Report Number : ICRR0020983

1. Project Data

Project ID P120985	**Project Name** KAZSTAT
Country Kazakhstan	**Practice Area(Lead)** Poverty and Equity

L/C/TF Number(s)	Closing Date (Original)	Total Project Cost (USD)
IBRD-80230	30-Apr-2017	22,813,000.00
Bank Approval Date	**Closing Date (Actual)**	
31-Mar-2011	30-Apr-2017	

	IBRD/IDA (USD)	Grants (USD)
Original Commitment	20,000,000.00	0.00
Revised Commitment	19,951,218.97	0.00
Actual	19,951,218.97	0.00

Prepared by	Reviewed by	ICR Review Coordinator	Group
Elena Bardasi	Judyth L. Twigg	Malathi S. Jayawickrama	IEGEC (Unit 1)

2. Project Objectives and Components

a. Objectives

The objective of the project was "to improve efficiency and effectiveness of the national statistical system to provide relevant, timely and reliable data in line with internationally accepted methodology and best practices" (Financial Agreement, 2011, Schedule 1, p. 5). The same formulation was used in the ICR (p. 2 and Annex 1, p. 25) and in the Project Appraisal Document (PAD), 2011, p. 14, Annex 3, p. 37, and Annex 15, p. 91).

b. Were the project objectives/key associated outcome targets revised during implementation?
No

c. Will a split evaluation be undertaken?
No

d. Components

The project had seven components (PAD, p. 15):

Component #1: Improvement of the institutional framework and operations of the statistical system (total estimated cost US$1.3m; actual US$1.3m): Providing goods, consulting services, and training programs for the following purposes: a) improvement of the legislative base coordinating interaction between government agencies producing statistical data; b) rationalization of the institutional structure of the Agency of the Republic of Kazakhstan on Statistics (ARKS); c) improvement of procedures and methodology for strategic planning; d) development and introduction of a system for measurement of personnel burden; e) introduction of a quality management program; and f) improvement of equipment.

Component 2: Improvement of information and communication systems and physical infrastructure (total estimated cost US$7.6m; actual US$11.0m): Providing goods, consulting services, and training programs for the following purposes: a) improvement of an integrated system of data processing; b) professional development of personnel staff of the Department of Classifications and Information Technology; c) maintenance of the computer facility and program support of ARKS in order to accelerate data processing; and d) improvement of the corporative communication network of ARKS.

Component 3: Development of human resources (total estimated cost US$0.8m; actual US$0.9m): Providing goods, consulting services, and training programs for the following purposes: a) implementation of new methods for management, career development and practice of appointment in ARKS; b) development and implementation of a training strategy in ARKS; c) development and implementation of a program on training of ARKS staff abroad; and d) revision of current procedures and recruitment policy in ARKS.

Component 4: Improvement of statistical infrastructure, standards and methodology (total estimated cost US$1.7m; actual US$1.6m): Providing goods, consulting services, and training programs for the following purposes: a) improvement of the business register; b) improvement of the population register; c) improvement of the housing stock register; d) improvement of the agriculture register; e) improvement of classifications and standards; f) development of a statistical toolkit; g) improvement of quality and methods of conducting sample surveys; h) formation of time series and seasonal adjustment methods implementation; and i) development of the analytical capacity of ARKS.

Component 5: Improvement of work with users and respondents (total estimated cost US$1.4m; actual US$1.3m): Providing goods, consulting services, and training programs for the following purposes: a) improvement of policy on relations with respondents; b) improvement of dissemination and marketing of statistical information; c) improvement of policy work with respondents; and d) improvement of the ARKS web portal.

Component 6: Improvement of methodology and practice in specific areas of statistics (total estimated cost US$9.3m; actual US$5.9m): Providing goods, consulting services, and training programs for the following purposes: a) improvement of macroeconomic statistics; b) improvement of microeconomic statistics covering industry, energy, construction, investment, foreign and domestic trade, and service statistics; c) improvement of agriculture statistics; d) improvement of social statistics; e) improvement of labor statistics; and f) development of environmental statistics.

Component 7: Project management (total estimated cost US$0.5m; actual US$0.6m): Providing goods, consulting services, training programs and operational costs of ARKS for project management, implementation, monitoring, and assessment.

e. Comments on Project Cost, Financing, Borrower Contribution, and Dates

Project costs: The total project cost was **US$22.6 million** (ICR, Annex 3, p. 28). The breakdown by component presented above includes both the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and government amounts combined (i.e. total project costs).

Financing: The project was financed with an IBRD loan in the amount of **US$20.00 million. US$19.95 million** was spent; US$48,781 of loan proceeds was cancelled in due course.

Borrower contribution: The government contributed **US$3.2 million**, or US$0.39 million more than the US$2.81 million originally planned (ICR, Annex 3, p. 28). However, the ICR does not indicate how the additional US$0.39 million was distributed across components, nor was this amount included in the total project costs of Table (a) in Annex 3.

Dates: The original credit was approved in March 2011 and became effective in February 2012. The project closed on April 30, 2017, the original closing date. There was no revision of objectives or components during project implementation.

3. Relevance of Objectives & Design

a. Relevance of Objectives

The project objectives were substantially relevant at the start of the project and continued to be relevant throughout. As recognized in the PAD (p. 10), improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the national statistical system was crucial to supporting Kazakhstan's transition to a modern economy and monitoring the performance of its various sub-sectors for developing policy measures. This was (and is) especially important following the transition from a centrally planned to a market economy, which called for significant changes in the tasks of ARKS and the improvement of data collection and production methods, standards, and classifications. While the Kazakh national statistical system was considered at the start of the project one of the best in the region, the project provided the necessary vehicle to support the implementation of the priorities already identified in the statistical master plan (SMP) 2008-2015 that had been prepared by the government with the World Bank's assistance through a Joint Economic Research Program (JERP).

The project objectives were directly relevant to the Area of Engagement 2, "Strengthening Governance and Improving Efficiency in Public Service Delivery," of the Country Partnership Strategy (CPS) FY12-FY17. The strategy document refers to the project's role of "introducing modern methods and sharpening skills in government statistics" (CPS FY12-FY17, p. 24). One of the project indicators ("International standard user satisfaction survey on quality and reliability of statistical data introduced in 2012 with satisfaction rates reaching 80 percent by 2017") was included among the CPS FY12-FY17 outcome indicators as a measure of the objective "Strengthening budget and accounting institutions." Moreover, under Area of Engagement 1, "Improving competitiveness and fostering job creation," aligning national services-trade statistics with the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development Manual on Statistics in International Trade in Services was identified as one of the milestones to achieve the outcome of strengthening fiscal discipline and trade openness and integration. According to the ICR (p. 20), the project's objectives could have better reflected the CPF 2012-2017 emphasis on regional development. A more recent CPF (2019-2023) is under preparation, but not finalized.

Rating
Substantial

b. Relevance of Design

The planned activities were logically linked to the achievement of the objectives and were strongly grounded in the SMP, which provided a systematic and long-term plan to develop statistical capacity in the country. In this framework, the project components covered all the necessary elements, including strengthening the institutional framework, improving human resources, and building physical and statistical infrastructure. The design emphasized the government's ownership and coordination with all stakeholders, chiefly users and producers. As the ICR highlights (p. 9), every component was built on existing systems, policies, and procedures (such as the ARKS Strategic Plan for Statistics 2009-2013, and the already mentioned SMP 2010-2015) to strengthen or modify them based on previous evaluations and recommendations (such as a Global Assessment undertaken by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) and the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNSCAP)); all the components

were also complementary to each other. One important element meant to increase government ownership and strengthen sustainability was the creation of a Project Implementation Team (PIT) within the ARKS, rather than as a separate Project Implementation Unit. Also, a twinning arrangement was established between ARKS and a consortium of European National Statistical Offices. This arrangement was meant to provide systematic and programmatic assistance to ARKS and, at the same time, strengthen sustainability.

Project design identified exogenous factors that could jeopardize implementation – such as insufficient government buy-in, poor coordination among government agencies, and weak capacity in statistical systems, financial management, and procurement – and integrated appropriate mitigating measures, such as training and features strengthening the country statistical system.

Rating
High

4. Achievement of Objectives (Efficacy)

Objective 1

Objective
Improve efficiency and effectiveness of the national statistical system to provide relevant data in line with internationally accepted methodology and best practices

[Note that several of the project's activities contributed to more than one objective. For example, activities meant to improve timeliness of data, such as upgrades in physical and statistical infrastructure, also contributed to improved data reliability. In what follows, activities have been assigned to the main objective they contributed to. The theory of change underlying achievement of the objectives was sound, as reconstructed by the ICR (Annex 6, p. 35). The ICR also provides an extremely detailed account of the project outputs (Table 6 (b), p. 37). In what follows, the main outputs are highlighted – in addition to the project development outcomes.]

Rationale
Project activities contributed to providing more relevant data by improving access to and use of data that was of value to users, as follows:

Outputs:

- An increase in the use of administrative data was achieved.
- Access to databases was granted to scientific organizations, including to anonymized microdata.
- New forms of dissemination of data were implemented.

Outcomes:

- User satisfaction rates significantly increased – to 94.4 percent in 2016, which exceeded the target value of 80 percent;
- Access to targeted statistical products substantially increased (by 8 times), based on the number of visits to the improved Central Statistical Office website (4 million visitors in 2016, which was tenfold the original target of 400,000). This indicator, as recognized by the ICR (p. 7) has some limitations, as it does not capture the extent to which visitors used the information accessed (as measured, for example, by the number of downloads). Moreover, the ICR rightly points out that the rapid increase in the number of visits is partially to be attributed to the broad dissemination of Internet in the country over the time period of the project.

Rating
Substantial

Objective 2
Objective
Improve efficiency and effectiveness of the national statistical system to provide timely data in line with internationally accepted methodology and best practices

Rationale
Project activities contributed to providing more timely data as a result of efficiency increases due to: (i) the optimization of the workload, (ii) improved coordination, and (iii) upgrades of physical and statistical infrastructure that were all completed on time. All targets were achieved or overachieved. In particular:

Outputs:

- Work processes were improved: an integrated country-level processing system was introduced, and optimization of the workload between central and regional offices started; a working group was established to design and introduce a personal workload recording system; and the division of labor within ARKS and the Committee on Statistics under the Ministry of National Economy (CSMNE) was improved.
- Increased coordination was achieved by integrating the information system of the CSMNE and the information systems of other government authorities.

- The physical and statistical infrastructure was upgraded: the CSMNE network equipment was modernized; new methods of electronic-based survey interviews were introduced, including (in the case of agricultural statistics) switching from paper to electronic format; R-software for sampling was adopted and allowed for substantial time saving gains; tools were adopted to estimate and monitor survey costs; and a web-based one-window respondent office was introduced.

Outcomes:

The project activities and the outputs achieved contributed to the achievement of the project development outcome defined as “statistical outputs are released in a timely manner in accordance with internationally accepted frequency and timeframes” (PAD, p. 37). As the ICR notes (p. 12), the indicators compiled by the ARKS/CSMNE fully meet the requirements of the Special Data Dissemination Standards (they had been in compliance since 2014), including with respect to the timing of compiling, disseminating, and transferring statistical indicators to national and international agencies. According to the ICR, an International Monetary Fund evaluation confirmed that these requirements are all met (ICR, p. 35). Moreover, the survey respondent burden was cut by 20 percent and, as a result, the response rate and the timeliness of data production improved.

Rating
Substantial

Objective 3
Objective
Improve efficiency and effectiveness of the national statistical system to provide reliable data in line with internationally accepted methodology and best practices

Rationale
According to the theory of change highlighted in Annex 6 of the ICR (p. 35) and the project results framework, the project activities succeeded in increasing the quality of statistics, as follows:

Outputs:

- A quality management approach to statistics production was introduced.
- International standards were adopted for all aspects of sampling surveys.
- A methodology for seasonal adjustment was adopted.
- A pre-test lab was established.

Outcomes:

The statistical office developed or improved 80 methodological guidelines, in line with international standards and classifications, and applied them in data collection, compilation, and verification. Regular validations were carried out.

Rating
Substantial

5. Efficiency

The PAD (p. 25) and the ICR (p. 15) note that a statistical development project like KAZSTAT is not amenable to a cost-benefit of economic rate of return analysis, considering that the production and dissemination of statistics is financed from tax revenue, and national statistical offices are not involved in any cost recovery activity. Both the PAD and the ICR stress that greater coverage and quality of statistical data contribute to a better functioning of the economy and society, and therefore enhance the potential for evidence-based decision-making. While the exact economic benefit cannot be quantified, it can logically be expected to be significant.

The ICR (p. 15) also notes that the project made efficient use of resources, as all activities were implemented and completed on time, with no project extension. As all targets were achieved and in some cases largely surpassed, this ICRR agrees that efficiency was Substantial.

Efficiency Rating
Substantial

a. If available, enter the Economic Rate of Return (ERR) and/or Financial Rate of Return (FRR) at appraisal and the re-estimated value at evaluation:

	Rate Available?	Point value (%)	*Coverage/Scope (%)
Appraisal	✓	0	0 ☑Not Applicable
ICR Estimate	✓	0	0 ☑Not Applicable

* Refers to percent of total project cost for which ERR/FRR was calculated.

6. Outcome

The relevance of objectives and the relevance of design are rated **Substantial** and **High** respectively, in consideration of the critical role of the project in supporting the government's production and dissemination of statistics, the critical role of statistics in strengthening decision-making in all the priority areas identified in the CPS, and the tight alignment between the project's planned activities and its intended outcomes. Achievement of all three objectives is rated **Substantial**, as the project achieved and in some cases surpassed its intended outcomes. The project implemented all the planned activities and fully met targets for its output and outcome indicators; given the logical links between output and outcomes, the project met the objectives of improving the relevance, timeliness, and reliability of data through increasing the efficiency and efficacy of the national statistical system; in a few cases it surpassed targets. The project succeeded in increasing data timeliness by increases in efficiency of the statistical system, which translated into timely data release. The project succeeded in improving the relevance and reliability of data mostly through increases in efficacy of the statistical system as measured by increased access to and use of data and higher user satisfaction. The ICR (p. 10) convincingly argues that these results should be largely attributed to the project, considering that (i) at the time of project implementation, this was the only statistical development initiative, and (ii) project funding represented in some years up to 16 percent of the total CSMNE budget. Efficiency is rated **Substantial**, considering the economic benefit of improved statistics, as well as the timely completion of the project, with no extension. Based on these ratings, the overall outcome rating is **Satisfactory**, indicating only minor shortcomings in the project's preparation and implementation.

a. Outcome Rating

Satisfactory

7. Rationale for Risk to Development Outcome Rating

Risk to development outcome depends, in this type of project, on the willingness and capacity of the government to build on the improvements generated by the project to maintain statistics delivery at higher standards. The ICR (p. 18) makes a persuasive case that several key achievements of the project will be sustained, at least in the medium term.

First, the project aimed at strengthening the country's statistical system, so several achievements were, at project closing, already institutionalized, as many processes and outputs were introduced as part of the CSMNE's regular work. An improved legal architecture was put in place, capacity building strengthened, equipment upgraded, new methodologies introduced, processes for active involvement of data users and producers activated, and linkages with other statistical agencies and international organizations established.

Second, the commitment of the government was strong at the beginning of the project, during implementation, and at project closing. The recurrent costs implied by the project activities (e.g.

maintenance of the new equipment) were included in the regular budget (ICR, p. 8). A new project was approved under the JERP to move to the System of National Accounts 2008 and develop the Sustainable Development Goals roadmap.

The ICR (p. 19) recognizes the existence of some threats, such as the absence of a high-level coordinating authority and potentially inadequate human, technical, and budgetary resources if statistical needs expand or become more complex. Overall, however, the risk is rated moderate, considering the strong level of buy-in and institutionalization of processes and products.

a. Risk to Development Outcome Rating

Modest

8. Assessment of Bank Performance

a. Quality-at-Entry

Project design was well calibrated. As the PAD (p. 26) notes, the Bank relied on a detailed analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the national statistical system, undertaken in 2008 by UNECE and UNESCAP. This evaluation was supplemented by the SMP, developed jointly by the Bank and the government, and the implementation of the ARKS Strategic Plan, which provided a solid base to develop the technical design.

Project design appropriately integrated lessons from previous Bank-financed statistical capacity building projects: the importance of a systemic and coordinated approach (hence the centrality of the existing SMP); the need of embedding sustainability at design (hence the focus on strengthening the institutional framework); the strengths of lean and "institutionalized" implementation arrangements (hence the creation of a project implementation team, rather than a separate project implementation unit); and the usefulness of partnerships (hence the creation of a Consortium, or a network of Central Statistical Offices). As the ICR (p. 6) notes, appropriate mitigation measures were taken to address some operational risks identified at appraisal. The limited prior experience of ARKS in managing institutional development projects was addressed by selecting a competent PIT and identifying well-established statistical offices to be part of the Consortium.

The project team had an appropriate skill mix, covering all technical aspects of the project, and substantial country experience (ICR, p. 20).

Quality-at-Entry Rating

Satisfactory

b. Quality of supervision

The Bank's performance did not have shortcomings during project implementation (ICR p. 20), as demonstrated by the timely and successful implementation of project activities. The ICR (p. 20) remarks that

the team remained stable throughout project implementation and that the Bank's fiduciary and procurement team provided constant and regular advice to the implementing agency, especially at the start of the project. This allowed for prompt identification of potential errors and rapid response.

Quality of Supervision Rating
Satisfactory

Overall Bank Performance Rating
Satisfactory

9. Assessment of Borrower Performance

a. Government Performance
Government commitment was strong. Previous experiences of collaboration between the government and the Bank in statistical work – through the Trust Fund for Statistical Capacity Building and the JERP project – were instrumental in generating genuine demand for assistance in statistics by the Kazakh government. The government provided timely co-financing (ICR, p. 21). There was close collaboration across line ministries and agencies. During implementation (in 2014), ARKS lost the status of autonomous agency and became part of the Ministry of National Economy (CSMNE). This arrangement, which contradicts the United Nations Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics, will require close monitoring going forward, but did not produce any negative consequences for project implementation.

Government Performance Rating
Satisfactory

b. Implementing Agency Performance
The ARKS (from 2014 part of the CSMNE) was highly committed in project preparation and implementation. The ICR (p. 21) remarks that the full-time project coordinator leading the PIT was knowledgeable and competent, and hired reliable procurement and financial management specialists. ARKS also actively engaged with the Consortium of international Central Statistical Offices, which facilitated ARKS' acquisition of technical expertise and practical skills (ICR, p. 21). ARKS was responsive to the advice received from consultants; similarly, the CSMNE was open to implementing the recommendations of the evaluations received. The ICR (p. 5 and 20) also notes the strong performance of the PIT within ARKS in coordinating the day-to-day project activities; managing reporting and auditing activities; and ensuring compliance with procurement, disbursement, and financial management policies and procedures.

Implementing Agency Performance Rating
Satisfactory

Overall Borrower Performance Rating

Satisfactory

10. M&E Design, Implementation, & Utilization

a. M&E Design

The indicators included in the Results Monitoring Framework were comprehensive, covering output, intermediate outcome, and (final/high level) outcome measures. They adequately reflected the whole range of project activities. The PDO indicators were formulated to capture relevant dimensions of efficiency (timeliness) and efficacy (quality and user satisfaction) of national statistics. The ICR (p. 7) notices that additional indicators could have been included, namely the number of downloads (rather than just visits to the web site) and the share of users that found the information they were seeking. In addition, there was no indicator of "complains" received (regarding, for example, difficulties in using the system, errors spotted, etc.) and addressed, nor any indication that such a feedback system was put in place.

Baseline information was available at appraisal or soon after the project started. Methods for data collection were aligned with international standards. For example, the user satisfaction survey was based on internationally recognized methodology (ICR, p. 7).

b. M&E Implementation

The ICR (p. 7) notes that indicators for monitoring and evaluation of project progress were tracked and updated regularly during project implementation.

c. M&E Utilization

The ICR does not provide information on utilization of project monitoring and evaluation. Many indicators appear to be extremely relevant to regular monitoring of ARKS/CSMNE activities beyond the life of the project, but there is no indication of the frequency with which these indicators are updated and how they are used.

M&E Quality Rating

Substantial

11. Other Issues

a. Safeguards

The project was rated environmental category "C". No social or environmental safeguard was triggered.

b. Fiduciary Compliance

The PAD (p. 26) rated the fiduciary risk at the project level as substantial before and moderate after proposed mitigation measures (the proposed mitigation measures included developing a financial management manual, hiring an experienced financial consultant, and modifying the accounting system to be able to generate interim financial reports). The reason that the risk was originally rated substantial was ARKS′ lack of previous experience in implementing Bank-financed projects, although it was recognized that the statistical agency had established adequate financial management systems for the management of budget funds. The PAD (p. 27; Annex 8, p. 80) rated procurement risk as substantial due to ARKS′ weak capacity to implement procurement and Kazakhstan being ranked as a high-risk country from the public procurement point of view.

The ICR (p. 8) notes only that financial management performance varied at the onset, but improved during implementation and remained consistently satisfactory; it does not offer any specific details. It also states that no mis-procurement was identified and no interim financial report was overdue, but it does not mention whether timely audit reports were submitted and whether they had unqualified audit opinions acceptable to the Bank.

c. Unintended impacts (Positive or Negative)

None reported.

d. Other

---

12. Ratings

Ratings	ICR	IEG	Reason for Disagreements/Comment
Outcome	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	---
Risk to Development Outcome	Modest	Modest	---
Bank Performance	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	---
Borrower Performance	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	---
Quality of ICR		Substantial	---

Note

When insufficient information is provided by the Bank for IEG to arrive at a clear rating, IEG will downgrade the relevant ratings as warranted beginning July 1, 2006.
The "Reason for Disagreement/Comments" column could cross-reference other sections of the ICR Review, as appropriate.

13. Lessons

(Lessons 1 is derived by IEG; lessons 2 and 3 are taken (revised) from the ICR.)

In developing statistical capacity, it is crucial to adopt a systemic approach to calibrate a project to country needs, ensure ownership, and strengthen sustainability. Statistics are essential to monitor country conditions and for policy decision-making. Statistical capacity building projects need therefore to consider existing needs, capacity, and constraints and to build on these elements in order to succeed and be sustainable. KAZSTAT set ambitious goals, but not unrealistic ones, based on country priorities and the government's willingness and capacity already in place. Moreover, the project cleverly used and developed institutional elements to ensure that the financed activities could become part of the regular operations of the Statistical Office. It decided to assign implementation to a Project Implementation Team that was fully embedded in the ARKS, rather than creating a separate entity. It supported a twinning partnership with statistical offices facing similar challenges and conditions to exchange experiences and expertise, rather than resorting to external consultants. It strengthened statistical and technical capacity, but also financial and procurement expertise, and supported hardware and software upgrades. All these elements modernized ARKS, and changed processes and methods – beyond the life of the project itself.

Building on existing experience and lessons from similar statistical capacity building projects is essential for the World Bank to maximize results and minimize risks. KAZSTAT benefited from very strong Bank experience in implementing statistical capacity building projects. The Bank could bring to the table the right technical expertise, and succeeded in identifying those aspects critical to smooth implementation and, eventually, achieving results – based on previous experience in the region. For example, focusing on institutional reform (ICR, p. 4), frontloading training and education of staff in the earlier phase of the project (ICR, p. 22), and ensuring a coordinated and systemic approach were all lessons taken from previous projects that proved instrumental to this project's success.

Consideration of the borrower's national conditions that can influence a project's implementation at the onset is essential for success. The ICR (p. 22) stresses that ARKS' weakness in financial management could have adversely impacted implementation. However, prompt identification of those weaknesses and adequate mitigating measures (hiring of financial management specialists, and training in Bank financial management and disbursement procedures) helped to ensure that the financial management of the project was maintained at a satisfactory level. The ICR (p. 6) also mentions that in Kazakhstan there was no additional workload related to conducting censuses or other major work during the five years of project implementation. This represented a very favorable condition allowing ARKS to undividedly focus on project implementation. The ICR does not mention whether the timing of the project was deliberately planned around a slack period, or if this was just a fortuitous coincidence. Irrespective, avoiding periods of overload is certainly important to increase the chances of success.

14. Assessment Recommended?

No

15. Comments on Quality of ICR

The ICR is concise and appropriately focuses on results and the theory of change. Yet, in striving for conciseness, it is excessively generic in many places and does not provide details or examples to support and explain specific statements (for example: "CMU engagement with the client in different areas provided a very favorable environment for successful preparation of the statistical operation", p. 4). Several of the lessons, while generally plausible, are vague and not clearly supported by narrative in the text of the ICR. The ICR also includes many typos, and sentences with grammatical and syntax errors.

Ultimately, the ICR presents enough credible evidence that the project satisfactorily delivered; however, it could have been more specific and added useful information to supplement and elucidate several of its statements.

a. Quality of ICR Rating
Substantial