

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS



2021

Group Operations Evaluation Department



ISLAMIC DEVELOPMENT BANK GROUP

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

Group Operations Evaluation Department
8111 King Khalid St. Al Nuzlah Al Yamaniya Dist. Unit No. 1, Jeddah 22332-2444
Kingdom of Saudi Arabia TEL: +966-12- 656-6934
FAX: +966-126366871
GOE Fax # (96612) 646-7853
Email:GOED@isdb.org

Table of Contents

PREFACE	i
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	ii
GENERAL CONCEPTS, METHODS, AND PROCESSES	0
INTRODUCTION	0
REPORT PREPARATION AND PROCESSES	1
(A) Purpose and Objectives	1
(B) Timing	1
(C) Coverage and Selection	1
(D) Evaluation Approach	2
(E) Stakeholders' Participation in Evaluation	4
(F) Management Response and Follow-up	4
(G) Using Lessons	5
EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	6
(A) Basis of the Evaluation	6
(B) Evaluation Criteria	6
(C) Project Ratings	7
(D) Other Assessment Criteria	7
DISSEMINATION AND DISCLOSURE OF EVALUATION PRODUCTS.....	8
(A)	
(B) Dissemination Products and Strategy	8
(C) Disclosure Policy	8
GUIDE TO PERFORMANCE RATING	9
RELEVANCE	9
EFFECTIVENESS	10
EFFICIENCY	11
SUSTAINABILITY	12
AGGREGATE PROJECT DEVELOPMENT OUTCOME (APDO)	14
BANK PERFORMANCE.....	15
PERFORMANCE OF THE BENEFICIARY OF THE IDB FINANCING	17
AUTOMATED RATING MATRIX	20

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

ANNEXES	21
Annex-1: Due Diligence Check List for Desk Review	21
Annex-2: Template of the Approach Paper	22
Group Operations Evaluation Department.....	22
Annex-3: Due Diligence Check List for Field Mission	23
Annex-4: Templates of the Wrap-Up Presentation and the Back-To-Office Report.....	24
Annex-5: Template of the PPER	25
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xxx
CURRENCY EQUIVALENTS AND LIST OF ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS	xxxii
BASIC PROJECT DATA	xxxii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	33
CHAPTER - 1 : BACKGROUND	34
1.1 CONTEXT AND RATIONALE.....	34
1.2 FORMULATION	34
1.3 OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE AT APPRAISAL.....	34
1.4 FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS AT APPRAISAL.....	34
1.5 EVALUATION PURPOSE AND PROCESS	35
CHAPTER - 2 : CRITERIA-BASED ASSESSMENT	37
2.1 RELEVANCE.....	37
2.2 EFFECTIVENESS.....	38
2.3 EFFICIENCY.....	39
2.4 SUSTAINABILITY	41
2.5 OVERALL ASSESSMENT	42
2.6 OTHER ASSESSMENT	42
CHAPTER - 3 : PERFORMANCE OF STAKEHOLDERS	43
3.1 BANK PERFORMANCE.....	43
3.2 PERFORMANCE OF THE BENEFICIARY OF IDB FINANCING	44
3.3 PERFORMANCE OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS.....	46
CHAPTER - 4 : ISSUES, LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	47
4.1 ISSUES.....	47
4.2 LESSONS LEARNED	47
4.3 FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	47
ANNEXES	49
ANNEX-1: PROJECT LOCATION MAP	50
ANNEX-2: PHOTOGRAPHS OF PROJECT FACILITIES.....	51
ANNEX-3: LIST OF PERSONS MET	52
ANNEX-4: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED.....	53
ANNEX-5: RETROFITTED LOG-FRAME	54
ANNEX-6: PLANNED AND ACTUAL PROJECT OUTPUTS.....	55

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

ANNEX-7A: MAIN ASSUMPTIONS FOR RE-ESTIMATION OF PROJECT’S ECONOMIC INTERNAL RATE OF RETURN (EIRR) AT POST-EVALUATION 56

ANNEX-7B: RE-ESTIMATION OF PROJECT’S ECONOMIC INTERNAL RATE OF RETURN (EIRR) AT POST-EVALUATION .. 57

ANNEX-8A: MAIN ASSUMPTIONS FOR RE-ESTIMATION OF PROJECT’S FINANCIAL INTERNAL RATE OF RETURN (FIRR) AT POST-EVALUATION 58

ANNEX-8B: RE-ESTIMATION OF PROJECT’S FINANCIAL INTERNAL RATE OF RETURN (FIRR) AT POST-EVALUATION ... 59

ANNEX-9: PROFILE OF PLANNED AND ACTUAL DISBURSED FUNDS..... 60

ANNEX-10: ORGANIZATIONAL CHART OF THE EXECUTING AGENCY AT POST-EVALUATION 61

APPENDIX I: RATING MATRIX 62

APPENDIX II: VALIDATION PROCESS FOR PPER (PROJECT CODE)..... 63

ANNEX-11: ALGORITHM FOR PROCESSING EVALUATION REPORTS..... 64

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

INDEX OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table-1: Guide for Rating of Relevance	9
Table-2: Rating Scale for Relevance	10
Table-3: Guide for Rating of Effectiveness	10
Table-4: Rating Scale for Effectiveness	11
Table-5: Guide for Rating of Efficiency	11
Table-6: Rating Scale for Efficiency	12
Table-7: Guide for Rating of Sustainability	13
Table-8: Rating Scale for Sustainability	13
Table-9: Overall Project Rating Scale	15
Table-10: Guide for Rating of Bank Performance	15
Table-11: Rating Scale for Bank Performance	17
Table-12: Guide for Rating of Performance of Beneficiary	18
Table-13: Rating Scale for Performance of the Beneficiary	20

PREFACE

The Islamic Development Bank Group (IDB Group) recognizes the importance of independent evaluation in the context of increased focus on development effectiveness and results, enhanced governance, and better informed decision-making. The independent evaluation function promotes accountability and learning which are achieved through the assessment of developmental results, the impact of development assistance, and the IDB Group's performance in discharging its responsibilities. Independent evaluation needs to be supported by a comprehensive self-evaluation system at the operational level which starts with an ex-ante evaluation and necessary quality at entry level.

The IDB Group Evaluation Policy states that guidelines, processes, administrative instructions, circulars, and guidance notes are issued to enforce the implementation of the Evaluation policy.

As part of the process of harmonizing the IDB Group's evaluation process with those of its major development partners, mainly the Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs), the existing Guidelines for Operations Evaluation have been revised under the title *"Guidelines for Preparing Performance Evaluation Reports for Public Sector Operations"* in compliance with the Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG) Good Practice Standards (GPS), adopted in September 2012. In addition, a template for preparing Project Performance Evaluation Reports (PPERs) has been developed which is annexed to this Guidelines.

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AER	Annual Evaluation Report
APDO	Aggregate Project Development Outcome
AWP	Annual Work Program
BED	Board of Executive Directors
BTOR	Back-to-Office Report
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
EA	Executing Agency
ECG	Evaluation Cooperation Group
EIRR	Economic Internal Rate of Return
EP	Evaluation Principles
FIRR	Financial Internal Rate of Return
GOE	Group Operations Evaluation
GPS	Good Practice Standards
ICD	Islamic Corporation for the Development of Private Sector
ICIEC	Islamic Corporation for Investment Insurance and Export Credit
ID	Islamic Dinar
IDB	Islamic Development Bank
IFI	International Financial Institution
IRTI	Islamic Research and Training Institute
ITFC	International Islamic Trade Finance Corporation
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MCPS	Member Country Partnership Strategy
MDB	Multilateral Development Bank
MTBS	Medium Term Business Strategy
OC	Operations Complex
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OEO	Operations Evaluation Office
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
OP	Operational Practices
PAD	Project Appraisal Document
PCD	Project Concept Document
PCR	Project Completion Report
PIASR	Project Implementation Assessment and Support Report
PPER	Project Performance Evaluation Report
RRP	Report and Recommendations of the President
TA	Technical Assistance

GENERAL CONCEPTS, METHODS, AND PROCESSES

INTRODUCTION

1. In its commitment towards achieving better development results, the Islamic Development Bank Group (IDB Group) recognizes the importance of independent evaluation of all types of its interventions. The main purpose of independent evaluation at IDB Group is to provide an objective assessment of its performance in achieving development results. Independent evaluation covers policies, strategies, operations, and business processes related to development interventions. It helps to ensure accountability and generate knowledge for better development effectiveness. It also aims to strengthen future policies, strategies, and operations by drawing lessons from experience and formulating evidence-based lessons and recommendations. In order for independent evaluation function to be effective, credible and transparent, it must be supported by a strong self-evaluation system. The IDB Group evaluation guidelines are harmonized with Good Practice Standards (GPS)¹ of the Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG) of Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs) and evaluation standards² of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

2. The first Evaluation Policies and Guidelines of the Bank, approved in 1993, were updated and enhanced in 2005 to reflect changing organizational circumstances and expectations. The present Guidelines cover the preparation of project performance evaluation reports for public sector operations financed by the IDB Group. These Guidelines, which replace the IDB Guidelines for Operations Evaluation (1993 and 2005), have been prepared in compliance with Good Practice Standards (GPS) of ECG adopted in September 2012. The implementation of these new Guidelines represents a further step in the process of harmonizing the IDB Group's evaluation process with those of its major development partners.

3. Compared with the 2005 Guidelines for project post evaluation reports, the number of core evaluation criteria for rating a project's success was reduced from five (namely relevance, implementation, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability) to four (namely relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability) in line with ECG-GPS. The rationale was to avoid the previous overlapping in implementation and efficiency criteria. Changes were also made to the weights applied to the core evaluation criteria for aggregation purposes, and the thresholds used to assign an overall rating. In addition, the report structure has been revised to incorporate new elements arising from the adoption of GPS. The term "post" in the previous report title has been changed to "performance" to reflect the evaluation process more accurately.

¹ Evaluation Cooperation Group, Working Group on Public Sector Evaluation: Good Practice Standards for the Evaluation of Public Sector Operations (2012)

² DAC Guidance Series: Quality Standards for Development Evaluation (2009)

4. Some changes have been made to the composition of chapters of the report. The chapter on “Project Results” has been renamed as “Criteria-Based Assessment” incorporating the core evaluation criteria, including the overall assessment of project performance to assign an Aggregate Project Development Outcome (APDO) rating. One chapter named “Performance of Stakeholders” has been added which focuses on the Bank Performance; Performance of the Beneficiary of IDB financing (comprising government and executing/implementing agencies); and Performance of Other Stakeholders (consultants, contractors etc.). The rationale behind putting the Performance of Stakeholders below the line while assigning the APDO rating is twofold. One reason is to avoid any possible overlap with the core evaluation criteria, especially efficiency. Second reason is to give the audience of the report sufficient details on the Performance of Stakeholders.

5. Furthermore, a template has been developed, which is annexed these Guidelines, to guide the evaluators in the preparation of PPER in a comprehensive, coherent, and consistent manner. The template is based on the Evaluation Principles (EP) and Operational Practices (OP) of ECG-GPS. It includes the structure of PPER along with the necessary issues to be tackled in the report. The template contains standardized formats of annexes and tables which should be used to substantiate facts in the PPER text.

REPORT PREPARATION AND PROCESSES

(A) Purpose and Objectives

6. The basic instrument for independent evaluation of projects is the Project Performance Evaluation Reports (PPER) prepared by the GOE Department. The main purpose of PPER is to ensure accountability and learning. The PPER is aimed at assessing the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the operations financed by the IDB Group.

7. The PPER provides an analytical commentary on the Project Completion Report (PCR), focusing selectively on issues that merit closer attention. Its preparation process begins after a decision on the selection of the project for performance evaluation. While PCRs are normally prepared for all completed projects and program financing activities, PPERs are prepared on a random basis for completed Bank-financed operations (projects, programs, policies, etc.), and focus on learning from experience and improve the Bank’s future financing activities. The PPERs contribute to other GOE Department studies, including country, sector, and thematic evaluations, which focus on particular issues or subjects of broader relevance to the IDB Group operations, policies, and procedures.

(b) Timing

8. Subject to the constraints and the specific evaluation needs, PPERs are undertaken once sufficient time has elapsed for outcomes of the project to be realized and for its sustainability to be apparent. A PPER is usually prepared after the physical completion of the project (not less than two years after completion).

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

Moreover, in some cases, it is desirable to allow Executing Agencies (EAs) additional time to implement their recommendations of the PCR. In some special cases, PPERs may be conducted before project closing, if needed, to inform the design of subsequent operations or to provide case studies for higher level evaluations – but if this is done, the project is not rated.

(c) Coverage and Selection

9. To maintain independence and objectivity, it is of utmost importance that the selection of projects eligible for post-evaluation be made with transparency and without external interference. For this purpose, the GOE Department introduced the selection of projects for post-evaluation on a random basis. Based on this, the projects to be post-evaluated under the annual work program are selected using the following criteria: (i) time factor; (ii) Exclusion of very-small size projects such as financed under lines of

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

financing; (iii) exclusion of projects that have already been post-evaluated; (iv) avoiding double counting of projects with multiple modes of financing; and (v) Division of projects according to size of disbursement. The long list of projects eligible for post- evaluation is prepared based on the following criteria:

- (i) *Time factor:* Projects approved in the last 12 years and completed since 2 years are considered as pertinent for the purpose of post-evaluation to provide sufficient and accurate information that enhances the quality of the post-evaluation reports. The reason for excluding projects that have been completed within the last 2 years is that they would not have been in operation for a sufficient period to have outcome and impact on the ground and encounter any sustainability issue. The objective of excluding projects that have been approved before the last 12 years is two-fold: (a) the data and information on the implementation of these projects would be difficult to trace and (b) these projects were appraised long time ago and the IDB project cycle has evolved significantly since then, making lessons drawn from these projects less relevant to the current operational processes of IDB.
- (ii) *Exclusion of very small-size projects such as financed under lines of financing:* It is considered not cost-effective to evaluate such small projects. However, the lines themselves may be covered as a thematic evaluation.
- (iii) *Exclusion of projects that have already been post-evaluated:* All projects already post-evaluated or covered under special or thematic evaluation have to be excluded.

10. Based on the above, a short-list of eligible projects for post-evaluation is generated. Following which, the list of eligible projects is further divided into two lists based on the disbursements amount (10 million USD and above, and below 10 million USD) for the purpose of representation of the project amount in the subsequent process of random selection. Then a computer program is used to generate randomly selected lists of projects from the 10 million USD and above list, and projects from the below 10 million USD list out of the eligible projects for performance evaluation.

11. In addition to the randomly selected list of projects for performance evaluations, few projects are selected for purposive evaluations. These could be problematic, large and complex, and innovative projects, and those with unusual features, which are likely to provide greater lessons of experience.

12. In some cases, projects can also be selected because they may be clustered and analysed together in one report with other projects that are similar, allowing more meaningful lessons to be drawn at the sector or country levels. Projects are also selected for evaluation if the PCR is considered to be generally weak and/or PCREN recommends the performance evaluation to be performed on the subject project.

13. A fair balance should also be maintained in the selection of sectors, regions, and modes of financing (from all IDB Group windows).

(d) Evaluation Approach

Desk Review

14. Evaluations typically involve desk review which examines all relevant documentation. The findings of desk review are usually summarized in an "Approach paper". The purpose of the approach paper is to identify and conceptualize the objective of the evaluation study, set out the issues, expected focus and outcome, key questions and evaluation methods, data collection methods, sources of information, schedule of activities, requirement of resources, and plans for communication and dissemination of findings, lessons and recommendations. The approach paper enables the evaluation process to be transparent to stakeholders and coordinate their inputs and participation according to a realistic timetable. The approach paper is sent for comments to all parties directly involved in the evaluation. The due diligence check list for desk review is given in **Annex-1**. The template of the approach paper is given in **Annex-2**.

Field Mission

15. Field missions ensure the quality and impartiality of the evaluation evidence. It is the primary means by which participatory methods can be applied and changes resulting from the project/program, ultimate beneficiaries, and project's strengths and weaknesses identified. A set of Questionnaires are prepared and sent to the executing and beneficiary agencies to solicit background information prior to mounting field missions.

16. Field missions for project level evaluation involve a period of about one week. The due diligence check list for field mission is provided in **Annex-3**.

17. Triangulation and validation of data generated from different sources are used to compare the information gathered with opinions of key informants and information from secondary sources. Evaluation missions present and discuss a "wrap-up presentation" containing preliminary field mission findings in order to ensure accuracy and appropriateness with stakeholders and development partners. The format of the

"wrap-up presentation" which is presented during the wrap-up mission is provided in **Annex-4**.

Back-to-Office Report

18. A Back-to-Office Report (BTOR) is prepared within maximum of one week after return from the mission. The preliminary findings of the evaluation mission are reflected in the BTOR which is submitted to the President of the Bank. Copies of the BTOR are to be sent to the concerned Vice President (VP), Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and the relevant departments for their information and necessary action. The template of the BTOR is provided in **Annex-4**.

Evaluation Report and Review Process

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

19. The PPER is prepared based on the findings of the field mission and feedback received from the stakeholders on the outcome of the project. To improve the quality and credibility of the draft PPER, a peer review is undertaken from within or outside IDB. The draft PPER is revised based on the comments of peer reviewer(s) and sent to the relevant operational department(s) for comments. If the GOE Department agrees with the comments, the operational department may raise regarding any particular issue, then the draft is modified accordingly.
20. The final PPER is then submitted to the President, IDB (with copies to the concerned VPs and CEOs). The final report is shared with the concerned member country's authorities and co-financiers (as appropriate) in order to verify facts and accuracy, and obtain their comments. Their observations, if any, are reflected in the final PPER.
21. An executive summary is prepared along with the final PPER for submission to the President which provides a brief roundup of the project's concept and the outputs and outcomes achieved. It also presents significant findings, lessons, conclusions and recommendations, and indicates the overall assessment rating. Typical length is two (2) pages for an executive summary.
22. A template for preparing PPER has been developed, which accompanies the Public Sector Evaluation Guidelines, based on the evaluation principles and operational practices of ECG-GPS. It includes the structure of PPER. The issues to be tackled in each chapter have been outlined in the template. The template contains standardized formats of annexes and tables. All other annexes, tables, and figures relevant to the nature and specificities of the project should be incorporated in the report. The template of PPER is provided in **Annex-5**.
23. The template is flexible to accommodate the specific needs of projects in different sectors. It does not limit the responsibility of evaluators to exercise their best judgement, avoid redundancies and repetition, and focus attention on significant issues. The report may quote freely from or provide cross-references to the relevant PCR.
24. PPERs are subject to a series of reviews within GOED and the IDBG. The purpose of the peer reviews, the managerial reviews is quality assurance and timely delivery of the evaluation products. Additionally, PPERs are reviewed by the operational departments/entities of the IDBG for validation purposes. All the details about processing PPERs can be seen in **Annex-6 (The Algorithm for Processing Evaluation Reports)**.

(e) Stakeholders' Participation in Evaluation

25. Evaluation reports are prepared in consultation with the operational and functional departments. The criteria for selecting operations for project level evaluation are made transparent to the stakeholders. As part of the field work for evaluation reports, a variety of stakeholders are consulted. They can include government departments, executing agencies, end beneficiaries, NGOs, other donors, contractors, consultants, academic community, and (if applicable) co-

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

financiers. Comments from the concerned member country agency(ies) on the draft evaluation report are invited. Their comments are taken into account when finalizing the report.

(f) Management Response and Follow-up

26. Management participates in Board meetings discussing evaluation reports and responds to questions raised. The GOE Department ensures Management views and comments are taken into consideration in the formulation of its recommendations. Comments of Management on evaluation reports are obtained in writing indicating areas of agreement and disagreement. Management comments are attached to the final evaluation report with GOE Department's response and clarification. Management keep track of the implementation of evaluation recommendations and regularly informs the Board about their progress.

27. Subsequently, management ensures that recommendations accepted, are put into practice, and implementation tracked, in order to allow later reporting to the Board. The GOE Department also reviews implementation of the recommendations.

(g) Using Lessons

28. It is important to document lessons learned in an organized and systematic way. In lessons learned, it is necessary to bring together experience from the implementation phase of a project. Lessons and findings from evaluations will be taken into account by Management in the design and approval process for new operations, programs, policies, sector strategies, and processes. Management ensures maintaining databases of lessons, including those from self-evaluation.

29. Lessons are self-explanatory, useful and are formulated clearly as follows: (i) what was expected at approval; (ii) what actually happened (providing information about the context); (iii) what went particularly well or wrong; and (iv) what is to be learnt. Lessons are based on evidence generated from the evaluation exercise.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

(A) Basis of the Evaluation

30. The focus of the evaluation is on the achievement of intended outcomes rather than outputs, which are derived from the project's statement of objectives. The statement of objectives is taken from the project document approved by the Board (appraisal or legal document). If the objectives statement is unclear about the intended outcomes, the evaluator retrospectively constructs an outcome-oriented statement of objectives using the project's results chain, performance indicators and targets, and other information (including country strategies and interviews with officials of executing agencies and staff of operational units).

31. If project objectives are revised during implementation, the project is assessed against both the original and the revised objectives. If the changes in project objectives and/or outcome targets were approved by the Board, these changes are taken into account in the assessment of the core criteria. In this case, a method for weighting the achievement of the original and revised objectives is adopted, in order to determine the assessment of the core criteria. The same method may be applied to projects with changes in objectives and/or outcome targets that are not approved by the Board. The evaluator needs to judge whether such changes are valid. Options for weighting include:

(i) using the original and revised objectives by the share of disbursements before and after the restructuring; (ii) weighting by the share of implementation time under each set of objectives; and (iii) weighting by the undisbursed balances on the financing before and after restructuring.

32. Furthermore, the evaluation includes consideration of unanticipated outcomes which are taken into account only if they are properly documented, are of significant magnitude to be consequential, and can be plausibly attributed to the project. These are defined as positive and/or negative effects of the project that are not mentioned in the project's statement of objectives or in project design documents.

The unanticipated outcomes are considered in the effectiveness and sustainability assessments also to ensure the accountability of the project for effective and sustainable achievement of its relevant objectives. Unanticipated outcomes are taken into account in the assessment of efficiency too. The calculation of the project's ex-post Economic Internal Rate of Return (EIRR) includes unanticipated positive outcomes (by raising benefits) and unanticipated negative outcomes (by raising costs).

(B) Evaluation Criteria

33. The GOE Department uses the four core criteria widely accepted for evaluating development interventions, namely relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability as developed by IFIs-ECG and OECD-DAC. Project performance is assessed against these criteria. Each criterion is rated while the aggregate performance rating is generated from the average rate of the four above-mentioned

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

criteria. The four evaluation criteria adopted by the GOE Department are explained below:

- (a) *Relevance*: Relevance is defined as the extent to which the project's objectives are consistent with beneficiary needs, the country's development or policy priorities and strategy, and the IDB Group's assistance strategy and corporate goals. In this regard, relevance to the IDB Group relates to the alignment with its strategic objectives and priority areas. It also refers to the adequacy and coherence of the project's components (design) to achieve those objectives.
- (b) *Effectiveness*: Effectiveness is defined as the extent to which the project achieved (or is expected to achieve) its stated objectives, taking into account their relative importance.
- (c) *Efficiency*: Efficiency is defined as the extent to which the project has converted its resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) economically into results. It signifies that the least costly resources possible are used to achieve the desired results. Measuring efficiency generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs to determine whether the most efficient process was adopted. Economic and financial rates of return (E/FIRR) should be used or, if not possible, other measures of cost effectiveness.
- (d) *Sustainability*: Sustainability is defined as the likelihood of continued long-term benefits, and the resilience to risk of net benefit flows over the intended useful project life. The main factors to be considered in establishing likely sustainability are: technical soundness; government commitment, including supportive legal/regulatory framework; socio-political support; economic viability; financial viability; institutional, organizational and management effectiveness; environmental impact; and resilience to exogenous factors.

34. Furthermore, two additional criteria, namely *Performance of the Bank* and *Performance of the Beneficiary of the IDB Financing* are also considered in the assessment of a development intervention as second layer of performance indicators.

(C) Project Ratings

35. Each of the four criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability) for assessment of project performance is assigned a rating. A four-point symmetric rating scale is used; ratings may be either categories or numbers. For bank performance and beneficiary performance, the number of rating scale points is also four. The ratings measure degrees of satisfactory or unsatisfactory project performance.

36. The rating for a given criterion is constructed from ratings of sub-criteria and from ratings on different elements (sub-questions) of the criterion. The rules for the aggregation are clearly spelled out in the Chapter – 2 of these guidelines.

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

37. An Aggregate Project Development Outcome (APDO) Rating is constructed from the core criteria. In constructing the APDO, the component criteria are given equal weights. For the APDO, the number of rating scale points is four. The criteria ratings are given numerical values, the rules for constructing the APDO rating category are clearly spelled out in the Chapter - 2 of these guidelines.

(D) Other Assessment Criteria

38. In addition to the APDO, a second layer of performance indicators are calculated for the Bank Performance and Performance of the Beneficiary of the IDB Financing. The component criteria and rules for constructing the second layer of indicators are also clearly spelled out in Chapter - 2 of these guidelines.

DISSEMINATION AND DISCLOSURE OF EVALUATION PRODUCTS

(A) Dissemination Products and Strategy

39. Dissemination of evaluation findings and recommendations is one of the main functions of the GOE Department. A special attention has to be given to the dissemination of evaluation results, so that lessons learned from experience are diffused for incorporation in new projects and development activities. The strategy for disseminating evaluation findings and lessons of experience depends on the type of products and the audiences it intends to reach.

(B) Dissemination Mechanisms

40. The GOE Department issues final evaluation reports along with summaries intended to communicate key findings effectively. The GOE Department disseminates the findings of its evaluations, including lessons learned, recommendations, and follow-up actions on the projects evaluated both internally and externally. Evaluation reports are made available online to IDBG staff for learning and knowledge-sharing.

(C) Disclosure Policy

41. The GOE Department ensures that evaluation reports are disclosed to all concerned stakeholders and to the public at large while observing confidentiality safeguards. The dissemination is done through various channels such as internet, workshops, seminars, and symposia, except when confidentiality required such as commercial confidential information on a client company.

GUIDE TO PERFORMANCE RATING

RELEVANCE

42. The assessment of relevance covers both the relevance of project objectives and design to achieve those objectives. It attempts to measure the extent to which the project's objectives are consistent with beneficiary needs, the country's development or policy priorities and strategy, and the IDB Group's assistance strategy and corporate goals. It also assesses the adequacy and coherence of the project's design to achieve the stated objectives.

43. The assessment of relevance is performed based on the following sub-criteria and sub-questions. Each sub-question is rated between 0 and 1, and the average of these ratings is the sub-criteria rating. Under the relevance criteria, several questions are asked in the assessment matrix and specific guidance on scoring of each sub-question could be found in the table below:

Table-1: Guide for Rating of Relevance

SUB-CRITERIA	EVALUATOR'S METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH (Sub-Questions)	GUIDELINE FOR RATING
Consistency of project objectives with country overall development strategy and with the beneficiaries' needs and with the IDBG's Member Country Partnership Strategy (MCPS) NB: Consistency of the project objectives is assessed against both the original and revised objectives	1. To what extent are the objectives in line with the country's development priorities and strategies?	Evaluator refers to the country's national development plan, poverty reduction strategy (where applicable), or meetings and interviews with country authorities. Rate between 0 and 1.
	2. To what extent are the objectives consistent with the end-beneficiary needs?	Evaluator refers to the evaluation mission findings. Rate between 0 and 1.
	3. To what extent are the objectives in harmony with the IDB's strategy (vision, strategic thrusts, crosscutting goals, main pillars)? Has the project contributed to IDB corporate cross-cutting goals: (reverse linkages; promotion of the Islamic Finance Industry; intra-OIC trade and economic integration)?	Evaluator refers to IDB's 1440 vision and 9 strategic thrusts. Rate between 0 and 1.
Relevance of Project Objectives and Coherence between outputs and outcomes (including the modified ones): <i>It assesses the extent to which the project's objectives are clearly stated and focused on outcomes rather than outputs. Also, It assesses the realism of intended outcomes in the</i>	1. Are the project's objectives clearly stated and focused on outcomes as opposed to outputs?	Evaluator refers to the project log-framework prepared at appraisal, as well as appraisal report and RRP (please note that long term outcomes may have been labeled as impacts by the project officer). If objectives were output oriented, restructure them as being outcome oriented. If not clear, the intended outcomes may need to be constructed from sources of information other than the project documents such as interview evidence from government officials and IDB staff. Rate between 0 and 1.
	2. Was the target end-beneficiary group properly selected?	Evaluator refers to appraisal report, RRP, as well as their evaluation mission findings. Rate between 0 and 1. Leave blank if not applicable.

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

<p><i>country's current circumstances.</i></p>	<p>3. How realistic are the objectives and intended outcomes to the country's current circumstances?</p>	<p>Evaluator refers to the evaluation mission findings, most recent country's national development plan (even if produced after project start). Rate between 0 and 1.</p>
--	--	---

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

SUB-CRITERIA	EVALUATOR'S METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH (Sub-Questions)	GUIDELINE FOR RATING
Relevance of the design entry, this includes technical, financial and development related design. <i>It assesses the relevance of the technical options and solutions adopted, to the beneficiaries needs. If applicable; relevance of the design at closing (including the modifications) is also assessed.</i>	1. To what extent did the project design adopt the appropriate solutions to the identified problems? (It is an assessment of the internal logic of the operation -the results chain- and the validity of underlying assumptions)	Evaluator refers to the project log-frame (if applicable) or retrofitted log-frame if needed. Log-frame components should be compared with what actually happened in the field. Rate anywhere from 0 to 1 based on findings with 1 being most appropriate and 0 being inappropriate. Leave blank if not applicable.
	2. Were the project's financing arrangements appropriate to meet project objectives and country needs?	Evaluator refers to stakeholder interviews (including beneficiary's ministry of finance). Rate between 0 and 1.
	3. Is the design still relevant to the circumstances prevailing at the time of the evaluation?	Evaluator should give justifying reasons (possible from evaluation visit findings). Rate between 0 and 1.
	4. Were the modifications to the project design (if any) during implementation appropriate and timely for the beneficiaries needs?	Rate between 0 and 1. Leave blank if not applicable.

44. Scores obtained for this sub-criterion are added, normalized to a value from 0% to 100%, to calculate the total project relevance score. Accordingly, the overall score of Relevance rated as *Highly Relevant, Relevant, Partly Relevant, or Irrelevant*, as shown in the table below:

Table-2: Rating Scale for Relevance

Category	Rating Range
1. Highly Relevant	Average score is $\geq 85\%$
2. Relevant	Average score is $\geq 60\%$ and $< 85\%$
3. Partly Relevant	Average score is $\geq 30\%$ and $< 60\%$
4. Irrelevant	Average score is $< 30\%$

EFFECTIVENESS

The assessment of effectiveness covers the capacity of the project to produce a tangible developmental effect. It tests the validity of the anticipated links between the project's activities, outputs, and intended outcomes (results chain).

45. The assessment of effectiveness is performed based on the following sub-criteria and sub-questions. Each sub-question is rated between 0 and 1, and the average of these ratings is the sub-criterion rating. Under the effectiveness criteria, several questions are asked in the assessment matrix and specific guidance on scoring of each sub-question can be found in the table below:

Table-3: Guide for Rating of Effectiveness

SUB-CRITERIA	EVALUATOR'S METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH (SUB-QUESTIONS)	GUIDELINE FOR RATING
	1. Were the project inputs fully utilized to generate the outputs?	Question is self-explanatory. Rate between 0 and 1 based on the evaluation findings.

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

Achievement of project outputs and outcomes compared to planned targets	2. Did the project realize its planned activities (including the modified ones)?	Evaluator should collect information related to the actual project activities such as procurement, consultancy works, construction works, supervision etc. The actual activities should be compared with the planned ones. Evaluator can rate anywhere between 0 to 1 with 1 being full realization of project activities.
	3. Did project activities lead to the desired outputs (as intended in the results chain and whether the	Evaluator should obtain information on actual project's outputs and compare them with planned ones. Assumption made at planning stage should be checked whether they materialize or not. Rate anywhere between 0 to 1 with 1 being exceeding the planned outputs.

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

	assumptions materialized)?	
	4. To what extent did the project outputs lead to the achievement of the intended outcomes (as planned in the results chain)?	Evaluator should collect data and information on outcomes generated as a result of the project operations. The actual outcomes should be compared against the planned ones. Assumption made at planning stage should be checked whether they materialize or not. Rate anywhere between 0 to 1 with 1 being exceeding the planned outcomes.
Net effect of the project (as compared with existing or constructed counterfactuals and other project externalities - unintended consequences - positive, negative, or specific problem solved/created)	1. To what extent did the project achieve its goal / overall objective compared to expectations?	Evaluator should collect data and information on the overall goal generated as a result of the project operations. The actual impacts should be compared against the planned ones. Assumption made at planning stage should be checked whether they materialize or not. Rate anywhere between 0 to 1 with 1 being exceeding the planned impacts.
	2. Is the achievement of project goal/ overall objective a direct result of the project's outcomes (counterfactual analysis)? (Analyse factors other than the project, which have contributed and/or hindered the effectiveness of the project.)	Evaluator should assess the contribution level of the project to the achievement of Goal. A counterfactual analysis may be carried out as well as analysis of other factors that may have contributed to and/or hindered the achievement of Goal/s. Rate anywhere between 0 to 1 with 1 being full contribution to the achieved Goal/s.

46. Scores obtained for this sub-criterion are added, normalized to a value from 0% to 100%, to calculate the total project effectiveness score. Accordingly, the overall score of Effectiveness rated as *Highly Effective*, *Effective*, *Less Effective*, or *Ineffective*, as shown in the table below:

Table-4: Rating Scale for Effectiveness

Category	Rating Range
1. Highly Effective	Average score is $\geq 85\%$
2. Effective	Average score is $\geq 60\%$ and $< 85\%$
3. Less Effective	Average score is $\geq 30\%$ and $< 60\%$
4. Ineffective	Average score is $< 30\%$

EFFICIENCY

47. The assessment of efficiency evaluates the extent to which the project has converted its resources economically into results. Efficiency is a measure of how well the project used resources in achieving the outcome. It is measured in economic terms, because it examines whether the project was an efficient use of resources for the country and/or society (not merely for the operating entity). The efficiency assessment attempts to answer two questions: (i) did the benefits of the project (achieved or expected to be achieved) exceed project costs? and (ii) were the benefits of the project achieved at least cost?

48. The assessment of efficiency is performed based on the following sub-criteria and sub-questions. Each sub-question is rated between 0 and 1, and the average of these ratings is the sub-criterion rating. Under the efficiency criteria, several questions are asked in the assessment matrix and specific guidance on scoring of each sub-question could be found in the table below:

Table-5: Guide for Rating of Efficiency

SUB-CRITERIA	EVALUATOR'S METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH (SUB-QUESTIONS)	GUIDELINE FOR RATING
--------------	---	----------------------

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

<p>Cost-benefit analysis of the project. <i>(Did the benefits of the project -achieved or expected to be achieved- exceed project cost?)</i></p>	<p>1. Did the re-estimated Economic and/or Financial Internal Rates of Return (EIRR/FIRR) exceed the planned or sector threshold?</p>	<p>The evaluator should obtain necessary operational data of the project to carry out re-estimation of the Financial and/or Economic rates of return (FIRR; EIRR) for the project. The re-estimation should be compared with the estimated values at appraisal. If there was no calculation of the FIRR and EIRR at appraisal, the re-estimated values should be compared against the sector threshold. If the re-</p>
--	---	--

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

		estimated values exceed the planned values or the sector threshold, this sub-criteria is rated as 1. If there-estimation of FIRR and EIRR shows negative values, this sub-criteria is rated as 0. Other values can be rated between 0 to 1.
	2. Did the project experience delays or early delivery and what was their effect on costs and benefits?	The evaluator should assess the effects of the implementation delays on increasing the cost of the project. If no cost increase was associated with the implementation delays, the project may be rated as 1. If more than 100% of the project original cost increased as a result of the implementation delays, the project can be rated as 0. Rate anywhere between 0 to 1 depending on the level of contribution of the delays in increasing the project cost.
	3. Are the outputs achieved fully utilized by the intended beneficiaries?	The evaluator should assess the utilization rate of the project outputs. If 100% of the outputs are utilized the project may be rated as 1. If less than 10% utilization rate, the project may be rated as 0. Rate anywhere between 0 to 1 depending on the utilization rate of the project.
Cost effectiveness of the project. <i>(Were the benefits of the project achieved at least cost?)</i>	1. Were the project activities and outputs delivered in a timely manner (timeliness)? Were they achieved according to the original time frame?	The evaluator should analyse the project implementation timeline. If the project was completed ahead of the planned time frame, the project can be rated as 1. If the project had a major delays that exceeds double the planned implementation period, the project can be rated as 0. Rate anywhere between 0 to 1 depending on the significance of the implementation delays.
	2. Were the outputs realized with the least cost (in comparison with similar projects and programs of government and donors of the recipient country)?	Rate anywhere between 0 to 1 depending on the level whether outputs were realized with the least cost in comparison with similar projects and programs of government and donors of the recipient country.

49. Scores obtained for this sub-criterion are added, normalized to a value from 0% to 100%, to calculate the total project efficiency score. Accordingly, the overall score of Efficiency is rated as *Highly Efficient, Efficient, Less Efficient, or Inefficient*. as shown in the table below:

Table-6: Rating Scale for Efficiency

Category	Rating Range
1. Highly Efficient	Average score is $\geq 85\%$
2. Efficient	Average score is $\geq 60\%$ and $< 85\%$
3. Less Efficient	Average score is $\geq 30\%$ and $< 60\%$
4. Inefficient	Average score is $< 30\%$

SUSTAINABILITY

50. The assessment of sustainability is based on the risk that changes may occur that are detrimental to the continued benefits associated with the achievement or expected achievement of the project's objectives, and the impact on that stream of benefits if some or all of these changes were to materialize. The sustainability assessment considers several aspects, as applicable: technical, financial, economic, social, political, and environmental. It also considers the degree of government ownership of and commitment to the project's objectives; the ownership of other stakeholders (e.g., the private sector and civil society); and the degree of institutional support and the quality of governance. The risk and potential impact of natural disasters is also considered. The time frame for the sustainability assessment is the anticipated economic life of the project.

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

51. The assessment of sustainability is performed based on the following sub-criteria and sub-questions. Each sub-question is rated between 0 and 1, and the average of these ratings is the sub-criteria rating. Under the sustainability criteria, several questions are asked in the assessment matrix and specific guidance on scoring of each sub-question could be found in the table below:

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

Table-7: Guide for Rating of Sustainability

SUB-CRITERIA	EVALUATOR'S METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH (Sub-Questions)	GUIDELINE FOR RATING
Technical, Financial, Economic soundness of the project results (including O&M facilitation, availability of recurrent funding, staff, spare parts, workshop facilities etc.)	1. Has there been an adequate O&M system to run the project facilities?	Evaluator refers to the evaluation mission findings. Rate between 0 and 1. If not applicable leave blank.
	2. To what extent is the operating body of the project able to leverage the financial resources (budgetary, donations, etc.) to sustain the project operation after its completion?	Evaluator refers to the evaluation mission findings as well as interviews with project stakeholders. Rate between 0 and 1. If not applicable leave blank.
	3. Is there sufficient technical expertise and training to operate, maintain and regularly service all the necessary facilities of the project?	Evaluator refers to the evaluation mission findings as well as interviews with project stakeholders. Rate between 0 and 1. If not applicable leave blank.
Beneficiary commitment, including supportive legal/regulatory framework and socio-political/stakeholder support	1. Is there sufficient local ownership of the end-beneficiaries of the project's outputs?	Evaluator refers to the evaluation mission findings as well as interviews with project stakeholders. Rate between 0 and 1. If not applicable leave blank.
	2. To what extent are the beneficiaries committed to contribute to the sustainability of the project outcomes on the long-term (including by paying regular fees and by setting-up local organizations to manage the facilities if applicable)?	Evaluator refers to the evaluation mission findings and stakeholder interviews. Rate between 0 and 1. If not applicable leave blank.
	3. To what extent are the domestic laws / policies / regulations, and the institutional and national/international context conducive to maintaining the results of the project?	Evaluator should refer to national legislation relevant to project area as well as any protocols/treaties signed by the host country, as well as stakeholder interviews. Rate between 0 and 1. If not applicable leave blank.
Institutional sustainability (organizational and management effectiveness)	1. Are there appropriate institutional arrangements to ensure the long-term sustainability of the project?	Evaluator refers to the evaluation mission findings as well as interviews with project stakeholders. If yes, please rate 1, if no, rate 0. If not applicable, leave blank.
	2. Does the authority in charge of the operation of the project, have the necessary experience, expertise and training to continue this project and adapt to any changes, and challenges?	Evaluator refers to the evaluation mission findings as well as interviews with project stakeholders. If yes, rate 1, if no, rate 0. If not applicable, leave blank.
Resilience of the project results to exogenous factor	1. Are there any other social/cultural/political challenges that are hindering/are likely to hinder the developmental outcomes and activities of the project?	Evaluator refers to the evaluation mission findings as well as interviews with project stakeholders. If yes, rate 1, if no, rate 0. If not applicable, leave blank.
	2. Is there any concern for a lack of consideration for the socially disadvantaged groups/ women/youth, or the poor, that is hindering/or is likely to hinder the developmental outcomes and activities of the project?	Evaluator refers to the evaluation mission findings as well as interviews with project stakeholders. If yes, rate 1, if no, rate 0. If not applicable, leave blank.
	3. Are there any particular environmental concerns (or lack of safeguards) that would jeopardize the overall sustainability of the project, and if so, are there necessary steps in place to tackle it ?	Evaluator refers to the evaluation mission findings as well as interviews with project stakeholders. If yes, rate 1, if no, rate 0. If not applicable, leave blank.

52. Scores obtained for this sub-criterion are added, normalized to a value from 0% to 100%, to calculate the total project sustainability score. Accordingly, the overall score of Sustainability is rated as *Most Likely to be Sustainable, Likely to be Sustainable, Less Likely to be Sustainable, or Unlikely to be Sustainable* as shown in the table below:

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

Table-8: Rating Scale for Sustainability

Category	Rating Range
1. Most Likely	Average score is $\geq 85\%$
2. Likely	Average score is $\geq 60\%$ and $< 85\%$
3. Less Likely	Average score is $\geq 30\%$ and $< 60\%$
4. Unlikely	Average score is $< 30\%$

AGGREGATE PROJECT DEVELOPMENT OUTCOME (APDO)

53. The overall project rating is based on separate assessments of four core evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability) which are then aggregated to produce the overall rating. Within these four criteria, sub-questions corresponding to the ECG-GPS operational practices are grouped into sub-criteria, each of which is given a rating between 0% and 100% based on project performance. Normalized score is given to the core criteria. Based on the scores of the sub-questions, a score is automatically calculated for the sub-criteria, which, in turn, gives an automatic normalized score (0% to 100%) to the core criteria based on the average score of the sub-criteria in each case. An automatic rating of each core criteria is, therefore, made based on the scores of sub-criteria and an automatic overall rating of the project itself.

54. Each criterion is rated on a scale of 0% to 100%. Then, the APDO is generated from the average rate of the four core criteria. Fixed cut-off points are used to assign appropriate categories of project performance (Highly Successful, Successful, Partly Successful, or Unsuccessful).

55. This approach provides a consistent basis for overall assessment. Evaluators should carefully appraise and, if necessary, modify the ranking if they come up with large differences between the ranking values of the core criteria. The relative rankings of the core criteria also need to be reviewed for logical consistency, for example, for an ineffective project to have a high rating for sustainability would be unusual. At the aggregate level, for a project to be given an overall ranking of Highly Successful if its sustainability was in doubt or if its relevance was poor at project completion and beyond would also be unusual. Particular attention should be given to those assessments where ratings are on the borderline between final rankings.

56. The completed rating matrix is included as an appendix to the PPER, which shows how the final ratings were calculated, and the components on which they were based. The overall project rating is given as four broad performance categories: *Highly Successful*, *Successful*, *Partly Successful*, and *Unsuccessful* which are explained below:

- (i) **Highly Successful (HS):** The maximum possible rating is *Highly Successful* which is given to projects with an average score of **HS \geq 85%** (See Table-1 below). This rating is given to projects whose achievements exceed expectations. The project has a high probability that the outcome and impact will be achieved sustainably and efficiently over the project's life. It remains relevant as envisaged at appraisal.
- (ii) **Successful (SU):** For a project to be rated as *Successful*, the average score on the core criteria is **60% \leq SU $<$ 85%**. Even though the outcome may not have been completely achieved or some negative results may have occurred that prevent a *Highly Successful* rating, there is no major shortfall, and the expected outcome and impact will, on the whole, be achieved sustainably over the project's life. The project remains relevant and its implementation and operations are efficient, and negative impacts are small in relation to the

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

gains generated by the project.

- (iii) **Partly Successful (PS):** Projects that are rated as *Partly Successful* are those whose average score is $30\% \leq PS < 60\%$. Although the evaluation anticipates a significant shortfall in achieving the outcome and impact and may consider full sustainability unlikely, it expects that some project components will achieve major benefits, for example, which should be equivalent to at least half the level of the output originally expected.

- (iv) **Unsuccessful (US):** The average score is **US<30%** for projects that are rated as *Unsuccessful*. In this case, the evaluation considers that the project is a technical and economic failure in the sense that it expects the facilities to operate at a low level of installed capacity, if at all, or at high cost requiring a large subsidy. There may be many negative effects associated with the project. The above-mentioned four broad performance categories are depicted in Table-1 below:

Table-9: Overall Project Rating Scale

Category	Rating Range
1. Highly Successful (HS)	Average score is $\geq 85\%$
2. Successful (SU)	Average score is $\geq 60\%$ and $< 85\%$
3. Partly Successful (PS)	Average score is $\geq 30\%$ and $< 60\%$
4. Unsuccessful (US)	Average score is $< 30\%$

57. The foregoing procedure should also be used to evaluate projects with two or more sub-projects, where a sub-project is defined as a set of separately executed activities. Separate financial and economic analyses should typically be carried out at appraisal for each sub-project, together with overall financial and economic analyses. For the purposes of the overall rating, such a project is considered a single project and be evaluated accordingly. Achievement of outcome, for example, is evaluated taking into account the combined outputs of all the sub-projects. Where wide differences in sub-project performance are apparent, evaluators should carry out stand-alone evaluations of each sub-project, with the results being reported in an annex.

BANK PERFORMANCE

58. This section focuses on the assessment of Bank performance in terms of the quality of services provided by IDB during all project phases. It also covers the assessment of IDB's performance in ensuring quality at entry, satisfactory implementation, future operation, and follow-up policy. The assessment of Bank performance is based on the extent to which IDB proactively identified and resolved problems at different stages of the project cycle, particularly those pertaining to issues such as procurement, disbursements, and compliance with covenants. The assessment of the Bank Performance is performed based on the following sub-criteria and sub-questions. Each sub-question is rated between 0 and 1, and the average of these ratings is the sub-criteria rating. Under the assessment of Bank Performance, several questions are asked in the assessment matrix and specific guidance on scoring of each sub-question could be found in the table below:

Table-10: Guide for Rating of Bank Performance

SUB-CRITERIA	EVALUATOR'S METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH (Sub-Questions)	GUIDELINE FOR RATING
Quality of Bank's input to the design and readiness for project implementation	1. Readiness Assessment of the capacity of the Executing Agency and the Operating Body	With reference to the correspondences and appraisal documents, if the readiness assessment of the capacity of the Executing Agency has been thoroughly done and detailed down

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

(consideration of alternative responses, Participation of stakeholders, institutional arrangements)		in the RRP, then score 1. Otherwise, score 0.
	2. Consultation with stakeholders, beneficiaries, and co-financiers	During the design phase of the project, if all the relevant stakeholders including beneficiaries have been consulted, then score 1. Otherwise, score 0. If there were no consultations with some of the stakeholders, score anywhere between

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

SUB-CRITERIA	EVALUATOR'S METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH (Sub-Questions)	GUIDELINE FOR RATING
	<p>3. Quality of project formulation (Background analysis + Rationale + Objectives / Results Chains) in PCD, PAD, and RRP</p> <p>4. Assessment of FIRR / EIRR and Consideration of alternatives responses and solutions</p>	<p>0 and 1.</p> <p>In the RRP, if the results chain of the project is clearly presented, score 1. Otherwise, score 0.</p> <p>If the FIRR/EIRR have been calculated at the appraisal level with sensitivity analysis, then score 1. Otherwise, score 0.</p>
<p>Use and quality of log frame, lesson learned, adequate risk analysis and compliance to safeguard policies</p>	<p>1. Design of the Results-Framework (Log frame /results chain / theory of change, Indicators, Baseline)</p> <p>2. Use of previous lessons learned and Analysis of their related implications</p> <p>3. Adequate risk analysis and adoption / inclusion of mitigation measures and their related financial implications</p> <p>4. Compliance with Environment and Social safeguards</p>	<p>If there is a results-based framework (logical framework) within the appraisal documents elaborating on the results chain starting from inputs and ending with the expected impact; with the baseline data and monitoring indicators for each step of the logical framework (i.e. inputs, outputs, outcomes and impact), then score 1. If no logical framework is available, score 0. If there is a logical framework, but lacking some of the ingredients listed above, then score anywhere between 0 and 1.</p> <p>If the appraisal documents have used the lessons learned derived from the past evaluations, with detailed analysis of their related implications for the project, then score 1. Otherwise, score 0.</p> <p>If RRP includes adequate risk analysis with suggestions of mitigation measures to be adopted and elaboration at the supervision stage about their financial implications if risks have materialized, then score 1. Otherwise, score 0.</p> <p>If the project is compliant with the Environmental and Social Safeguards, score 1. Otherwise, score 0.</p>
<p>Quality of supervision (skills-mix and frequency, problem solving, responsiveness to</p>	<p>1. Quality of Staff Assigned (Qualification and Experience of the Project Officers)</p> <p>2. Quality of Support to the EA During Project Start-up (Launching events, Familiarization Visit, Guidance on Recruitment, Procurement, and Disbursement Issues)</p>	<p>If the qualifications and experience have been relevant to the requirements of the project, score 1. Otherwise, score 0.</p> <p>During the start-up phase, if the EA was supported through familiarization visit and guidance on IDB rules and regulations, score 1. Otherwise, score 0.</p>

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

changing conditions, adequacy of follow up to recommendations and decisions raised in PIASR)	3. Adherence to IDB Supervision Policy (skills-mix and frequency, problem solving, responsiveness to changing conditions, # of PIASR produced)	If PIASRs have been regularly produced during the implementation and problems have been addressed accordingly, score 1. Otherwise, score 0.
	4. Quality of Bank Responsiveness to the Client and Adequacy of follow up to recommendations and	If Bank Responsiveness has been credibly assessed positively by the client, based on concrete evidence, score 1. Otherwise, score 0. If there are some anecdotal findings that the Bank

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

SUB-CRITERIA	EVALUATOR'S METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH (Sub-Questions)	GUIDELINE FOR RATING
	decisions	responsiveness was high, score anywhere between 0 and 1.
Adequacy of the M&E design and use of M&E (monitoring indicators, use of monitoring plan, use of baseline data, PCR production and quality.	1. Results-Based Management (Use of the Log frame, Baseline and M&E Plan, Tracking of M&E Indicators)	If the logical framework has been utilized during the implementation, via tracking monitoring indicators against the baseline and necessary corrective actions were taken as soon as signaled by the M&E system, score 1. Otherwise score 0. On the other hand, if the logical framework has been utilized as explained above, however, no needed corrective action was taken, then score anywhere between 0 and 1.
	2. Adequacy of the design and use of M&E (monitoring indicators, monitoring plan, use of baseline data)	If the design of the M&E system was sufficient to serve as an implementable supervision and risk measurement tool, score 1. Otherwise, score 0.
	3. To what extent will you rate the follow-up system of the Bank	If the Bank has already followed up on the needed actions during the implementation, either implied by the M&E system or found out during the supervisions by the Bank, score 1. Otherwise, score 0.
	4. Production of the PCR	If the PCR was produced within the timeframe set in the guidelines as per the template, score 1. Otherwise, score 0.

59. Scores obtained for this are added, normalized to a value from 0% to 100%, to calculate the overall assessment of the Bank Performance score. Accordingly, the overall score can be rated as *Highly Satisfactory*, *Satisfactory*, *Unsatisfactory*, or *Highly Unsatisfactory*, as shown in the table below:

Table-11: Rating Scale for Bank Performance

Category	Rating Range
1. Highly Satisfactory	Average score is $\geq 85\%$
2. Satisfactory	Average score is $\geq 60\%$ and $< 85\%$
3. Partly Satisfactory	Average score is $\geq 30\%$ and $< 60\%$
4. Unsatisfactory	Average score is $< 30\%$

PERFORMANCE OF THE BENEFICIARY OF THE IDB FINANCING

60. The assessment of the performance of the beneficiary of IDB financing covers the adequacy of the beneficiary's assumption of ownership and responsibility during all project phases. The main focus of beneficiary performance is on effective measures taken by the beneficiary in ensuring quality preparation and implementation, compliance with covenants and agreements, establishing the basis for project sustainability, and fostering participation by the project's stakeholders. The assessment covers the performance of the government and executing/implementing agencies. The assessment also covers the technical and

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

managerial competence of the executing agency during implementation, and indicates whether any cumbersome and complicated decision-making or approval processes hampered the implementation of the project. The performance of the executing agency to monitor the project, and to report to and consult with the Bank and the capacity to make mid-course adjustments are also assessed. It also determines whether the executing agency established a healthy relationship, through a good rapport and an easy flow of communication, with the consultants, contractors, and suppliers and with the Bank.

61. The assessment of the Beneficiary of the IDB Financing Performance is performed based on the following sub-criteria and sub-questions. Each sub-question is rated between 0 and 1, and the average of these ratings is the sub-criteria rating. Under the assessment of the Beneficiary performance, several questions are asked in the assessment matrix and specific guidance on scoring of each sub-question could be found in the table below:

Table-12: Guide for Rating of Performance of Beneficiary

SUB-CRITERIA	EVALUATOR'S METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH (Sub-Questions)	GUIDELINE FOR RATING
Quality of Preparation (Ownership, end-beneficiaries participation, government commitment, macro-economic policies, sector policies and institutional arrangements including provision of counterpart funding.	1. Readiness of the EA (Government commitment, Macro-economic policies, Sector policies and institutional arrangements including provision of counterpart funding, Feasibility Studies, Detailed Engineering Studies)	Referring to the official programming and planning documents of the Government, if the EA is fully ready – i.e. the project has stemmed from the planning and budgeting cycle of the Government, with the provision of counterpart funding, feasibility study and detailed engineering design available- to start-up the project implementation, then score 1. Otherwise, score between 0 and 1,
	2. Quality of Preparation (Ownership, Consultation / Participation of the end-beneficiaries	While preparing the project, if the Government has consulted with the end-beneficiaries and integrated their feedback into the decision making process, then score 1. Otherwise, score 0.
	3. Leverage of co-financings	If the co-financiers were already determined and communicated by the Government ensuring their commitments, then score 1. Otherwise, score 0.
	4. Time taken for project effectiveness (less than 6 months)	Score 1, if the project was declared effective within 6 months. Otherwise, score 0.
Quality of implementation: Assignment of key staff,	1. Quality of institutional arrangements (PIU / PMU) and of key staff assigned to the implementation	Referring to the field mission findings, if the qualification and experience of the PMU staff is deemed sufficient to address the requirements of the project implementation, score 1. Otherwise, score 0.
	2. Capacity to mobilize counterpart funding, key stakeholders, and other of TAs	If the counterpart funding has been mobilized and corresponding roles of key stakeholders have been fulfilled, score 1. Otherwise, score 0.

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

<p>performance of EA and PMU, Use of TAs, adherence to costs and time.</p>	<p>3. Results-Based Management (Use of the Logframe, Baseline and M&E Plan, Tracking of M&E Indicators)</p>	<p>If the logical framework has been utilized by the beneficiary during the implementation, via tracking monitoring indicators against the baseline and necessary corrective actions were taken as soon as signaled by the M&E system, and accordingly the Bank was informed score 1. Otherwise score 0. On the other hand, if the logical framework has been utilized as explained above, however, no needed corrective action was taken, then score anywhere between 0 and 1.</p>
	<p>4. Adherence to costs and</p>	<p>Referring to the supervision reports and</p>

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

SUB-CRITERIA	EVALUATOR'S METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH (Sub-Questions)	GUIDELINE FOR RATING
	time.	PCR, if the beneficiary has demonstrated its efforts to be able to adhere to the initially targeted cost structure and timeline, score 1. Otherwise, score 0.
Compliance with Project Covenants, Environmental and fiduciary safeguard policies.	1. Compliance with Financing Covenants	If the beneficiary has complied with the financing covenants of the agreement, score 1. Otherwise, score 0
	2. Adherence to Procurement Procedures	If the beneficiary has adhered to procurement procedures, score 1. Otherwise, score 0.
	3. Compliance with Reporting Requirements	If the beneficiary is compliant with the reporting requirements, score 1. Otherwise, score 0.
	4. Compliance with Environmental and Social Safeguard policies.	If the beneficiary is compliant with the Environmental and Social Safeguards, score 1. Otherwise, score 0.
Responsiveness to Bank supervision findings and recommendations for mid-course adjustments.	1. Undertaking of Project Annual Planning and Reviews	If the beneficiary has done implementation reviews and raised the required actions to correct the problems detected during the reviews, score 1. Otherwise, score 0.
	2. Adequacy of the design and use of monitoring indicators for decision making, and reporting on achievements.	Referring to the logical framework (assuming that it is available in the appraisal documents), if the beneficiary has actively contributed to the design of it and used the monitoring indicators for decision making and reporting on achievements (or failures), then score 1. Otherwise, score 0. If there is no logical framework available to begin with, then leave blank.
	3. Capacity to address supervision follow-up actions and recommendations for mid-course adjustments	Referring to the field mission findings, interviews, supervision reports and PCR, if the beneficiary has demonstrated necessary and sufficient capacity to address the follow up actions and recommendations for mid-course adjustments, then score 1. Otherwise, score 0.
	1. Extent to which the Risk Mitigation measures were implemented	If the beneficiary has fully implemented the risk mitigation measures, then score 1. Otherwise, score between 0 and 1 depending on how much of it was implemented.

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

Effectiveness of measures taken to ensure project sustainability and satisfactory operations.	2. Measures taken by the beneficiary to establish the basis for project sustainability, particularly by fostering participation by the project's stakeholders	Referring to the field mission findings and interviews, if the beneficiary has taken technical and financial measures ensuring the project sustainability, particularly by fostering participation by the project's stakeholders, score 1. Otherwise, score 0.
	3. Transfer of Skills to the Operating Body	If the operating body has demonstrated necessary and sufficient skills relevant to the project, ensuring the project sustainability, then score 1. Otherwise, score 0.
	4. Proper Handing-over	If the handing over was smooth, without any problems, then score 1. Otherwise, score 0.
	5. Quality of Archiving	If the beneficiary had a proper archiving

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

SUB-CRITERIA	EVALUATOR'S METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH (Sub-Questions)	GUIDELINE FOR RATING
	System	system responsive to historical inquiries on the project, then score 1. Otherwise, score 0.

62. Scores obtained for this are added, normalized to a value from 0% to 100%, to calculate the overall assessment of the Beneficiary Performance score. Accordingly, the overall score can be rated as *Highly Satisfactory*, *Satisfactory*, *Unsatisfactory*, or *Highly Unsatisfactory*, as shown in the table below:

Table-13: Rating Scale for Performance of the Beneficiary

Category	Rating Range
1. Highly Satisfactory	Average score is $\geq 85\%$
2. Satisfactory	Average score is $\geq 60\%$ and $< 85\%$
3. Partly Satisfactory	Average score is $\geq 30\%$ and $< 60\%$
4. Unsatisfactory	Average score is $< 30\%$

AUTOMATED RATING MATRIX

63. An automated template for preparing the ratings matrix has also been developed for inputting the scores of sub-questions and generating the overall rating for each criteria as well as the APDO rating. A summary of the matrix with general comments explaining the rating of each criteria is provided for inclusion in the PPER as an appendix (See it in Template of PPER, i.e. in Annex 5).

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

ANNEXES

Annex-1: Due Diligence Check List for Desk Review

N/A = Not Applicable; N/R = Not Relevant NB: Put tick (✓) mark in the box as the case may be.

Sl. No	Task	Yes	No	Part ly	N/A	N/R
1	Contacted concerned IDB Group operational department(s), identify focal point(s) and conduct a dialogue about proposed evaluation mission					
2	Coordinated with the IDB Focal Point in the subject member country government or company					
3	Coordinated with the IDB Regional Office, Country Gateway Office or Field Representative, if available					
4	Contacted Finance Department to discuss any disbursement issues					
5	Contacted Legal Department to discuss any legal issues					
6	Submitted a memo or go to the concerned department(s) (responsible staff) soliciting the required information and documentation on the project					
7	Collected and reviewed all the relevant documents on the project available in project files such as:					
7.1	<i>Report and Recommendations of the President (RRP) and Appraisal Report</i>					
7.2	<i>BED Resolution</i>					
7.3	<i>Feasibility Report</i>					
7.4	<i>Financing Agreement</i>					
7.5	<i>Bidding Documents</i>					
7.6	<i>Evaluation reports on the offers related to the selection of consultants, contractors and suppliers of the project</i>					
7.7	<i>Contracts signed between the executing agency and consultants, contractors and suppliers of the project</i>					
7.8	<i>BTORs on the follow-up missions that have visited the project</i>					
7.9	<i>Correspondence files (obtained from concerned Operations Department, Legal Department and Finance Department)</i>					
7.10	<i>Repayment Schedule</i>					
7.11	<i>Project Financial Statement (Financial Department)</i>					
7.12	<i>Country Portfolio Report (OPSD)</i>					
7.13	<i>Country Brief and Fact Sheet (Country Programs Department)</i>					
7.14	<i>Project Implementation Assessment and Supervision Reports (PIASRs)</i>					
7.15	<i>Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP)</i>					
7.16	<i>Member Country Partnership Strategy (MCPS)</i>					
7.17	<i>Project Completion Report (PCR) and any progress reports</i>					
7.18	<i>PCR Evaluation Note (PCR-EN)</i>					
7.19	<i>Evaluation reports of GOE Department conducted in the same sector/country</i>					
7.20	<i>Evaluation reports of other MDBs conducted in the same sector/country</i>					
8	Contacted executing agency/PMU and other stakeholders, and dispatch fax announcing the mission and get their confirmation for the mission.					
9	Prepared the skeleton report (at least, chapter 1 of the PPER template should be filled in) and submit to the GOE Department Management					
10	Prepared detailed questionnaire in line with the PPER template for getting the necessary data and information from the executing agency and/or PMU					
11	Prepared a tentative mission program in liaison with the executing/implementing agency covering schedule of meetings and site visits					
12	Made all travel arrangements					
13	Transmission of confirmation fax (including the evaluation questionnaire) by GOE Department					

This check list is submitted before going on mission.

I/We have completed the above check list, and confirm its compliance with the relevant tasks.

.....
Signature

.....
Date: dd /mm/yy

Annex-2: Template of the Approach Paper

Group Operations Evaluation Department

Memorandum

No. Date

To : The Director, Group Operations Evaluation

Department/Through : The Manager, Project & Special Evaluation

Division From : ...

Subject : **Approach Paper on GOED Mission to ...**

Desk review findings:

1. ...
2. ...
3. ...

Key Evaluation Questions:

1. ...
2. ...

Annexes:

- I. Detailed Questionnaire to the Executing Agency
- II. Skeleton PPER based on desk review readings & findings and interviews with the relevant Operational staff

Best regards.

Annex-3: Due Diligence Check List for Field Mission

Sl. No	Task	Yes	No	N/A	Partly	N/R
1	Met the IDB Focal Point in the country and any other relevant agency, and brief about the objectives of the mission, write detailed minutes of the meetings for future reference while writing the PPER.					
2	Met the key officials of the executing/implementing agency and discuss the issues related to the project's implementation and performance, write detailed minutes of the meetings for future reference while writing the PPER.					
3	Arranged meetings with the consultants, contractors, suppliers and other stakeholders to solicit their feedback on the implementation of the project. Write detailed minutes of the meetings for future reference while writing the PPER.					
4	Collected relevant data and information on the project from all sources in the field. It is a must to meet and collect the views of the end beneficiaries, directly and indirectly targeted by the project.					
5	Visited the site(s) to observe project facilities first hand and take photos of project facilities in existence.					
6	Met the key officials of the operating agencies and discuss the issues related to project effectiveness and sustainability, write detailed minutes of the meetings for future reference while writing the PPER.					
7	Conducted interviews/field surveys, if deemed appropriate, to assess impact of the project on the ground.					
8	Ensured that responses to the evaluation questionnaire are collected					
	Conducted wrap-up meeting with the Governor office, the executing agency/PMU, Operations/RO/CGO staff, IDB focal point and all other concerned parties about the mission's findings and any follow-up issues. Write detailed minutes of the meetings for future reference while writing the PPER.					
9	Ensured that all the detailed minutes of all the meetings are fully included in the skeleton report, right after completion of the mission.					
10	Within three days after resuming in the office, submit the BTOR on the mission findings.					

N/A = Not Applicable; N/R = Not Relevant

NB: Put tick (✓) mark in the box as the case may be.

This check list is submitted alongside the BTOR.

I/We have completed the above checklist, and confirm its compliance with the relevant tasks.

.....
Signature

.....
Date: dd /mm/yy

Annex-4: Templates of the Wrap-Up Presentation and the Back-To-Office Report

The template of the wrap-up presentation should be in line with the BTOR template provided below:

Group Operations Evaluation Department
Memorandum

No.

Date:

To : The President, IDB
From : The Director, Group Operations Evaluation Department
Subject: **Brief Back-to-Office Report (BTOR) on the Mission for GOE Evaluation of ...**

A mission comprising Br. The main findings of the field mission are highlighted below.

1. Background:

Main Findings

2. Relevance:

3. Effectiveness:

4. Efficiency:

5. Sustainability:

6. Issues and Opportunities:

- i) ...
- ii) ...
- iii) ...

7. Recommendations and Follow-up Actions:

- i) ...
- ii) ...
- iii) ...

The findings presented here are preliminary. A comprehensive PPER is being prepared. The matter is submitted for your kind information.

Profound regards.

Cc: The Vice President (OC)