



Enhanced Integrated Framework

Trade for LDC development

Project Completion Reports

Guidance Note

For Staff/Raters

September 2022

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW	2
	Purpose and Scope.....	2
	Description of Concept	2
	When to undertake a PCR.....	3
	Scope of the PCR.....	3
	Structure of the PCR.....	3
	Rating methodology.....	3
2	PCR PROCESS	3
3	DETAILED GUIDANCE FOR COMPLETING THE PCR TEMPLATE	5
4	ANNEX	8
	Annex 1: Guidance on Ratings Evaluation Criteria	8

1 INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this note is to present an approach to project reporting and rating at the completion stage, applicable to all projects financed by the EIF through the EIF Trust Fund. It refers to the Project Completion Report (PCR) template and provides technical guidance to users for undertaking the PCR rating.

The PCR complements and completes the set of quality assurance tools adopted by the EIF Board to guide project reporting and rating throughout the operational cycle.

According to the Compendium for EIF Phase Two, a PCR is required upon project completion of each EIF-funded project, which helps to determine the overall project performance and to be used for feedback purposes. It will serve as a tool to identify the project's accomplishments, problems faced, and lessons learned. The findings of the evaluation report for each project will therefore inform the PCR.

Description of Concept

A PCR is a standardized self-evaluation conducted by the EIF National Implementation Unit (NIU)/Main Implementing Entity (MIE) project manager for a completed EIF project. PCRs are aimed at providing a rapid internal quantitative and qualitative assessment of project and stakeholder performance, as well as a summary of key lessons learned/recommendations, which helps to determine the overall project performance and will be used for feedback. PCR preparation is among the final milestones of project implementation and results tracking and constitutes the culmination of regular supervision. The timely submission of PCRs is also essential for the EIF's results reporting to its funders.

When to undertake a PCR

As the name suggest, PCRs will be carried out only towards the end/closure of a project, and hence cannot be conducted at mid-term. PCRs will be prepared for all EIF projects (except for EIF Tier 1 Phase 1 projects), both big and small. For bigger projects (projects worth USD 500,000 and above in EIF funding), PCRs will serve as a supplementary assessment to the external Final Project Evaluation, while for smaller projects (EIF projects below USD 500,000), PCRs will serve as the only performance assessment for such projects and hence will be considered as the Final Evaluation Review.

Scope of the PCR

The emphasis of the PCR is on performance assessment as well as learning for future initiatives and policies.

The performance assessment covers the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)-DAC evaluation criteria of (a) relevance, (b) coherence, (c) effectiveness, (d) efficiency, (e) sustainability, and (f) emerging impacts. The PCR also includes a section to capture key issues and lessons learned.

With respect to learning, the PCR will capture lessons learned throughout project implementation; and such lessons could also be extracted from the Final Project Evaluation, if applicable. The summary of the management response and of the external evaluation commissioned for the project will also be captured in the PCR if applicable.

Structure of the PCR

The PCR contains four main sections, with an optional section on "Overall PCR Ratings" in the annexes (see template): (I) Project Information (basic data), (II) Project Performance Assessment, (III) Summary of Key Issues/Lessons Learned and Recommendations and (IV) Supporting Documents and Human-Interest Stories.

Rating methodology

The ratings of the project's performance towards the achievement of the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria will generally be mandatory for all small projects, but optional for big projects where the independent final project evaluation has rated the project against the OECD-DAC criteria. In cases where the final evaluation does not provide criteria ratings or where the project team believes that there should be substantially different ratings, the ratings should be included. Although the approach for rating is largely evidence-based, the ratings will always be based on the judgment of the rater(s), based on the best available information. To the extent possible, the PCR should provide quantitative data to substantiate these assessments (evidence-based) and specific lessons and recommendations should be clearly identified. For all ratings in the PCR, the following scale is used: 4 (Highly satisfactory), 3 (Satisfactory), 2 (Unsatisfactory), 1 (Highly unsatisfactory). Annex 1 provides more guidance on rating.

2 PCR PROCESS

The PCR preparation is the final operational deliverable for all EIF projects. It must begin at least one month before the end of the project's memorandum of understanding (MOU) or immediately

following the completion of the Final Project Evaluation¹, whichever comes first or applies². This is to ensure that the findings from the project evaluation feed into the PCR process.

The PCR shall be conducted in a participatory manner between the NIU/MIE staff and the Executive Secretariat for the EIF (ES)-EIF Trust Fund Manager (TFM), and include other relevant stakeholders, such as the EIF Donor Facilitator and direct beneficiaries. The PCR process shall be completed in five main stages, further elaborated below: PCR drafting; participatory assessment stage; update of the draft PCR and criteria rating; final ES-TFM review; and finalization of the PCR process.

The process:

1. PCR drafting: The NIU/MIE will prepare a first draft of the PCR using the recommended EIF template. The first draft will be informed by the project-level data collected and reported throughout the project implementation and findings from the final project evaluation. Criteria ratings will not be completed in the first draft.
2. Participatory assessment of the draft PCR: The draft PCR will be circulated with all relevant stakeholders for review, and then presented and discussed at the participatory review meeting (virtual or physical) that will be organized by the NIU/MIE. Such meetings should be planned and budgeted well ahead of time and could be organized within the framework of the Project Steering Committee. Review comments can range from highlighting factual errors, to calling for more detail, editing, disqualifying some of the initially reported data, or providing additional data/supporting evidence in relation to some reported results. This process shall not last more than seven working days to conclude, especially if done by e-mail.
3. Update of the PCR and criteria rating by the NIU/MIE: Following the feedback from the participatory assessment, the NIU/MIE will update the draft report by incorporating the comments and inputs provided by the stakeholders. This update phase will also consist of assigning ratings to each criterion based on the assessment provided for each criterion. Note that criteria rating is mandatory for small projects but optional for bigger EIF projects. The process should be concluded within three working days.
4. Final ES-TFM review:
 - a. Quality assessment: The updated PCR will be assessed for quality, and comments will be raised where needed.
 - b. Criteria rating validation: The ES Coordinator (ESC) and the TFM Regional Portfolio Manager (RPM) will validate the criteria rating based on the narrative provided by the MIE/NIU in the PCR and their own knowledge of the overall performance of the project. The rating will be done using the template provided in Annex 3.
 - c. Preparation of the ES-TFM reflection note on the project's performance: As an annex, the ESC-RPMs will prepare a one-two page brief on the overall performance of the project, mostly focused on results and financial performance, as well as on the key lessons learned, best practices from the project and any final feedback to the NIU/MIE.The review process should be completed within 10 working days from the day of reception.
5. Finalization of the PCR process: The final reviewed PCR will be shared with the NIU/MIE to address any final comments that may have been raised before sharing. Otherwise, the version will be shared as final with key stakeholders and filed accordingly.

Summary of Steps

¹ Note that the Final Project Evaluation should begin at least three months before the MOU closure of the project and must be completed at least one month before the close of the project

² Note that the completion of the Final Project Evaluation will not be a condition for smaller projects below USD 500 000, which do not require an external evaluation.

Step	Person Responsible	Estimated Days Required
Step 1: PCR Drafting	NIU/MIE.	8 working days.
Step 2: Participatory Assessment of the Draft PCR	All stakeholders, including DF.	7 working days.
Step 3: Update of the PCR and Criteria Rating by the NIU/MIE	NIU/MIE.	3 working days.
Step 4: Final ES-TFM Review	ESC, RPM, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning team.	10 working days.
Step 5: Finalization of the PCR Process	NIU/MIE.	2 working days and continuous.

3 DETAILED GUIDANCE FOR COMPLETING THE PCR TEMPLATE

This section provides detailed guidance on the PCR structure and rating methodology to be applicable, when relevant³, section by section. It should be read in conjunction with the PCR template.

Section I. Project information

In this section, the basic project data is presented, including responsible staff, financial information, key dates, and the key (expected) results. This information is descriptive and will normally be taken from the approved project proposal, the country section of the EIF Management Information System, or project reports and existing project documents.

Section II. Project performance assessment

This section is the core part of the PCR and provides an assessment of the project's performance and achievements for each of the OECD-DAC criteria. In the following, guidance on rating is provided. For more background information on the evaluation criteria, see the EIF Project Evaluation Guidance Note and the EIF Evaluation Training materials.

A. Relevance

The relevance of a project is assessed at its completion in order to validate the original analysis and take into account any changes that may have taken place during project implementation. The assessment should cover the *relevance of the project objective* and the *relevance of the project design*.

The assessment of the relevance of the project shall focus on, but not be limited to, the following:

- Assessing the alignment of the **project objective** to the country's needs as expressed in the country's trade policy priorities, beneficiary needs, trade mainstreaming, and development agenda.
-
- Assessing the relevance of the eventual adjustments/adaptations that were made to the scope, implementation arrangements, or technical solutions to ensure the achievement of the intended results.

³ As advised under the section Rating Methodology above, the rating of evaluation criteria will be optional for all projects that have undergone an independent final project evaluation that rated the project against the OECD DAC criteria. In other cases (for example where there has not been a final evaluation with ratings provided), or where the project team believes there should be substantially different ratings, the ratings should be included.

B. Coherence

The coherence of a project is assessed at its completion in order to validate the original concept and take into account any changes that may have taken place during project implementation.

The assessment of coherence should cover the coordination, complementarity and harmonization with other related projects and initiatives (external coherence) and the quality of the project design in meeting outcomes, i.e., the extent to which the various elements reinforced each other (internal coherence). Specifically, this should assess:

- The extent of synergy, coordination, complementarity and harmonization between the project and other government- or partner-funded interventions both at the implementation and result levels.
- The effect of positive and negative synergies to the overall performance of the project.
- The quality of the project design in meeting outcomes by specifically explaining the extent to which the different components and activities of the project support each other. This criterion complements the "relevance of design" criterion (see above).

C. Effectiveness

The assessment of *effectiveness* evaluates the extent to which the project achieved its stated results, i.e., the intended set of outcomes and outputs. This assessment should consider the validity of the links between the project's activities, outputs, and intended outcomes (the results chain). It requires an updated and accurate reporting of actual achievements compared to planned targets for the output and outcome indicators of the project logical framework.

- The assessment should examine the extent to which project targets as defined in the logframe have been achieved (both quantitatively and qualitatively).
- Assess the unintended results that have been achieved, **including, for example, issues related to gender and the environment.**
- Also of importance is the total number of beneficiaries by categories and disaggregated by gender and age (where relevant), which should be clearly reported.
- Also assess any unanticipated or additional factors, either positive or negative, that may have influenced the achievement of the project outcomes.

D. Efficiency

The assessment of *Efficiency* is based on a measure of how well the project has used resources in achieving its outputs and outcomes. The assessment evaluates how efficiently the expected project results were delivered during project implementation. This should include an assessment of:

- The extent to which the project delivered on work plan activities in a timely manner (work plan implementation rate, timeliness rate, time use rate). The time baseline will be the date of first disbursement. The timeliness rate will be calculated by getting a ratio of the "Total Actual Implementation Time in months (including NCE)/Planned Implementation Time at project design (excluding NCE). The lower the ratio or percentage, the more efficient the timeliness.
- The efficiency in the use of project resources, including human, material and financial (budget execution rate, absorption capacity).
- The cost-efficiency dimension and value for money considerations during implementation.
- The efficiency with regards to how well the project managed and adapted to risks.

- The PCR should also discuss the factors that influenced efficiency in *timeliness and resource-use efficiency* at completion.

E. Sustainability

The assessment of *sustainability* considers the extent to which the project benefits last or are likely to last following the end of the project. It assesses:

- Sustainability along the following five dimensions:
 - i) financial sustainability: assesses the extent to which funding mechanisms and modalities (e.g., government support through budgetary allocations, other stakeholder contributions, aid flows, user fees, etc.) have been put in place to ensure the continued flow of benefits after project completion.
 - ii) institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities: assesses the extent to which the project has contributed to strengthening institutional capacities, such as improved governance practices, improved skills, procedures, incentives structures, or institutional mechanisms that will facilitate the continued flow of benefits associated with the project. It should also include an assessment of the building of capacity to lead and manage the trade policy reform process and how committed and supportive the ministry responsible for trade is to this process in order to reinforce national ownership.
 - iii) ownership and sustainability of partnerships: assesses the degree to which the project has catalyzed ongoing change in the sector. It is closely related but goes beyond institutional sustainability and ownership by addressing change in the sector more broadly.
 - v) environmental and social sustainability: this dimension would assess the extent to which the environmental mitigation measures of the project were implemented, the capacity of country institutions and systems, and the availability of funding to ensure the environmental sustainability of the operation.
- The extent to which the project has addressed risks during implementation and put in place mechanisms to ensure the continued flow of benefits after project completion.
- The sustainability of the project in terms of its resilience and adaptation during implementation and whether the project has put in place appropriate exit strategies during its implementation.

F. Impact (emerging or evident)

The assessment of the project's impact in a PCR is arguably difficult – at around project completion, it will typically be too early to have any systematic evidence or information about impact. Therefore, the PCR will focus on emerging impact, i.e., initial tendencies towards impact achievement, or anecdotal evidence of evident impact. The following seven impact areas will be specifically assessed:

- i) impact on women socio-economic empowerment
- ii) impact on youth inclusion and socio-economic empowerment
- iii) impact on job creation
- iv) impact on the economy, including investment
- v) environmental impact
- vi) social impact
- vii) other impact (where identified)

This section summarises issues, lessons learned and recommendations from the project evaluations report and the corresponding management responses,. *In the absence of an independent final project evaluation, the NIU team shall jointly reflect on the key issues and lessons drawn from implementing the projects and propose possible recommendations for improving future project design and implementation.*

Key Issues: Identify and describe the key issues that have gravely affected the delivery of the project in relation to the different criteria. key issues that have affected project relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability.

Lessons learned: lessons learned (both positive and negative) are generalizations based on experiences with project implementation. Unlike findings and conclusions, lessons are not limited to the specific circumstances of the project, but rather address issues that go beyond the project, and can inform future actions. At the same time, unlike recommendations, lessons do not mandate that specific actions be taken in the future, but rather indicate what factors from experience should be considered in forming future actions.

In determining lessons learned, reflect on what was planned, what happened (providing information about the context), taking into consideration what went on well or wrong and then what is useful or not from the experience. For each lesson learned it is recommended to specify the "key issue" and the target audience (e.g., country/MIE, ES/TFM, co-financiers).

Recommendations: this is a forward-looking section to identify specific recommendations to address key risks for sustainability, as well as other issues. The recommendations should be specific and feasible. For each recommendation, the person responsible and the timeframe/deadline should be indicated.

Section IV: Human interest stories

For communication and awareness-raising, provide some of the stories and voices of the project beneficiaries (include any that was published in newsletters, newspapers, or any other public media). Quotations and photos from beneficiaries are encouraged. Also list and provide links, where appropriate, to key project documentation and visibility (e.g., published reports, news articles, videos...).

4 Annex

Annex 1: Guidance on Ratings Evaluation Criteria

The overall PCR rating is based on the average rating of the six key PCR criteria (Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability, and Impact).

The computation method is as follows:

- Each criterion under each dimension will be rated 1 (Highly Unsatisfactory), 2 (Unsatisfactory), 3 (Satisfactory), or 4 (Highly Satisfactory), based on the guidance and definitions outlined above in this document.
- The overall PCR rating is calculated as the simple average of the six criteria ratings. The following scale will apply: 1 (Highly Unsatisfactory), 2 (Unsatisfactory), 3 (Satisfactory), 4 (Highly Satisfactory).

Deviations from this calculation by applying different weightings could be used but need to be duly justified.

Below are described the different elements to take into account before attributing a specific rating score under each evaluation criteria.

Relevance

<p>Relevance of the project objective: the assessment should cover the <i>relevance of the project objective</i> against the country's needs and the country's trade policy priorities, beneficiaries' needs, trade mainstreaming and development agenda. <i>Where applicable, ratings should be based on the following scale:</i></p>
<p>4 – Highly Satisfactory: During the implementation period, the project purpose remained fully aligned with all the following: i) the EIF's objectives, ii) the country's trade needs and beneficiaries' needs, respectively, and iii) the country's development agenda.</p>
<p>3 – Satisfactory: During the implementation period, the project purpose was largely aligned with all the following: i) the EIF's objectives, ii) the country's trade needs and beneficiaries' needs, respectively, and iii) the country's development agenda.</p>
<p>2 – Unsatisfactory: During the implementation period, the project purpose was not aligned with one of the following: i) the EIF's objectives, ii) the country's trade needs and beneficiaries' needs, respectively, and iii) the country's development agenda.</p>
<p>1 – Highly Unsatisfactory: During the implementation period, the project purpose was not aligned with two or more of the following: i) the EIF's objectives, ii) the country's trade needs and beneficiaries' needs, respectively, and iii) the country's development agenda.</p>
<p>Relevance of the project design: this criterion assesses the soundness of the project design against the identified problems and the appropriateness of the eventual adjustments that were made in the scope, implementation arrangements, or technical solutions to ensure the achievement of the intended results. <i>Where applicable, rating should be based on the following scale:</i></p>
<p>4 – Highly Satisfactory: from approval to closure, the design was highly conducive to achieving the project results. The design remained appropriate throughout implementation. Where required by unforeseeable changes in the project context, adjustments to the scope, implementation arrangements or technical solutions were swiftly and effectively made to ensure the achievement of the intended outputs and outcomes.</p>
<p>3 – Satisfactory: from approval to closure, the design was consistently conducive to achieving the project results. The design remained appropriate throughout implementation. Where adjustments to the scope, implementation arrangements or technical solutions were required because of unforeseeable changes in the project context, they were carried out in a timely manner to ensure the achievement of the intended outcomes and outputs.</p>
<p>2 – Unsatisfactory: from approval to closure, the design was not consistently conducive to achieving the project results. The original design was either weak or lost its relevance during implementation. Major adjustments to the scope, implementation arrangements or technical solutions were required during implementation, but they were made with substantial delays, which negatively affected the achievement of the intended outcomes and outputs.</p>
<p>1 – Highly Unsatisfactory: from approval to closure, the design was not conducive to achieving the project results. The original design was weak and remained irrelevant during implementation. Major adjustments to the scope, implementation arrangements or technical solutions were required during implementation, but they were not made, which negatively affected the achievement of the intended outcomes and outputs.</p>

Coherence

Coordination with other related projects and initiatives: The assessment should cover coherence with other relevant government- and donor-funded initiatives, both at the level of implementation (e.g., whether meetings or other forms of coordination took place; whether activities were coordinated) and at the level of results (e.g., the extent to which the project results and the results of other initiatives supported or built on each other). *Where applicable, rating should be based on the following scale:*

4 – Highly Satisfactory: Other initiatives were duly considered in the project design. During the implementation period, coordination activities took place periodically. Positive synergies between the project’s results and other initiatives clearly outweigh any potential negative links.

3 – Satisfactory: Positive synergies between the project’s results and other initiatives outweigh any potential negative links, even though coordination activities did not take place systematically or periodically.

2 – Unsatisfactory: The project has not generated any net positive synergies with other initiatives, even though coordination activities took place and other initiatives were considered in the project design.

1 – Highly Unsatisfactory: The project conflicted with other initiatives, and no systematic or periodical coordination activities took place.

Quality of the project design in meeting outcomes: this criterion complements the "relevance of design" criterion (see above). It specifically assesses the extent to which the different components and activities of the project support each other. The rating should be based on the following scale:

4 – Highly Satisfactory: The project design clearly shows the positive linkages between project activities/components by explaining the synergies between them. Such synergies were also evident during project implementation, leading to a tangible and significant added value from the combination of the activities and components.

3 – Satisfactory: Although the original project design did not explicitly address coherence, during project implementation, positive linkages between project activities/components outweighed any potential negative linkages, leading to a net added value from the combination of the activities and components.

2 – Unsatisfactory: Although the project design showed the positive linkages between project activities/components, during project implementation, such synergies did not materialize (e.g., due to conflicts between the components, or because there were no linkages between them). No tangible added value from the combination of the activities and components is visible.

1 – Highly Unsatisfactory: The project design clearly did not address the links between project activities and components, nor did they materialize during project implementation. Individual project components activities would have been better implemented separately.

Effectiveness

Project objective rating: the ratings derived for outcomes and outputs are **combined** (i.e., there is just one rating for effectiveness) to assess the progress that the project has made towards realizing its development objective. Good judgement should be used in rating the combinations. *Where applicable, rating should be based on the following simple scale:*

4 – Highly Satisfactory: all outcomes and outputs (based on their indicators) are rated highly satisfactory.

3 – Satisfactory: all outcomes and outputs are rated at least satisfactory.

2 – Unsatisfactory: either all the outcomes or the outputs are rated unsatisfactory.

1 – Highly Unsatisfactory: all the outcomes or the outputs are rated highly unsatisfactory.

For the scoring of individual output and outcome indicators, the following scale could be used:

4 – Highly Satisfactory: At least 100% of the indicator target has been achieved.

3 – Satisfactory: At least 80% but less than 100% of the indicator target has been achieved.
2 – Unsatisfactory: At least 50% but less than 80% of the indicator target has been achieved.
1 – Highly Unsatisfactory: Less than 50% of the indicator target has been achieved.

Efficiency

Timeliness: the timeliness of project implementation is based on a comparison between the planned (as shown in project work plan, excluding any No-Cost Extensions) and the actual period of implementation from the date of the first disbursement (Including any No-Cost Extensions). <i>Where applicable, rating should be based on the following simple scale:</i>
4 – Highly Satisfactory: the ratio of the planned implementation time from the date of signing the MOU to the actual implementation time from the date of signing the MOU is expected to be <1.
3 – Satisfactory: the ratio of the planned implementation time from the date of signing MOU to the actual implementation time from the date of signing the MOU is expected to be 1.
2 – Unsatisfactory: the ratio of the planned implementation time from the date of signing the MOU to the actual implementation time from the date of signing the MOU is expected to >1 but ≥ 1.25 .
1 – Highly Unsatisfactory: the ratio of planned implementation time from the date of signing the MOU to the actual implementation time from the date of signing the MOU is expected to be ≥ 1.25 .
Resource use efficiency: this compares the ratio between the rate of physical execution/implementation of the project's planned activities and outputs and the budget consumption. <i>Where applicable, rating should be based on the following simple scale:</i>
4 – Highly Satisfactory: the ratio of the approximate percentage of physical implementation of the project outputs and commitment rate is >1. The project has delivered more outputs than expected within the available budget.
3 – Satisfactory: the ratio of the approximate percentage of physical implementation of the project outputs and commitment rate is 1. The project has delivered the outputs expected within the available budget.
2 – Unsatisfactory: the ratio of the approximate percentage of physical implementation of the project outputs and commitment rate is between <1 and ≥ 0.75 . The project has delivered fewer outputs within the available budget.
1 – Highly Unsatisfactory: the ratio of the approximate percentage of physical implementation of the project outputs and commitment rate is <0.75. The project has delivered significantly fewer outputs within the available budget.

Sustainability

Financial sustainability: this criterion assesses the extent to which funding mechanisms and modalities (e.g., government support through budgetary allocations, other stakeholder contributions, aid flows, user fees, etc.) have been put in place to ensure the continued flow of benefits after project completion. Concrete examples should be cited in the PCR. <i>Where applicable, rating should be based on the following scale. Ratings here will be essentially qualitative:</i>
4 – Highly Satisfactory: The project has put in place robust mechanisms for financial sustainability that are very likely to ensure the continued flow of benefits associated with the project after completion.
3 – Satisfactory: the project has put in place sufficient mechanisms for financial sustainability to ensure the continued flow of benefits associated with the project after completion.
2 – Unsatisfactory: the project has put in place some mechanisms for financial sustainability , but they are not expected to be sufficient to ensure the continued flow of benefits associated with the project after completion.

1 – Highly Unsatisfactory: the project *has not put in place* any *mechanisms for financial sustainability*, and the flow of benefits associated with the project *are not expected to continue* after completion.

Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities: the criterion assesses the extent to which the project has contributed to strengthening institutional capacities such as improved governance practices, improved skills, procedures, incentives structures, or institutional mechanisms that will facilitate the continued flow of benefits associated with the project. It should also include an assessment of the building of capacity to lead and manage the trade policy reform process and how committed and supportive the ministry responsible for trade is to this process in order to reinforce national ownership. Concrete examples should be cited in the PCR. *Where applicable, rating should be based on the following scale. Ratings here will be essentially qualitative:*

4 – Highly Satisfactory: the project was *critical in building* or strengthening institutional capacities in the trade or trade-related sectors. Country systems and capacities *are excellent and sufficient* to ensure the continued flow of benefits associated with the project after completion.

3 – Satisfactory: the project *significantly* contributed to strengthening *institutional capacities* in the trade or trade-related sectors. Country systems and capacities *are good and deemed sufficient* to ensure the continued flow of benefits associated with the project after completion.

2 – Unsatisfactory: the project *marginally* contributed to strengthening institutional capacities in the trade or trade-related sectors and/or parallel systems had to be used. Country systems and capacities remain weak and are deemed insufficient to ensure the continued flow of benefits associated with the project after completion.

1 – Highly Unsatisfactory: the project did not contribute to strengthening institutional capacities in the trade or trade-related sectors and/or parallel systems had to be used intensively. Country systems and capacities are very weak and insufficient to ensure the continued flow of benefits associated with the project after completion.

Ownership and sustainability of partnerships: the assessment determines whether the project has effectively involved relevant stakeholders, promoted a sense of ownership amongst the beneficiaries (both men and women), and put in place effective partnerships with relevant stakeholders (e.g., local authorities, civil society organizations, private sector, donors) as required for the continued maintenance of the project results. Concrete examples should be cited in the PCR. *Where applicable, rating should be based on the following scale. Ratings here will be essentially qualitative:*

4 – Highly Satisfactory: The project has been *very effective* in involving all the relevant stakeholders and there is a strong sense of ownership amongst the beneficiaries. Effective partnerships with relevant stakeholders (e.g., local authorities, civil society organizations, private sector) have been put in place to ensure the continued maintenance and management of project outputs.

3 – Satisfactory: The project has been *effective* in involving most stakeholders and promoting a sense of ownership amongst the beneficiaries. Partnerships with relevant stakeholders have been put in place and are deemed sufficient to ensure the continued maintenance and management of project outputs.

2 – Unsatisfactory: The project has *involved only a small number* of stakeholders and there is limited ownership amongst the beneficiaries. No or marginally effective partnerships with relevant stakeholders have been put in place and are not considered sufficient to ensure the continued maintenance and management of project outputs.

1 – Highly Unsatisfactory: The project *has not been effective* in involving the relevant stakeholders and there is no sense of ownership amongst the beneficiaries. No partnerships with relevant stakeholders have been established to ensure the continued maintenance and management of project outputs.

<p>Systemic change: this criterion assesses the degree to which the project has catalyzed ongoing change in the sector. It is closely related but goes beyond institutional sustainability and ownership by addressing change in the sector more broadly. Concrete examples should be cited in the PCR. <i>Where applicable, rating should be based on the following scale. Ratings here will be essentially qualitative:</i></p>
<p>4 – Highly Satisfactory: There is clear evidence that the project has contributed significantly to a strategic change in the sector towards better, and more sustainable, long-term performance.</p>
<p>3 – Satisfactory: There is at least anecdotal evidence that the project has contributed to a strategic change in the sector towards better, and more sustainable, long-term performance.</p>
<p>2 – Unsatisfactory: Based on indicative evidence available, the project marginally contributed to a strategic change in the sector towards better, and more sustainable, long-term performance.</p>
<p>1 – Highly Unsatisfactory: The project has not contributed to a strategic change in the sector towards better, and more sustainable, long-term performance.</p>
<p>Environmental sustainability: this criterion would normally only apply to projects with potential environmental impacts. It assesses the extent to which the environmental mitigation measures of the project were implemented, the capacity of country institutions and systems, and the availability of funding to ensure the environmental sustainability of the operation. Concrete examples should be cited in the PCR. <i>Where applicable, rating should be based on the following scale. Ratings here will be essentially qualitative:</i></p>
<p>4 - Highly satisfactory. an environmental impact mitigation plan was fully implemented in a timely and satisfactory manner; institutional capacity is strong; and there is sufficient funding to ensure the environmental sustainability of the project.</p>
<p>3 – Satisfactory. an environmental impact mitigation plan was largely implemented in a timely and satisfactory manner; and institutional capacity and funding are deemed sufficient to ensure the environmental and social sustainability of the operation.</p>
<p>2 – Unsatisfactory. an environmental impact mitigation plan was implemented with major delays or in an unsatisfactory manner; and institutional capacity and funding are deemed insufficient to ensure the environmental and social sustainability of the operation.</p>
<p>1 – Highly unsatisfactory. an environmental impact mitigation plan was not implemented; and institutional capacity and funding are not available to ensure the environmental and social sustainability of the operation.</p>

Impact

<p>Impact rating (by impact area): for each of the seven impact areas, an individual rating will be made, based on a narrative qualitative review of the project’s performance in that area. Good judgement should be used in the rating, considering both the actual observed development with respect to the impact areas and the likely contribution of the project to these developments. If a project does not touch upon a specific impact area, this should not be rated, but a justification should be provided as to why the project was not relevant for that impact area. <i>Where applicable, rating should be based on the following simple scale:</i></p>
<p>4 – Highly Satisfactory: Developments in the country (or sector) regarding the respective impact area have been positive, and there is a clear indication that the project has contributed to them.</p>
<p>3 – Satisfactory: Developments in the country (or sector) regarding the respective impact area have been positive, but there is no clear indication that the project has contributed to them. Or, if the overall developments were not so positive, there is an indication that without the project they would have developed even worse.</p>
<p>2 – Unsatisfactory: Developments in the country (or sector) regarding the respective impact area have not been positive, and there is no indication that the project had any positive influence.</p>

1 – Highly Unsatisfactory: Developments in the country (or sector) regarding the respective impact area have not been positive, and the project was part of the problem.
