

# PCR Quick Reference Guide

## Rating Dimensions of Development Effectiveness

| CRITERIA                   | UNSATISFACTORY   | PARTLY UNSATISFACTORY  | SATISFACTORY  | EXCELLENT   | NOT YET ACHIEVED   |
|----------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|
| <i>Strategic Relevance</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low priority issues addressed OR</li> <li>Assistance not appropriate given conditions at start OR</li> <li>No client contribution</li> </ul>                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Priority issues overlooked OR</li> <li>Initially appropriate, but conditions changed OR</li> <li>Less than appropriate client contribution was achieved</li> </ul>                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major priority issues addressed to some extent AND</li> <li>Potential substantial impact on direct recipients and/or local community AND</li> <li>Majority client contribution achieved</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major priority issues addressed AND</li> <li>Potential high impact AND</li> <li>Appropriate client contribution achieved</li> </ul>  |  |
| <i>Outputs</i>             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Few, or no key deliverable achieved or several major outputs of less than satisfactory quality</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 1 key deliverable not achieved or at least 1 key deliverable with unsatisfactory quality</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All key deliverables achieved with satisfactory quality (based on client feedback)</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All key deliverables achieved with excellent quality (based on client feedback)</li> </ul>   |  |
| <i>Outcomes</i>            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Few or no outcomes achieved, OR</li> <li>Clients attribute no change to the advisory service, or AS had negative effects</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fewer than half of outcomes achieved OR</li> <li>Client attributes limited influence on behavior or performance change</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most of the outcomes achieved AND</li> <li>Client indicates that the AS contributed to behavior or performance change</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All outcomes achieved AND</li> <li>Client says AS produced behavior or performance change AND</li> <li>Positive outcomes beyond direct recipients</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No outcomes yet been achieved, but partial outcome achievement is expected</li> </ul> |
| <i>Impact</i>              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact not achieved, OR</li> <li>Negative impacts</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts on the direct beneficiaries achieved with weak attribution to the project OR</li> <li>Impacts wholly or partially achieved with some unintended negative impact</li> </ul>                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts on the direct beneficiaries achieved with strong attribution to the project backed by evidence from a solid methodology</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts with strong attribution &amp; evidence from solid methods AND</li> <li>Impacts beyond direct beneficiaries (demonstration effect) AND</li> <li>Impacts are best practice, worthy of replication</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No major impacts yet achieved, but partial impact achievement is expected</li> </ul>  |
| <i>Efficiency</i>          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highly negative cost-benefit ratio OR</li> <li>Resources could have been spent much more economically OR</li> <li>Much more reasonable alternatives were available</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Negative cost-benefit ratio, OR</li> <li>Some resources could sometimes have been spent more cheaply OR</li> <li>More reasonable alternatives were available that could have been used</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Positive cost-benefit ratio AND</li> <li>Resources were expended economically AND</li> <li>Resources were reasonable in relation to alternatives</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High positive cost-benefit ratio AND</li> <li>Resources were expended highly economically AND</li> <li>Assistance was far less costly than the alternative(s)</li> </ul>   |  |

Please turn over for guidance on rating *Development Effectiveness Synthesis* and *IFC Role and Contribution* criteria

## PCR Guidance Quick Reference Guide

### Guidance for Rating Development Effectiveness Synthesis

| HIGHLY UNSUCCESSFUL  | UNSUCCESSFUL   | MOSTLY UNSUCCESSFUL  | MOSTLY SUCCESSFUL   | SUCCESSFUL   | HIGHLY SUCCESSFUL  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| Negative development aspects and no positive impacts to compensate | Largely negative aspects, clearly outweighing positive aspects | Minor shortcomings across the board, or serious shortcoming in one area which outweighs otherwise positive aspects | A project which may have some shortcomings, but with a clear predominance of positive aspects | A project that has strong positive aspects that more than compensates for any shortfalls. It is a project without material shortcomings, that clearly meets expectations | A project with overwhelming positive development results, with virtually no flaws. It indicates the type of project IFC should use publicly to illustrate the contribution of IFC AS |

- *Synthesis rating is not an average of the five dimensions*
- *Exclude projects in which no outcomes or impacts have been achieved at the time of filling in the PCR*
- *Projects that were not expected or intended to have any impact on development effectiveness (for example, feasibility studies for investment projects)*

### Guidance for IFC Role AND Contribution Rating

| CRITERIA                         | UNSATISFACTORY  | PARTLY UNSATISFACTORY                          | SATISFACTORY   | EXCELLENT   |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| <i>IFC Role AND Contribution</i> | IFC's role was not additional and IFC's expected contribution was not delivered | IFC's role or contribution was not significant | IFC's role and contribution were in line with its operating principles | IFC was essential and made major contributions that made the project particularly catalytic, innovative, or developmental |



Check the website for details of mandatory indicators by business line: <http://www.ifc.org/ifcext/sme.nsf/Content/M&EMeetingMay2007Indicators2>

***If you have additional questions, please contact Luba Shara at (202) 473-2717, [Ishara@ifc.org](mailto:Ishara@ifc.org)***