

## V. SELF-EVALUATION IN PREPARATION FOR THE NEXT CAS: CAS COMPLETION REPORTS

1. CASCRs are intended to derive practical lessons from the past so that they can be incorporated into new program design. This self-evaluation of the country assistance program focuses on the achievement of CAS outcomes and on Bank performance in managing CAS implementation. It is intended to serve as both a learning and accountability tool for the country team. Over 55 Completion Reports have been prepared, only 11 were based on RB CASs: six on RBCAS pilots (Armenia, Brazil, Mozambique, Sri Lanka, Ukraine, and Zambia) and five on subsequent RBCASs (Guatemala, Nigeria, Philippines, Romania, and Yemen). IEG rated one (Armenia) satisfactory, seven (Brazil, Guatemala, Mozambique, Nigeria, Philippines, Ukraine, Yemen,) “moderately satisfactory”, and three (Romania, Sri Lanka and Zambia) “moderately unsatisfactory”. Because the first CASCRs were prepared on CASs that were not results-based, comparisons of CASCR ratings over time should be regarded with caution.

2. ***Focus on CAS Development Outcomes.*** The CAS is designed to focus on the development outcomes that the Bank intended to influence through its program of lending and nonlending activities. The CAS and CASPR results frameworks provide the reference framework for the self-evaluation, and thus are key determinants of the quality and the usefulness of the CASCR. An attempt to evaluate a program based on a not-so-well designed results framework, or on a program laid out in a traditional CAS that did not have a results framework, is likely to fall short of delivering what a CASCR is designed to fulfill. It is therefore important to recognize two aspects of the experience with CSCRs over the last several years. First, as noted, the first cohort of CASCRs was prepared on non-results-based CASs; and second, the results framework was a major shift in the way CAS programs were designed, was new to many CAS teams, and was meant to evolve over time as teams accumulated experience and learned from other teams. In a sense, holding the first cohort of CASCRs to the same standards as the new cohort of CASCRs that are based on RBCASs would not be appropriate.

3. ***Challenges of CASCRs: the Preceding CAS.*** One of the main challenges of the CASCR lies in problems with the design of the original CAS. In particular, CASs that date from three to four years ago and were not adequately updated in a CASPR often exhibit (a) unclear definition of objectives and outcomes, or CAS outcomes that are unrealistic and/or at too high a level for the Bank alone to influence (e.g. GDP growth, enrolment or completion rates); and (b) a large number of outcomes. This problem has declined somewhat since the launch of the RBCAS pilot, but is still occurring. Of course, as noted, the problem is compounded when CASCRs are undertaken for non-results-based CASs because completion reporting requires a “retrofitting” of outcomes on the basis of CAS matrices and stated objectives in the CAS text.

4. ***Challenges of CASCRs: Bank’s Contribution, Attribution, and Aggregation Across Country Strategies.*** The challenge is twofold: (a) to gauge the Bank’s contribution to program-level outcomes (i.e., CAS outcome), and (b) attribute Bank contributions to high country-level outcomes. It is often difficult to establish a casual chain between the Bank intervention and progress or lack of progress in the targeted outcome, especially when country outcomes are influenced by a variety of factors. For example, malnutrition in Bangladesh fell dramatically during the CAS period, but it could not be credibly argued that the Bank's modest intervention contributed directly to this result. This highlights the importance in future CASs of including

results frameworks at the program level that directly derive from the activity-level results, and targeting results that have a direct and realistic causal link to the particular Bank activity being carried out. By necessity, these program and activity level results are very project-and country-specific, and hence do not lend themselves to aggregation across countries.

5. ***Challenges of CASCRs: Need for Greater Focus.*** Some CRs were extensive and detailed, and could have benefitted from more focus on the relevance of the strategy and on the overall reasons for progress or failure in CAS outcomes. With an average length of 25 pages and a results matrix averaging 10 pages, these reports often lacked an overall picture and an identification of the key drivers of results, in particular in what respects the Bank's contribution to results. The Philippines CASCR is a good example of a concise report with a clear description of the main developments under each outcome and of the Bank intervention's contribution to the results. As a corollary of the excessive detail, general lessons are often lost in favor of very specific narrow recommendations tied to individual outcomes.

6. ***Challenges of CAS CRs: Integration of IFC.*** There was, in general, limited integration of IFC in the CAS CR, even when the CAS is joint. This was particularly clear in the cases of Bangladesh, Mozambique, and Ukraine. IFC had no input in the preparation of the Mozambique CASCR, and there was very little information on IFC's investments and advisory activities. The Ukraine CASCR reported good performance and expansion of IFC investment and advisory activities but recognizes the need for greater harmonization with the Bank in achieving common results. The IEG Review included a separate review of IFC and noted that the "CASCR would have benefited from a more direct discussion of IFC's experience with some objectives and activities identified in the CAS". It is expected that the implementation of the pilot to enhance Bank-IFC collaboration in country strategies will help draw lessons to mainstream a greater integration of IFC not just in country strategy formulation, but also in the self-assessment in the CAS CR.

7. ***Strengthening the Foundations of a Results Approach to CASs.*** To enhance the focus and value of CRs, Management will issue enhanced guidance to staff. In addition to distilling good practices from experience and more clearly defining the objectives, focus, and areas to be covered, and to highlighting the importance of the CASCR being prepared ahead of the CAS review process, the new guidelines will formally introduce a rating system for self-evaluation of the previous CAS. This guidance will also emphasize the need for CASCRs to be made available six months before Board discussion of a CAS, to facilitate the preparation of IEG's validation of the CASCR in time for the Executive Board's discussion of the CAS. To strengthen the accountability aspect of the CAS, and in line with the proposal set out in the 2005 stocktaking report,<sup>1</sup> beginning in FY10, CASCRs will be enhanced by the formal inclusion of teams' self-ratings on overall program performance<sup>2</sup> and on Bank performance. Since RBCASs establish with some precision the intended CAS outcomes, an overall program assessment should be relatively straightforward—especially in what relates to outcomes arising from the ongoing portfolio. Because outcomes for new activities envisaged under the CAS are indicative in nature, in the CASCR the assessment of outcomes will rely largely on results of the portfolio activities

---

<sup>1</sup> See paras 79-80 of *Results Focus in Country Assistance Strategies: A Stocktaking of Results-Based CASs* (OPCS), final public version, July 2005. The draft version of this report was discussed by the Board on March 10, 2005 (R2005-0042).

<sup>2</sup> "Program performance" as used here is equivalent to "program outcome" as used by IEG in its CAEs.

that were already under implementation at the time of the CAS, and those activities that were initiated during the CAS period and have had sufficient implementation time to deliver development results.

8. ***Rating Bank Performance.*** Since program performance is determined not only by the Bank's performance but also by the behavior of the client, partners, and other stakeholders, and by exogenous factors, Bank performance will be rated separately. Bank performance will be judged on the basis of the relevance of the strategy and success in implementing that strategy, including whether appropriate adjustments to the strategy and the Bank's interventions were made during implementation. When the strategy is realigned during the CASPR, ratings of Bank performance in the CASCR will reflect this realignment. Ratings will use a six-point scale consistent with the scale used by IEG. IEG will validate country teams' ratings. IEG will continue to provide its review of the CASCR to the Board in time for the Board discussion of the next CAS.