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main issues

- What are PCRs and ICRs?
- Why are they required?
- When do we have to prepare them?
- Who is responsible?
- How to prepare?
- Which data is needed?
- Example of ICR – China ODS project
PCR (1): General

- Project Completion Report
- Upon completion of the projects
- Required by Montreal Protocol/MLF – Guidelines to PCRs is available
- Responsibility of project team/client: FA and/or NOU
- Available templates developed for stand alone project, but later used also for umbrella projects and Multi Year Agreement type of projects
PCR (2) : PCR review

- Draft PCRs were sent to ENVMP through TTL for review

- Experiencing data in consistencies

- Task team provided assistance to ensure correct baseline data

- Shall NOU retain a copy of final PCR ??
PCR (3): PCR MYA

- No specific templates developed for Multi Year Agreement (MYA) projects

- MYA will cover multiple sectors or one sector

- Characterized by having both investment and non-investment activities including policy, TA and training component
PCR (4): MYA PCR Component

- Main components of MYA PCR:
  - Project overview
  - Overall assessment/rating
  - Descriptive assessment, including lesson learned
  - Cumulative phase out figures by manufacturing and servicing
  - Cumulative costs (by sector and/or category) as compared to approved amounts
  - Implementation efficiency/delays
  - “Closure” i.e. assurance that project outcomes (as well as output) point to sustained phase out
PCR (5) : MYA Progress report

- Annual reporting to the MLF is done through the progress report for all projects and all tranches of MYAs

- MYAs are performance-based, detailed progress and financial information must be provided periodically under MYAs through the annual plans, overview tables and verification reports
PCR (6) Where is the data?

- Data should already be contained in the last annual plan. The work will involve:
  - Extracting data, such as the cost table that is in APs and finalizing figures
  - Assessing overall achievements of the entire program
  - Lesson Learned at the sector, program level
PCR (7) Source of Information

- Original Sector/national phase out plan and associated cost table
- Final annual plan and overview tables
- Simplified PCRs done for the subprojects under the sector plan
- Verification reports
- Other audit, evaluations or reviews commissioned during project implementation
ICR (1) : General

• ICR: Implementation Completion and Results Report
• Process of self-evaluation, lesson learning and application, sharing knowledge, and being accountable for results
• Lesson-learned to improve the quality and effectiveness of Bank operation
• Type: CORE ICR
ICR (2): audience

Internal:
• Board members
• Bank Managers
• Staff

External
• Governments and their agencies
• Stakeholders
• Beneficiaries
• General public
ICR (3): preparation

• Prepared by the Task Team in the Bank
• Prepared not later than six months after the project closing date
• TTL prepare ICR TOR (which include provision of advice and support to the client in preparing its own contribution to ICR)
• Task Team holds discussion with borrower, implementing agencies, beneficiaries and other stakeholders.
ICR (4): Responsibilities

• REGION
  ▫ Responsible for completion reporting for all Bank-assisted operations
  ▫ Ensuring the overall quality, completeness, and transparency of the ICR process
  ▫ Ensuring that the lessons learned are taken into account in Country Assistance Strategies (CASs)/CPS and the design of new lending operations

• BORROWER
  ▫ Preparing and submitting to the Bank its own completion report – assisting the preparation of Bank’s ICR
  ▫ Providing information to the Bank on the economic, financial, social, institutional, and environmental conditions in which the operation was implemented, and on implementation and operation results
ICR (5): Responsibilities

- **COFINANCIERS AND PARTNERS**
  - Respond to requests from the Bank for comments on the draft ICR and participate in stakeholder workshops

- **INDEPENDENT EVALUATION GROUP**
  - Reviews all ICRs and provides ratings
  - Assesses the project experience as well as the quality of the Bank’s self-evaluation
  - ICR Review sent to the region for comments

- **OPERATIONS POLICY AND COUNTRY SERVICES (OPCS)**
  - Oversees compliance with completion reporting policy and execution
  - Provides guidance and support to staff on ICRs by managing policy and process guidelines and resolving related issues
ICR (6): PROCEDURES

- Required for all P-number projects (including GEF)
- Completed soon after Project Completion
- Sent to Board less than 6 months after Closing-
suggested preparation in earlier time
- TTL advises borrower of its ICR obligations
- Use all project documents (especially ISRs)
- Requires an ICR Mission
- Concise Report – less than 15 pages
- Effectiveness issues and their resolution
- Statistical data goes into the Annexes
ICR Sections - DATA SHEET

- Section A: BASIC INFORMATION
- Section B: KEY DATES
- Section C: RATINGS SUMMARY
  - C.1 Performance Ratings by ICR
  - C.2 Detailed Ratings of Bank and Borrower Performance
  - C.3 Quality at Entry and Implementation Performance Indicators
- Section D: SECTOR AND THEME CODES
- Section E: BANK STAFF
- Section F: RESULTS FRAMEWORK ANALYSIS
- Section G: RATINGS OF PROJECT/PROGRAM PERFORMANCE IN ISRs
- Section H: RESTRUCTURING (if any)
- Section I: DISBURSEMENT PROFILE (for IL & GEF only)
ICR SECTIONS - MAIN DOCUMENT

• SECTION 1: PROJECT/PROGRAM CONTEXT, DEVELOPMENT [OR GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL] OBJECTIVES, AND DESIGN
  ▫ Context at Appraisal
  ▫ Original Project/Program Development Objectives (PDO) [or GEO for GEF] and Key Indicators
  ▫ Revised PDO [or GEO for GEF] and Key Indicators (if applicable), and Reasons/Justifications
  ▫ Main Beneficiaries (for IL & GEF only)
  ▫ Original Components (as approved) (for IL & GEF only)
  ▫ Revised Components (for IL & GEF only)
  ▫ Other Significant Changes (if applicable)
ICR SECTIONS - MAIN DOCUMENT

• SECTION 2: KEY FACTORS AFFECTING IMPLEMENTATION AND OUTCOMES
  ▫ Project Preparation, Design and Quality at Entry (for IL & GEF only) e.g. QAG
  ▫ Implementation (for IL & GEF only)
  ▫ Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Design, Implementation, and Utilization
  ▫ Safeguard and Fiduciary Compliance (for IL & GEF only)
  ▫ Post-completion Operation/Next Phase (for IL & GEF only)
ICR SECTIONS - MAIN DOCUMENT

• SECTION 3: ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES
  ▫ Relevance of Objectives, Design, and Implementation
  ▫ Achievement of Project/Program Development Objectives [or Global Environmental Objectives]
  ▫ Efficiency (for IL and GEF only)
  ▫ Justification of Overall Outcome Rating
  ▫ Overarching Themes, Other Outcomes and Impacts (if any)
  ▫ Summary of Findings of Beneficiary Survey and/or Stakeholder Workshops
ICR SECTIONS - MAIN DOCUMENT

• SECTION 4: ASSESSMENT OF RISK TO DEVELOPMENT OUTCOME
  ▫ *The risk, at the time of evaluation, that development outcomes (or expected outcomes) will not be maintained (or realized).*
  ▫ *This replaced the earlier “Sustainability” rating.*
ICR SECTIONS - MAIN DOCUMENT

• **SECTION 5: ASSESSMENT OF BANK AND BORROWER PERFORMANCE**

  ▪ **Bank Performance**
    • (i) Bank performance in ensuring quality at entry
    • (ii) Quality of Bank supervision
    • Include any QAG ratings

  ▪ **Borrower Performance**
    • *The extent to which the borrower (including the government and implementing agency or agencies) ensured quality of preparation and implementation, and complied with covenants and agreements, toward the achievement of development outcomes.*
    • (i) Government performance (central and/or subnational government as applicable, which is normally the borrower of the loan/credit)
    • (ii) The performance of the implementing agency or agencies
ICR SECTIONS - MAIN DOCUMENT

• SECTION 6: LESSONS LEARNED
  ▫ The most significant positive and negative lessons learned from the operation’s experience
  ▫ Draw on the descriptions and analysis in earlier sections of the operation’s design, implementation, and outcome, and on the assessments of Bank, borrower, and stakeholder performances
  ▫ Indicate how these lessons are reflected in the arrangements for post-completion operation of the investments financed, follow-up operations, and/or any other next steps
  ▫ Suggest which of the lessons have general applicability for similar operations in the sector/subsector, the country, or other countries.
ICR SECTIONS - MAIN DOCUMENT

**SECTION 7: COMMENTS ON ISSUES RAISED BY BORROWER/IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES/PARTNERS**
- Respond to any issues raised in the comments (attached in the respective annexes) of the:
  - Borrower
  - Implementing Agency
  - Cofinanciers
  - Other Partners
ICR SECTIONS - ANNEXES

• Project Costs and Financing
• Outputs by Component
• Economic and Financial Analysis (for IL & GEF only)
• Bank Lending and Implementation Support/Supervision Process
• Beneficiary Survey Results (if any)
• Summary of Borrower’s ICR and/or Comments on Draft ICR
• Comments of Cofinanciers and Other Partners/Stakeholders
• List of Supporting Documents
• Additional Annexes (Optional)
ICR resources

- ICR Guidelines – Feb 2007
- ICR Quick Reference Guide
- China ODS-3 ICR – June 2009
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## Project Data Sheet

### A. Basic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th>CN THIRD ODS PHASE OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project ID:</td>
<td>P003409</td>
<td>L/C/TF Number(s):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICR Date:</td>
<td>06/26/2009</td>
<td>ICR Type:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lending Instrument:</td>
<td>SIL</td>
<td>Borrower:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Total Commitment:</td>
<td>USD 90.1M</td>
<td>Disbursed Amount:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Category:</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Global Focal Area: O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Implementing Agencies:

Ministry of Environmental Protection (until early 2008, the State Environmental Protection Administration, or SEPA), and the Financial Agents (China Investment Bank (CIB), China Everbright Bank (CEB), and China International Economic Cooperation (CIEC)).

### Cofinancers and Other External Partners:

### B. Key Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Original Date</th>
<th>Revised / Actual Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal:</td>
<td>10/25/1994</td>
<td>Restructuring(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval:</td>
<td>06/22/1995</td>
<td>Mid-term Review:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Closing:</td>
<td>06/30/2000</td>
<td>12/31/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Ratings Summary

#### C.1 Performance Rating by ICR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes:</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk to Global Environment Outcome</td>
<td>Low or Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Performance:</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrower Performance:</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C.2 Detailed Ratings of Bank and Borrower Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bank</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>Borrower</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality at Entry:</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Government:</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Supervision:</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Implementing Agency/Agencies:</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Bank Performance:</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Overall Borrower Performance:</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C.3 Quality at Entry and Implementation Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Performance</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>QAG Assessments (if any)</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Problem Project at any time (Yes/No):</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Quality at Entry (QEA):</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Project at any time (Yes/No):</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Quality of Supervision (QSA):</td>
<td>Moderately Unsatisfactory (in Nov. 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO rating before Closing/Inactive status</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Sector and Theme Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector Code (as % of total Bank financing)</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central government administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other industry</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Code (as % of total Bank financing)</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental policies and institutions</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. Bank Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>At ICR</th>
<th>At Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President:</td>
<td>James W. Adams</td>
<td>Jean-Michel Severino</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Results Framework Analysis

Global Environment Objectives (GEO and Key Indicators (as approved))

The project objectives of this Montreal Protocol Project are to: (a) support China’s total ODS phase-out program by establishing an efficient and flexible institutional mechanism to prepare, appraise, finance and implement a large number of subprojects; (b) implement cost-effective priority subprojects; and (c) allow ODS phase-out to proceed at or ahead of schedule.

The project is designed as an umbrella project. The MOD reads “The proposed amount under the umbrella agreement would be sufficient to cover subprojects up to the end of 1996. The Project will support 60-80 subprojects in all ODS user and producer industries.” In this sense, ODS-III, was a “time-slice” operation in a series of projects, including ODS-I, ODS-II and ODS-IV. The ODS-IV project was approved in November, 1997, and continued to finance ODS phase-out in the same sectors as was covered by the earlier projects.

The global development objective of reversing the damage to the Ozone layer will only be met as a result of all global actions taken from 1987 through 2010, and many of the required actions were taken in the late 1980s in industrial countries. Even so, the complete reversal of ozone layer damage will take sixty to seventy years to complete. China represents one of the largest remaining ODS producers and consumers and is an important part of the remaining global phase-out. There is every reason to expect both China’s and the global objective will be met.

Revised Global Environment Objectives and Key Indicators and reasons/justifications

The GEO was not revised.

(a) GEO Indicator(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Value</th>
<th>Original Target Values (from approval documents)</th>
<th>Formally Revised Target Values</th>
<th>Actual Value Achieved at Completion or Target Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1: Value (quantitative or Qualitative)</td>
<td>See comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date achieved</td>
<td>Comments (incl. % achievement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Although ODS phase-out was the objective of the project, there were no GEO indicator for ODS phase-out in tons. The “umbrella” or programmatic approach followed by the project used only the intermediate indicator of a target number of subprojects. Nevertheless, ODS phase-out was closely tracked and reported (see Sections 3.2-3.4): the project led to 38% of China’s CFCs being eliminated, did so in a cost-effective manner, and helped China meet its international commitments ahead of schedule.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Intermediate Outcome Indicator(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Value</th>
<th>Original Target Values (from approval documents)</th>
<th>Formally Revised Target Values</th>
<th>Actual Value Achieved at Completion or Target Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1</td>
<td>Number of ODS phase-out subprojects completed</td>
<td>60-80</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value (quantitative or Qualitative)</td>
<td>06/22/1995</td>
<td>09/30/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments (incl. % achievement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Ratings of Project Performance in ISRs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date ISR Archived</th>
<th>GEO</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>Actual Disbursements (USD millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>06/30/2000</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>69.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>01/04/2001</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>71.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>05/14/2001</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>73.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12/05/2001</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>77.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>05/22/2002</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>79.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>09/11/2002</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>83.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>02/21/2003</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>88.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>09/30/2003</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>90.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>05/09/2004</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>93.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12/16/2004</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>95.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>05/22/2005</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>97.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>05/23/2006</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>97.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>05/29/2007</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>88.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>06/28/2008</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>88.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. Restructuring (if any)
While the project was not formally restructured in May 2000, it was extended to 2010 to coincide with the overall ODS phase-out date of the Montreal Protocol. Also, the grant ceiling was increased by $30 million to a total of US$120.1 million. The revised closing date was consistent with those of Montreal Protocol projects in other countries, and the expectation was that an increased number of subprojects would be approved in the following few years. As it turned out, with the opportunities provided by the more flexible ODS-IV project, the last ODS-III disbursement was made in 2005. Some enterprises that might otherwise have been financed under ODS-III, “migrated” to the ODS-IV project starting in 2002, which explains why the ODS-III grant increase approved in 2000 was not utilized. The project closing date was moved up to 2008 when discussions concerning the use of available funds concluded that all future activities were to be better handled under the scope of the ODS-IV project. For details, see Section 1.7.

I. Disbursement Profile
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