale:

(i) *Negligible to Low*
(ii) Moderate
(iii) Significant
(iv) High

Whenever lack of sufficient information or other circumstances make it impossible to assign one of the above ratings, "*Non-evaluable*" should be recorded.

3. BANK PERFORMANCE

Definition: *the extent to which services provided by the Bank ensured quality at entry of the operation and supported effective implementation through appropriate supervision (including ensuring adequate transition arrangements for regular operation of supported activities after loan/credit closing), toward the achievement of development outcomes.*

Dimensions

Bank Performance is rated by assessing two dimensions: (i) Bank performance in ensuring quality at entry; and (ii) quality of Bank supervision. Quality at Entry refers to the extent to which the Bank identified, facilitated preparation of, and appraised the operation such that it was most likely to achieve planned development outcomes and was consistent with the Bank's fiduciary role. Quality of supervision refers to the extent to which the Bank proactively identified and resolved threats to the achievement of relevant development outcomes and the Bank's fiduciary role.

The lists of assessment criteria below are taken from QAG's criteria for QEA7 and QSA6, which may be seen in full here.

(1) Ensuring Quality at Entry

Criteria

Bank performance is rated against the following criteria, as applicable to a particular operation. The evaluator should take account of the operational, sector, and country context in weighing the relative importance of each criterion of quality at entry as it affected outcomes.

- Strategic Relevance and Approach
- Technical, Financial and Economic Aspects (for investment lending operations)
- Structural, Financial and Macro-economic Aspects (for development policy lending operations)
- Poverty, Gender and Social Development Aspects
- Environmental Aspects
- Fiduciary Aspects
- Policy and Institutional Aspects
- Implementation Arrangements
- Monitoring and Evaluation Arrangements
- Risk Assessment
- Bank Inputs and Processes.

Rating Scale

With respect to the relevant criteria that would enhance development outcomes and the Bank's fiduciary role, rate Bank performance in ensuring Quality at Entry using the following scale:

Highly Satisfactory	There were **no** shortcomings in identification, preparation, or appraisal.
Satisfactory	There were **minor** shortcomings in identification, preparation, or appraisal
Moderately Satisfactory	There were **moderate** shortcomings in identification, preparation, or appraisal
Moderately Unsatisfactory	There were **significant** shortcomings in identification, preparation, or appraisal
Unsatisfactory	There were **major** shortcomings in identification, preparation, or appraisal

Highly Unsatisfactory	There were **severe** shortcomings in identification, preparation, or appraisal

(2) Quality of Supervision

Criteria

Bank performance is rated against the following criteria, as applicable to a particular operation. The evaluator should take account of the operational, sector, and country context in weighing the relative importance of each criterion of quality of supervision as it affected outcomes.

- Focus on Development Impact
- Supervision of Fiduciary and Safeguard Aspects (when applicable)
- Adequacy of Supervision Inputs and Processes
- Candor and Quality of Performance Reporting
- Role in Ensuring Adequate Transition Arrangements (for regular operation of supported activities after Loan/Credit closing)

Rating Scale

With respect to relevant criteria that would enhance development outcomes and the Bank's fiduciary role, rate Quality of Supervision using the following scale:

Highly Satisfactory	There were **no** shortcomings in the proactive identification of opportunities and resolution of threats.
Satisfactory	There were **minor** shortcomings in the proactive identification of opportunities and resolution of threats.
Moderately Satisfactory	There were **moderate** shortcomings in the proactive identification of opportunities and resolution of threats.
Moderately Unsatisfactory	There were **significant** shortcomings in the proactive identification of opportunities and resolution of threats.
Unsatisfactory	There were **major** shortcomings in the proactive identification of opportunities and resolution of threats.
Highly Unsatisfactory	There were **severe** shortcomings in the proactive identification of opportunities and resolution of threats.

Rating of Overall Bank Performance

The rating of overall *Bank Performance* is based on the ratings for each of the two dimensions: (i) Bank performance in ensuring quality at entry; and (ii) the quality of supervision. Quality at entry and quality of supervision should each be rated using their respective six-point rating scales, and for transparency, the individual ratings for quality at entry and quality of supervision should be presented separately. The quality at entry and quality of supervision ratings should be combined into a rating of overall *Bank Performance*. Ratings for the more common combinations of ratings of quality at entry and quality of supervision are provided below, followed by additional guidance on other combinations.

Highly Satisfactory	Bank performance was rated Highly Satisfactory on both dimensions.
Satisfactory	Bank performance was rated Satisfactory on both dimensions, OR was rated Satisfactory on one dimension and Highly Satisfactory on the other dimension.
Moderately Satisfactory	Bank performance was rated Moderately Satisfactory on both dimensions, OR was rated Moderately Satisfactory on one dimension and Satisfactory or Highly Satisfactory on the other dimension. (Also see guidance below.)
Moderately Unsatisfactory	Bank performance was rated Moderately Unsatisfactory on both dimensions. (Also see guidance below.)
Unsatisfactory	Bank performance was rated Unsatisfactory on both dimensions, OR was rated Unsatisfactory on one dimension and Moderately Unsatisfactory on the other dimension.
Highly Unsatisfactory	Bank performance was rated Highly Unsatisfactory on both dimensions, or was rated Moderately Unsatisfactory or Unsatisfactory on one dimension and Highly Unsatisfactory on the other dimension.

Guidance

When the rating for one dimension is in the satisfactory range while the rating for the other dimension is in the unsatisfactory range, the rating for overall *Bank Performance* normally depends on the *Outcome* rating. Thus, overall *Bank Performance* is rated *Moderately Satisfactory* IF *Outcome* is rated in the satisfactory range or *Moderately Unsatisfactory* IF *Outcome* is rated in the unsatisfactory range, except when Bank performance did not significantly affect the particular outcome.

4. BORROWER PERFORMANCE

Definition: *the extent to which the borrower (including the government and implementing agency or agencies) ensured quality of preparation and implementation, and complied with covenants and agreements, toward the achievement of development outcomes.*

Dimensions

Borrower Performance is rated by assessing two dimensions: (i) government performance (central and/or local government as relevant); and (ii) implementing agency or agencies performance. Where the government and implementing agency are indistinguishable, particularly for development policy financing operations, only an overall rating is necessary taking into account relevant criteria from both lists below.

(1) Government Performance

Government performance is rated against the following criteria, as applicable to a particular operation. The evaluator should take account of the operational, sector, and country context in weighing the relative importance of each criterion of Government Performance as it affected outcomes.

Criteria

- Government ownership and commitment to achieving development objectives
- Enabling environment including supportive macro, sectoral, and institutional policies (legislation, regulatory and pricing reforms, etc.)
- Adequacy of beneficiary/stakeholder consultations and involvement
- Readiness for implementation, implementation arrangements and capacity, and appointment of key staff
- Timely resolution of implementation issues
- Fiduciary (financial management, governance, provision of counterpart funding, procurement, reimbursements, compliance with covenants)
- Adequacy of monitoring and evaluation arrangements, including the utilization of M&E data in decision-making and resource allocation
- Relationships and coordination with donors/ partners/stakeholders
- Adequacy of transition arrangements for regular operation of supported activities after Loan/Credit closing.

Rating Scale

With respect to the relevant criteria either in identifying opportunities for, or resolving threats to, development outcomes or sustainability, rate government performance using the following scale:

Highly Satisfactory	There were **no** shortcomings in government performance
Satisfactory	There were **minor** shortcomings in government performance

Moderately Satisfactory	There were **moderate** shortcomings in government performance
Moderately Unsatisfactory	There were **significant** shortcomings in government performance
Unsatisfactory	There were **major** shortcomings in government performance
Highly Unsatisfactory	There were **severe** shortcomings in government performance

(2) Implementing Agency/Agencies' Performance

Implementing agency/agencies' performance is rated against the following criteria, as applicable to a particular operation. The evaluator should take account of the operational, sector, and country context in weighing the relative importance of each criterion of agency performance as it affected outcomes.

Criteria

- Agency commitment to achieving development objectives
- Adequacy of beneficiary/stakeholder consultations and involvement
- Readiness for implementation, implementation arrangements and appointment of key staff
- Timely resolution of implementation issues
- Fiduciary (financial management, governance, procurement, reimbursements, compliance with covenants)
- Adequacy of monitoring and evaluation arrangements, including the utilization of M&E data in decision-making and resource allocation
- Relationships and coordination with partners/stakeholders
- Adequacy of transition arrangements for regular operation of project supported activities after Loan/Credit closing

Rating Scale

With respect to the relevant criteria either in identifying opportunities for, or resolving threats to, development outcomes or sustainability, rate implementing agency performance using the following scale:

Highly Satisfactory	There were **no** shortcomings in implementing agency or agencies' performance

Satisfactory	There were **minor** shortcomings in implementing agency or agencies' performance
Moderately Satisfactory	There were **moderate** shortcomings in implementing agency or agencies' performance
Moderately Unsatisfactory	There were **significant** shortcomings in implementing agency or agencies' performance
Unsatisfactory	There were **major** shortcomings in implementing agency or agencies' performance
Highly Unsatisfactory	There were **severe** shortcomings in implementing agency or agencies' performance

Rating of Overall Borrower Performance

The rating of *Borrower Performance* is based on the ratings for each of the two dimensions: (i) government performance; and (ii) implementing agency or agencies' performance. Government performance and implementing agency or agencies' performance should each be rated using their respective six-point rating scales, and for transparency, the individual ratings for them should be presented separately. The ratings for government performance and implementing agency or agencies' performance should be combined into a rating of *Borrower Performance*. Ratings for the more common combinations of the ratings for government and implementing agency performance are provided below, followed by additional guidance on other combinations.

Highly Satisfactory	Performance was rated *Highly Satisfactory* on both dimensions.
Satisfactory	Performance was rated *Satisfactory* on both dimensions, OR was rated *Satisfactory* on one dimension and *Highly Satisfactory* on the other dimension.
Moderately Satisfactory	Performance was rated *Moderately Satisfactory* on both dimensions, OR was rated *Moderately Satisfactory* on one dimension and *Satisfactory* or *Highly Satisfactory* on the other dimension. (Also see guidance below.)
Moderately Unsatisfactory	Performance was rated *Moderately Unsatisfactory* on both dimensions. (Also see guidance below.)
Unsatisfactory	Performance was rated *Unsatisfactory* on both dimensions, OR was rated *Unsatisfactory* on one dimension and *Moderately Unsatisfactory* on the other dimension.
Highly Unsatisfactory	Performance was rated *Highly Unsatisfactory* on both dimensions, OR was rated *Moderately Unsatisfactory* or *Unsatisfactory* on one dimension and *Highly Unsatisfactory* on the other dimension.

Guidance

When the rating for one dimension is in the satisfactory range while the rating for the other dimension is in the unsatisfactory range, the rating of overall *Borrower Performance normally* depends on the *Outcome* rating. Thus, overall *Borrower Performance* is rated *Moderately Satisfactory* IF *Outcome* is rated in the satisfactory range, or *Moderately Unsatisfactory* IF *Outcome* is rated in the unsatisfactory range, except when Borrower performance did not significantly affect the particular outcome.

10/06/05

RATING THE OUTCOME OF PROJECTS WITH FORMALLY REVISED OBJECTIVES

Joint Guidelines for Use in Implementation Completion and Results Report (ICR) and Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) Assessments

Application

These guidelines concern a subset of restructured projects (i.e., those whose objectives have been formally revised). The outcome of restructured projects where neither the project/program development objectives (PDOs) nor key associated outcome targets have been formally revised will continue to be assessed against the (unchanged) original project objectives and targets.

Principle

For projects whose project objectives (as encompassed by the stated PDOs and key associated outcome targets) have been formally revised – through approval by the Bank authority that approved the original loans/credits/grants – project outcome will be assessed against both the original and revised project objectives. To assist in arriving at an overall outcome rating following this principle, separate outcome ratings (against original and revised project objectives) will be weighted in proportion to the share of actual loan/credit disbursements made in the periods before and after approval of the revision.

Rationale

The rationale for the above is based on the following:

- The Bank uses an objective-based evaluation methodology whereby project outcome is evaluated against the project objectives for which Bank funds have been approved.

- If substantial changes to the original project objectives and/or key associated outcome targets are required, such changes must be approved by the same authority that approved the original loans/credits/grants.

- For accountability purposes, the evaluation of project performance should take into account performance both before and after the revision of project objectives. Weighting pre- and post-revision performance by the share of actual loan disbursements before and after the revision took place is both practical and transparent, and at the same time rewards early revision.

Evaluation Approach

- Rate project outcome against the original project objectives and against the revised project objectives, respectively.

- Assign a value for each rating*: Highly Satisfactory*=6, *Satisfactory*=5, *Moderately Satisfactory*=4, *Moderately Unsatisfactory*=3, *Unsatisfactory*=2, and *Highly Unsatisfactory*=1.

- Derive the actual total Bank/IDA disbursements before and after the date when the revised project objectives were formally approved.

- Arrive at an overall rating by weighting the two ratings by the proportion of actual total disbursement in each period, and rounding to the nearest whole number (1 to 6).

Examples

Formal approval was obtained for a change in the project objectives of a project with a loan of $115 million when $20 million was disbursed. It then performed quite well and closed with an additional $80 million disbursed ($15 million was cancelled). The project was rated *Unsatisfactory* against the original project objectives (with a weighted value 2 x 0.2 = 0.4), while it was rated *Satisfactory* against the revised project objectives (with a weighted value 5 x 0.8 = 4.0), making a weighted average score of 0.4 + 4.0 = 4.4, that is *Moderately Satisfactory* with rounding. (In comparison, had the project been rated *Highly Satisfactory* with the revised objectives, the weighted value is 6 x 0.8 = 4.8 and the weighted overall outcome value is 0.4 + 4.8 = 5.2, or *Satisfactory* with rounding.)

Notes

- For evaluation purposes, a project's objectives encompass both the PDOs stated in project documents and key associated outcome targets. This means that whenever the PDOs stated in project documents are so broad and/or vaguely worded as to preclude any meaningful evaluation, intended project objectives are inferred by the evaluator from key associated outcome targets (and/or project design features as relevant).

- During project implementation, task teams are expected to continuously monitor the current relevance of the project objectives and the likelihood of achieving them, and when needed should take action to restructure the project. If such restructuring implies a change in the stated PDO and/or key associated outcome targets of a project (e.g., as a result of the cancellation of major project components), they should be revised and the revisions should be formally approved by the authority that approved the original loan/credit/grant.

Attachment (OPCS & IEG 1/12/2005)

Attachment to the Guidelines for Outcome Rating of Projects with Formally Revised Project Objectives

Additional Examples

The tables below illustrate calculations for three examples to demonstrate how the weighting system works with early or late revision of project objectives (disbursements of 20 percent and 60 percent). Only cases with “crossover” ratings (crossing from below to above the S-U line) are included, not the simple cases where the project with revised PDOs is also rated below the line, or where the project had an above-the-line rating (since it was doing well) but whose objectives were formally revised in response to a higher or changing priority. Also, the two most common ‘crossover’ scenarios are selected – *Unsatisfactory* rating against original PDOs but *Satisfactory* or *Moderately Satisfactory* ratings with revised PDOs.

1. A Poorly Performing Project <u>Performs Well</u> After <u>Early</u> Revision of Project Objectives

		Against Original PDOs	**Against Revised PDOs**	**Overall**	**Comments**
1.	Rating	*Unsatisfactory*	*Satisfactory*	-	Significant improvement
2.	Rating value	2	5	-	
3.	Weight (% disbursed before/after PDO change)	20%	80%	100%	
4.	Weighted value (2 x 3)	0.4	4.0	4.4	
5.	Final rating (rounded)	-	-	*Moderately Satisfactory*	Early revision results in “above the line” overall rating

2. A Poorly Performing Project <u>Performs Well</u> After <u>Late</u> Revision of Project Objectives

		Against Original PDOs	Against Revised PDOs	Overall	Comments
1.	Rating	*Unsatisfactory*	*Satisfactory*	-	Significant improvement
2.	Rating value	2	5	-	
3.	Weight (% disbursed before/after PDO change)	60%	40%	100%	
4.	Weighted value (2 x 3)	1.2	2.0	3.2	
5.	Final rating (rounded)	-	-	*Moderately Unsatisfactory*	Delayed revision keeps rating "below the line"

3. A Poorly Performing Project <u>Improves Marginally</u> After <u>Early</u> Revision of Project Objectives

		Against Original PDOs	Against Revised PDOs	Overall	Comments
1.	Rating	*Unsatisfactory*	*Moderately Satisfactory*	-	Small improvement
2.	Rating value	2	4	-	
3.	Weight (% disbursed before/after PDO change)	20%	80%	100	
4.	Weighted value (2 x 3)	0.4	3.2	3.6	
5.	Final rating (rounded)	-	-	*Moderately Satisfactory*	Early revision preserves MS rating

Appendix C

Guidance Note on ICRs for Programmatic Development Policy Financing[1]

Introduction

1. OP/BP 8.60 approved in August 2004 sets out the requirements for Implementation Completion and Results Reports (ICRs) for development policy financing.[2] This note guides staff on requirements for and preparation of ICRs for programmatic development policy operations. A single ICR should be prepared after the closing of the last operation in a prespecified series of programmatic DPFs. The programmatic ICR should include and justify ratings for the program based on the overall programmatic series.

Requirements for ICRs for Programmatic Development Policy Financing

2. Programmatic development policy financing consists of a series of individual operations within a medium-term framework of policy and institutional actions. Each subsequent operation builds on the previous one, which contains triggers (anticipated prior actions) determining the move to the next operation.

3. A programmatic series should have a prespecified end-point and should normally span no more than four operations and four-to-five years. The first operation should specify the number of operations in the series and the notional timing of subsequent operations.[3] A programmatic series is considered to have lapsed if no subsequent operation is presented to the Board 24 months after the Board approval of the previous operation in the series.

4. Each programmatic series covered in an ICR should include a consistent medium-term results framework (i.e., a set of objectives and expected outcomes for the overall program). The program document of the first operation incorporates measurable indicators for monitoring progress and evaluating results on completion of the program, and the program document of each subsequent operation would need to report on progress of these indicators under the previous operation(s).

5. Staff undertake continuous and rigorous supervision and monitoring of each intermediate operation, to ensure adequate reporting on the performance of each of these operations and on progress in meeting the overall program objectives. Implementation Status and Results Reports (ISRs) are prepared on a 12-month cycle and at least one ISR is prepared for each individual operation before it closes.

Preparation of ICR for Programmatic DPF

6. The ICR for programmatic DPF is prepared along the following lines:

---

[1] Effective as of April 1, 2006 (last updated on July 2014).

[2] BP 8.60, para. 33: "The Bank prepares an ICR on completion of an operation, due 12 months after the Closing Date…. For a programmatic DPF, a single ICR for the series is prepared on completion of the program, due 12 months after the Closing Date of the last operation in the series or the lapse of the series."

[3] In exceptional cases, an additional operation may be added at the end of a programmatic series provided that the overall series spans no more than four operations and five years. Moreover, the additional operation would have to adopt the same results measurement framework as the previous operations and set appropriate targets in relation to these operations.

(a) **Content:** The ICR is prepared at the end of a programmatic series as defined above and provides a comprehensive evaluation of the series of operations as a coherent program.[4] For each operation, the ICR should discuss the extent to which the operation's activities and inputs have contributed (or may be expected to contribute) to outputs, outcomes (or expected outcomes), and impacts (or expected impacts) of the series, as relevant. The ICR draws on program documents for individual operations in a series and builds on the cumulative findings and internal ratings in the ISRs.

(b) **Ratings:** The programmatic DPF will be rated for outcome, risk to development outcome, Bank performance, and borrower performance. Ratings will be established at the program level, as opposed to ratings for each individual operation. In its ICR Review, and a Project Performance Assessment Report (PPAR) if undertaken, the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) will validate the ratings for the overall programmatic series.

(c) **Format:** The ICR for programmatic DPF will use a template accommodating its special reporting requirements.[5]

(d) **Timing**: The ICR for programmatic DPF is prepared within 12 months after the closing of the last operation in the series or the lapse of the series. A programmatic series is considered to have lapsed 24 months after the Board approval of the previous operation in the series, thus at the latest an ICR is due no later than 36 months after the Board approval of the previous operation in the series.

---

[4] In line with the *ICR Guidelines* , the ICR focuses on the program context, development objectives and design, program implementation, monitoring and evaluation arrangements, major factors affecting implementation and outcomes, program outcomes, including relevance to country development priorities and Bank country assistance strategy, lessons learned, Bank and borrower performance, including compliance with relevant Bank policies.
[5] The ICR web-based template for programmatic DPF is available in the Operations Portal.

Guidance on Intensive Learning ICRs (ILI)

The ILI has the same structure and content as the core ICR, but provides more extensive analysis of outcomes and lessons based on feedback from beneficiaries and stakeholders.

To achieve these ends, ILI preparation involves the following:

(a) A **stakeholder workshop** to gather information, discuss the experience, and derive lessons learned; and/or

(b) A **survey of beneficiaries,** where feasible, to gather information especially on project impacts and provide inputs for workshop discussions.

See Social Development Paper No. 23, "*Toward a Listening Bank: A Review of Best Practices and the Efficacy of Beneficiary Assessment*," September 1998; and No. 5, "*Implementing Beneficiary Assessment in Education: A Guide for Practitioners*," September 1998.

Operations are selected for ILIs mainly on the basis of their learning potential from a wider institutional perspective, including projects of special interest to the Sector Boards or the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG). Other selection criteria may include the following:

(a) Operations with a proposed follow-on;
(b) Innovative/pilot operations;
(c) Operations with a new or returning borrower;
(d) Highly successful projects, and
(e) Problem projects, particularly controversial ones - publicly or internally.

ILIs are **especially appropriate when the operation is to be followed by another addressing similar objectives**, but in that situation ICR preparation must be advanced (see previous section on timing) to fit the schedule for processing the following operation. Preparation of the ILI combines naturally with the fact-finding and analysis required for design of the following operation, and thus affords opportunities for savings in Bank administrative costs.

Problem projects are suitable for ILIs since careful analysis of poor performance and project failure can provide valuable lessons to help avoid repeating past mistakes.

Guidance on Note on Cancelled Operation[1]

Following earlier practice, an **Implementation Completion and Results Report (ICR) is not prepared for an operation that "fails to become effective or is cancelled before significant implementation is initiated."** Instead, a **Note on Cancelled Operation (NCO)** (formerly known as a Project Completion Note) is sent to the Board summarizing the operation, explaining why it was not implemented, and assessing Bank and borrower performance; the Note is also reviewed by IEG. The cut-off point for "significant implementation" is defined as final actual disbursement of less than five percent of the initial commitment or US$ 1 million (whichever is smaller), excluding any Project Preparation Facility and front-end fees.

A **NCO** is completed soon after an agreement is reached with the borrower to cancel the operation and should be circulated to the Board no later than six months after cancellation of the loan/credit/grant balances.

As with ICRs, **NCOs are disclosed to the public** (except in extraordinary circumstances) at the time they are sent to the Board, in accordance with The World Bank Policy on Access to Information (2013)

The NCO is a shortened and adapted version of the ICR, meeting reasonable information, accountability, and self-evaluation requirements (see the NCO Template). An NCO comprises 2-3 pages of issue-oriented text supported by available basic data, mostly system-generated.

Where applicable to a cancelled operation, the text should generally follow the relevant sections of the ICR Guidelines and cover briefly the operation's rationale and objectives, main events and factors leading to cancellation, and any lessons learned. Special attention should be paid to the roles of the Bank and borrower with respect to design and implementation problems, their attempted resolution, and to Bank/borrower responses to any changed circumstances threatening the operation.

[1] Formerly known as a Project Completion Note.

Further Guidance on Key Factors Affecting Implementation and Outcomes

This appendix provides additional guidance on factors affecting implementation and outcomes. Employing the approaches and categories presented below can improve the comparability of analysis across countries, projects, programs, and sectors and may assist with drawing effective lessons.

1. Project Objective(s)

Discussion on project objectives may include:

(a) whether the PDO/GEO focused on the outcome for which the operation could reasonably be **held accountable**, given its duration, resources, and approach, without encompassing higher-level objectives that depend on other efforts outside the scope of the operation;

(b) **whether objectives were clear, realistic ,and important** for the country and sector and furthered the Bank's Country Assistance/Partnership Strategy/Framework (CAS/CPF/CPS) and global goals for GEF operations;

(c) how responsive objectives were to **borrower circumstances and development priorities**; and

(d) how **demanding** the objectives were on the borrower and its implementing agencies.

2. Components

Were components reasonable in relation to:

(a) **achieving the project/program objectives**;

(b) the **capacity** of the implementing agency (including administrative and financial management capacity);

(c) the likely **availability of local funding**, and

(d) **lessons learned** in relevant prior projects.

3. Implementation Factor Groups

Three groups of implementation factors may be distinguished:

(a) Factors **outside the control of government or implementing agencies**, such as:

(i) **changes in world markets and prices**;
(ii) unexpected and unforeseeable **technical difficulties**;
(iii) **natural disasters** (including extraordinary weather and sudden disease epidemics);
(iv) **war and civil disturbances**, including the effects overflowing from neighboring territories such as refugees; and
(v) **performance of the Bank**, **cofinancier(s), other partners, and contractors and consultants** (in so far as borrowers were constrained from taking corrective actions). (See Appendix I of the ICR Guidelines, *Commenting on Contractors and Consultants in Implementation Completion Reports.*)

(b) Factors generally subject to **government control**, such as:

(i) **macroeconomic and sector policies**;
(ii) government **commitment**;
(iii) **governance and corruption** (see *Handbook on Governance and Corruption*);
(iv) **appointment of key staff**;
(v) provision of **counterpart funds**, and
(vi) efficient **administrative procedures**.

(c) Factors generally subject to **implementing agency control**, such as:

(i) **management effectiveness**;
(ii) **staffing** adequacy and quality;
(iii) **implementation delays** (and loan extensions);
(iv) effective use of **technical assistance**;
(v) adequacy of **monitoring and evaluation**, and
(vi) adequacy of **beneficiary participation**.

4. Implementation Efficiency

(a) Implementation efficiency may be affected by:

(b) the **complexity** of the project/program and its organizational arrangements;

(c) the **commitment** to objectives of government, its agencies, and other participants;

(d) whether **risks** were identified and their mitigation adequate;

(e) the adequacy of **participatory processes**; and

(f) unforeseen **security and natural events**.

5. Implementation Delays

Possible causes of implementation delays include:

(a) **incomplete preparation** of the project;

(b) **unrealistic implementation schedule**, including failure to schedule sufficient time for start-up activities and mobilization;

(c) unforeseen **technical difficulties**;

(d) **changes** in project/program scope;

(e) **quality of management**, including financial management;

(f) **delays in selecting staff/contractors/consultants**;

(g) delays in receiving **funds**, whether counterpart, or funds from the Bank or cofinanciers;

(h) inefficient **procurement or disbursement**; and

(i) **security problems and natural disasters**.

Economic and Financial Analysis

The Bank's standard approach to economic analysis is set out in OP/BP 10.00, *Investment Project Financing*.

Net Present Value/Economic Rate of Return: Although the Bank's policy has long been to calculate net present value (NPV), customary practice has been to calculate a project's economic rate of return (ERR). The ERR is the rate of discount that results in a zero NPV for the project (i.e., the discounted present worth of costs and benefits are equal). The ERR is not fully satisfactory on its own (e.g., when comparing mutually exclusive project alternatives); however, it is widely understood and may continue to be used for the purpose of presenting the results of analysis.

If the ERR was calculated at project appraisal, it is also used for completion reporting. If a NPV or ERR was calculated for the project, the Implementation Completion and Results Report (ICR) should indicate what it was in the Project Appraisal Document (PAD), what it is when re-estimated at completion, and on what percent of total project costs the original and revised estimates were based. A re-estimate should be made even if the ICR is prepared so early in the project operation stage that only a short period of actual benefits can be observed and future investments may still be required. For any new analysis, the revised NPV or ERR at least provides actual latest cost figures and an updated projection of benefits, reflecting changes made during implementation. Underlying assumptions about costs and benefits, and other information supporting the analysis (e.g., output volumes, major cost items, or prices) should be presented.

If the re-estimated NPV or ERR differs significantly from the appraisal estimate, the discussion should indicate and, if practical, quantify the reasons (e.g., output delays or changes in costs, output, prices or methodology/analysis).

If, in exceptional cases, an **NPV or ERR could not re-estimated**, the ICR should cite the reason (e.g., project not fully implemented or inadequate data).

In the absence of NPV or ERR estimates, the ICR analyses the project's efficiency using any other appropriate cost-effectiveness criteria to determine whether the project represented the expected least-cost solution to attain identified and measurable benefits by either an analysis of cost per unit of input or cost per unit of output. Whether benefits are measured in monetary or other terms, flows are adjusted to reflect real use of resources, and when distortions are considerable, values are adjusted to reflect social opportunity costs.

Financial Rate of Return: If a financial rate of return (FRR) or other financial indicators were calculated for the project, the annex should indicate what they were in the PAD and how they were re-estimated at completion. Underlying assumptions about costs and revenues, and other information supporting the re-estimation, should be given. If the re-estimated FRR or other financial indicators differ significantly from the appraisal estimate, the reasons should be discussed (e.g., changes in tariffs/user charges, or those changes introduced under any restructuring). If the FRR or other financial indicators were not re-estimated, the ICR should cite the reason.

Deriving Lessons and Recommendations: An Illustrative Example

Relationships of lessons to findings and recommendations:

- Facts are the building blocks for findings, which lead to lessons and recommendations, but not all findings result in lessons and recommendations.

- Lessons are based on findings, but only the most important lessons of general application are turned into recommendations (new ones or those habitual ones which bear repeating).

The following table suggests a logic for moving from facts to recommendations.

	What is it?	**Example**	**Intent**
Fact	What happened – an event and data (results). Not in dispute.	"The project manager was dismissed in Year 5."	Provides the story line.
Finding	What the analyst interpreted from the factual events, establishing the significance of the facts recorded. Can be arguable.	"Mainly because replacement of the project manager was delayed, the project did not meet its targets."	A finding draws conclusions from the facts which are specific to the project.
Lesson	The broader significance of a finding.	"Poor performance by project managers can critically affect project outcomes."	Draws a general conclusion from experience beyond the single instance of the operation under review.
Recommendation	Suggests how to proceed in the future in the light of this experience.	"Ensure that key project management positions are filled with competent staff, through appropriate covenants and prompt supervision follow-up."	A recommendation is an imperative – it proposes action(s).

Source: IEG (adapted)

Commenting on Consultants, Contractors, and Suppliers in Implementation Completion Reports

1. In the preparation of Implementation Completion and Results Reports (ICRs), the following rules govern the critical mention of consultants, contractors, and suppliers:

(a) Critical mention is limited to what is necessary to properly explain shortcomings in project execution;

(b) Critical mention is restricted to facts and does not include judgments. For example, the following statement is acceptable: "The contractor was unable to complete the contract in the four years agreed upon; the contractor took seven years";

(c) Names of firms or individuals are not mentioned;

(d) No critical mention is made that is not backed up by hard evidence in Bank files; and

(e) Whenever a critical report is made, the party criticized is afforded a reasonable opportunity to comment on the criticism in writing, and the comment is included in the report.

2. Staff preparing ICRs should consult the Legal Department (LEG) and Operations Policy and Country Services (OPCS) on how to report a significant aspect of project experience relating to the performance of consultants, contractors, and suppliers.

Appendix J

July 1, 2014
Independent Evaluation Group

IEG Guidance on ICR Reviews

1. Which objectives should be used as the benchmark for evaluation in an ICR Review?

When there is a material difference between a project's objectives as stated in the PAD versus as stated in the Legal Agreement, the Legal Agreement statement of objectives should be used as the benchmark for evaluation. If the Legal Agreement statement of objectives is vague or not sufficiently monitorable, IEG should refer to the PAD to infer the intent of the Legal Agreement statement of objectives, but should not directly lift the statement of objectives from the PAD (to avoid legitimizing the non-legally binding PAD). In such cases, the justification for the statement of objectives that forms the benchmark of evaluation is in terms of the evaluator's best judgment of the benchmark, never simply because 'the PAD says so.' With regard to any 'key associated outcome targets' that are in the PAD but not in the Legal Agreement, the evaluator would include them as the benchmark, justifying their use in terms of his/her judgment of their appropriateness as a benchmark for evaluation – again, not just because 'the PAD says so.'

2. How should the three constituent elements of Outcome – Relevance, Efficacy, and Efficiency – be aggregated into the Outcome rating?

Table 1 (attached) should be used as a guide or 'rule of thumb' to aggregate Relevance, Efficacy, and Efficiency into the Outcome rating. When the two Relevance sub- ratings are rated differently and/or when there are multiple objectives rated differently under Efficacy, the evaluator should come to an aggregate judgment for each of Relevance and Efficacy before applying Table 1.

3. At which points in time is the Relevance of objectives assessed?

The Relevance of the objectives is to be assessed both as at the time of appraisal and also as at the time of evaluation.

4. How should vague overambitious, and under-ambitious objectives be assessed under Relevance of Objectives?

If the stated objectives are vague or not sufficiently monitorable, marks are to be deducted from the Relevance of Objectives (and from Quality at Entry).

If the stated objectives are under-ambitious, marks are to be deducted from Relevance of Objectives. The correct level of 'ambition' should be seen in the context of the specific country/sector situation.

With regard to over-ambitious objectives, they will already be penalized under Efficacy, so there is no need to penalize them again under Relevance of Objectives.

5. What does 'Relevance of Design' include?

Relevance of Design includes a discussion of the causal chain or project logic, but not of performance indicators or M&E. Where relevant, the appropriateness of the lending instrument is also an aspect of the Relevance of Design.

6. ***How is Efficacy to be assessed?***

Efficacy is to be assessed as at the time of evaluation (as are the other two constituent elements of Outcome). If a flood had wiped out all project achievements *after* project closing such that at the time of evaluation there was nothing to be seen on the ground, Efficacy would not be rated in the satisfactory range (Bank and/or Borrower Performance could, of course, be rated in the satisfactory range depending on whether the Bank and/or Borrower had done all they possibly could to avoid the unfavorable Outcome).

Each stated objective is to be rated, even if it is stated in output terms. In the latter case, marks can be deducted from the 'Relevance of Objectives' for setting the bar too low/stating the objectives in output terms if the evaluator can make the case that a higher bar or promising intermediate or final outcomes would have been possible and desirable in the particular country circumstances.

Where there is a clear hierarchy of objectives and there is both an overall objective and specific objectives, a textual comment should be made about progress on the overall objective, while the specific objectives should each be rated.

The "by" and "through" parts of an objectives statement should be individually rated only if they refer to intermediate outcomes. If they refer to inputs and outputs, then performance on them should be discussed to confirm attribution, but should not be rated.

If objectives are not yet achieved at the time of project closing, the ICR and/or the ICR Review can still make a case that they are 'likely to be achieved' (the harmonized criteria define Efficacy as the extent to which project objectives 'were achieved or are expected to be achieved'), but the IEG evaluator would need to look for, and present, convincing evidence of the 'likelihood' of such achievement through a strong results chain. If sufficient evidence does not exist, no leaps of faith should be made.
A downgrade in the Efficacy rating is warranted in both of the following cases: (i) when there is insufficient evidence on impact; or (ii) there is evidence of insufficient impact.

7. Is the 'disbursement-weighted split rating' to be applied even if the objectives have not changed but the key associated outcome targets have changed?

When the objectives change (through a Level 1 restructuring), the disbursement-weighted split rating should be applied to Outcome. However, even if the objectives do not change, but the key associated outcome targets change (through a Level 2 restructuring), the disbursement-weighted split rating should still be applied to Outcome.

8. How is Risk to Development Outcome to be assessed when no (or very little) Outcome is realized?

The Risk to Development Outcome (RDO) is defined in the Harmonized Evaluation criteria as *the* "risk, at the time of evaluation, that development outcomes (or expected outcomes) will not be maintained (or realized)." If no Outcome is achieved, the RDO would be rated as 'Low/Negligible'. If very little Outcome is achieved, the IEG evaluator would look at the risk that

that little Outcome would be maintained/knocked off by a shock and rate RDO either as 'High' or 'Low/Negligible' or somewhere in between, depending on the particular case (without worrying about the RDO for the unachieved part).

9. Does the ICR Review confine itself only to evidence on the project's key performance indicators that were identified in the PAD or ISR?

No, all evidence regardless of the source is to be brought to bear in preparing the ICR Review so long as the evidence is of quality. The ICR should provide enough information for IEG to be able to assess the quality of the evidence (e.g., the methodology of the Beneficiary Assessment, how the control group was selected, etc).

10. How should interlinkages between ratings be addressed?

For the most part, each of the key ratings – Outcome, Risk to Development Outcome, Bank Performance, Borrower Performance – measure distinct dimensions of development effectiveness and are independent of each other. So, for example, Outcome may be rated highly unsatisfactory (say in a fragile state where a political coup erodes government commitment and the project objectives remain unachieved), while Bank Performance may be rated highly satisfactory (if the political coup was wholly unpredictable and the Bank had done the best it could under the circumstances), or vice versa.

In practice, however, there can be a number of interlinkages among the ratings which must be borne in mind in order to ensure internal consistency among the ICR Review ratings. Some of these interlinkages are deliberate and obvious while others are not so obvious:

- The IEG-OPCS Harmonized Evaluation Criteria introduce a deliberate interlinkage between the Outcome and the Bank/Borrower Performance ratings – when the two elements of Bank/Borrower Performance are in opposite directions (one above the line and the other below), the Outcome rating becomes the tie-breaker.

- There is another deliberate linkage between the Bank/Borrower Performance ratings and the following sub-ratings/dimensions: M&E Quality rating, safeguard compliance, fiduciary compliance, unintended positive and negative effects. These sub-ratings/dimensions were introduced as separate sections in the ICR Review form to specifically zoom-in on, and give prominence to, particular aspects of Bank/Borrower Performance, resulting in interlinkages. So, if, say M&E Quality is rated unfavorably, Bank/Borrower Performance cannot be rated too favorably. Similarly, if there is weak fiduciary compliance, Bank/Borrower Performance will be affected.

- Not-so-obvious interlinkages can manifest themselves between the Bank/Borrower Performance ratings and the Outcome rating depending on the extent and nature of weaknesses in the above mentioned sub-ratings/dimensions. So, for example, if M&E Quality is extremely weak or M&E is non-existent, that would raise questions about how effectively project implementation could have occurred and, therefore, how favorable Efficacy (and hence Outcome) could be. Similarly, if there were significant unintended negative effects attributable to the project (the road was built in line with the stated project objectives and was also efficiently built, but the surrounding areas were deforested in the process), Outcome could not be rated favorably. Again, if fiduciary compliance was weak and there was evidence of substantiated corruption, then that would signal an inefficient use of project resources and Outcome could not be rated favorably.

- There is a final set of not-so-obvious interlinkages that the IEG evaluator needs to also be aware of. While the Outcome rating and the Bank/Borrower Performance ratings can certainly go in different directions, the IEG evaluator should be able to explain the reasons for any divergence. Generally, if Outcome is rated unfavorably, at least one of the two ratings, either Bank Performance or Borrower Performance, would typically be affected and explain the unfavorable Outcome, although there are three exceptions: First, it could be that the explanation lies not in Bank or Borrower Performance, but rather in the performance of other donors/cofinanciers if there were such other donors/cofinanciers in the project. Second, it could be that an exogenous shock (e.g., an earthquake that wipes out the project roads) explains the unfavorable Outcome. Finally, it could be that the Bank supports a high risk project, the risk materializes, the Bank makes an informed decision not to cancel or restructure the project because the rewards could be extra ordinarily high if the project succeeded, but in the end the project fails to achieve its objectives, in which case Outcome will be rated unfavorably while Bank/Borrower Performance could both be rated favorably. In any event, when the ratings diverge, the IEG evaluator should be able to explain the reasons for the divergence. Otherwise, the divergence may be unjustified.

Appendix J

Table 1: Guidelines for Investment Projects when relevance sub-ratings are the same and efficacy of each objective is the same

Rating	Definition	Relevance	Efficacy	Efficiency	Comment
Highly satisfactory	There were no shortcomings in the operation's achievement of its objectives, in its efficiency, or in its relevance	High on any two criteria – *one of which must be efficacy* – and at least substantial on the third.			Requires efficacy to be one of the high ratings.
Satisfactory	There were minor shortcomings in the operation's achievement of its objectives, in its efficiency, or in its relevance	Substantial on all three criteria Substantial on two criteria and high on the third Substantial efficacy but high relevance and efficiency			*"Minor" shortcomings are implicitly defined as substantially achieving the objectives, and substantial or better on the other two criteria.*
Moderately satisfactory	There were moderate shortcomings in the operation's achievement of its objectives, in its efficiency, or in its relevance	Substantial (or high) on two criteria—one of which must be efficacy—and modest on the third.			*"Moderate" is implicitly defined as modest on one criterion.*
Moderately unsatisfactory	There were significant shortcomings in the operation's achievement of its objectives, in its efficiency, or in its relevance.	Modest on any two criteria and substantial (or high) on the third, modest efficacy with substantial (or high) on the other two criteria..			*"Significant" is implicitly defined as modest on two criteria or modest efficacy. Would also apply if one were high and two were modest.*
Unsatisfactory	There were major shortcomings in the operation's achievement of its objectives, in its efficiency, or in its relevance.	Modest on all three criteria Negligible on one criterion and modest/substantial/high on the other two			*"Major" is implicitly defined as three modests or at least one negligible.*
Highly unsatisfactory	There were severe shortcomings in the operation's achievement of its objectives, in its efficiency, or in its relevance.	Negligible on all three criteria Negligible on two criteria and modest/substantial/high on the third one			*"Severe" is implicitly defined as at least two negligible.*