Appendix C: Country Case Study Methodology

Guiding Principles

Country cases follow a multiple country case study design, that is, focus on three regional clusters each with three sets of PPP projects with distinct features. In total nine country case studies were selected on a purposive basis with a view to generating three sets of case studies in Latin America and the Caribbean and East Asia and Pacific, the two most active regions in applying PPPs, and Sub-Saharan Africa, with one of the lowest PPP activity levels and high cancellation rates. This allowed learning from both the “common case” as well as the “critical case.” Each set contains one country where the World Bank Group provided mainly upstream support to study its effects on the country’s PPP agenda and / or subsequent PPP transactions; one country where the World Bank was active mainly downstream; and one country where the World Bank was active both upstream and downstream to study the added value of continuous engagement and the effects of direct support to PPPs. See Table C.1 for countries covered by all nine case studies. Drawing lessons within and across these regions, in particular across these “horizontal” cases yielded more valid and robust lessons.

The purpose of country case studies is to enrich the learning agenda of the evaluation and to fill certain gaps. More specifically, country cases are conducted to …

- Answer questions of “how” and “why,” that is, to obtain the necessary contextual information and insights to identify drivers of success and failure; we do not aim at telling a “rating story” based on country cases.
- Address the question of whether PPP projects produced desired outcomes as a result of specific sectoral factors or as a result of overall governance/framework/country factors that could be transferred across sectors and may be country specific.
- Collect information on if and how Bank Group upstream work was used by the governments/countries for subsequent PPP transactions – whether supported by the Bank Group or not.
- For downstream work, to assess PPP sustainability in the longer term, including the need to renegotiate PPP during their lifespan.
- Address issues of complementarity and synergies which may not be evident from country or project level documents.

Country case studies covered the entire World Bank Group PPP portfolio, as identified by the project team. These PPP interventions were recorded in the portfolio analysis database by the team and the case study author was advised to make use of this information when answering the evaluation questions, preferably when preparing for the mission as well as when drafting the case study report. During the actual field visit to the country, the incumbent evaluated these Bank Group PPP interventions in greater detail and answered the evaluation questions (see next section) through interviews with relevant counterparts, government officials, beneficiaries, investors, industry associations, civil society organizations, academia, and other suitable stakeholders, complemented by data gathering and site visits. If because of size not all interventions could be
reviewed in detail, a sample was chosen purposively – in coordination with the task team leader – so that the selected sample …

1. Mirrored the overall portfolio composition in terms of Bank Group entities engaged and in terms of types of interventions, even if the sample size for each intervention type was likely not statistically representative.

2. Allowed for a rich learning experience with regard to the country’s PPP agenda.

3. In case IFC Advisory Services or MIGA projects could be assessed in the country even in an “upstream country,” they had to be assessed, as outcome information is scarce in the portfolio review. Each author coordinated the selection of the PPP projects with the team and task team leader and documented the selection up front in the country case study.

Depending on the type of the country the focus of the case study was on the relevant type of support, that is, for upstream countries on World Bank Group upstream support, for continuous engagement countries on the entire spectrum of Bank Group support (up and downstream), for downstream countries more Bank Group support to actual PPP transaction. This, however, did not preclude an assessment of some upstream work even in a downstream country or conversely, of some downstream work in an upstream country. In general, the evaluation focused on Bank Group interventions that have already been delivered, for example, closed World Bank projects, completed PPIAF/WBI activities, and/or operationally matured IFC/MIGA investments.

### Table C.1. Countries Covered by Case Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAC</th>
<th>EAP</th>
<th>SSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upstream countries</strong></td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuous engagement countries</strong></td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Downstream countries</strong></td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(based on CPE)*

**Note:** CPE = country program evaluation; EAP = East Asia and Pacific Region; LAC = Latin America and the Caribbean Region; SSA = Sub Saharan Africa.
Template for Country Case Study

**SECTION I: THE COUNTRY EXPERIENCE AND PPP AGENDA, FY02–12**
- Recent relevant political economy developments
- Relevant macroeconomic developments FY02–12
- Overview of the country’s experience with implementing its PPP agenda.

**SECTION II: WORLD BANK GROUP ROLE AND RELEVANCE**
- How did the role of PPPs evolve in World Bank Group country strategies (CAS, ISN)?
- Did the World Bank Group’s PPP interventions address development priorities in that country; that is, were they relevant?
- How did the World Bank Group engagement operationally in the country’s PPP agenda (add table, if needed), did this engagement change over time (for example, see a shift in the mix of tools or a shift from upstream to more transaction oriented work) and if so why? Was the Bank Group responsive in case priorities changes or emerged?
  - What’s the role of the World Bank Group in the country’s PPP agenda and vis-à-vis other major donors/MDBs? Was the Bank Group more active upstream or downstream vis-à-vis the other players? Did the Bank Group provide a comprehensive solution package, including up and downstream work?
  - How was coordination of World Bank Group work with other major players in the PPP agenda of that country, for example, other MDBs, DFID, USAID, other national agencies, the United Nations?

**SECTION III: EFFECTIVENESS OF WORLD BANK GROUP UPSTREAM WORK**
To be able to answer questions in Sections 3–5, the country’s PPP-related projects needed to be assessed first one by one. The portfolio analysis and the field visits provided the necessary information, with the field visits providing a more up-to-date and more detailed information. Then the findings of the portfolio analysis were considered together with the information collected during the field visits when answering the below questions at an aggregate level.

- Has the World Bank Group provided strategic advice to client countries in making informed decisions about the nature and level of private sector involvement in sector reform, the choice between public investment versus PPP, and type of PPP? Is there evidence that this advice taken on board and knowledge actually delivered? Are there examples of well conducted Value for Money analysis, due diligence applying the Public Sector Comparator Model, and so forth?
To what extent have World Bank Group interventions and project components that targeted the enabling environment for PPPs achieved their stated objectives; that is, have PPP units taken up their jobs, are the regulators functional, are PPP laws actually used to process PPP transactions, and so forth?

- What were the factors enabling or preventing the achievement of these objectives? What can we learn from cases where the implementation of upstream measures was particularly successful or failed?
- Has the World Bank Group enhanced the public sector’s capability to assess and account for contingent liability and recurring expenditures related to PPPs?
- In how far did country parameters (for example governance issues, enabling environment income level, absorption capacity, investment climate, and so forth) or sector parameters (for example lack of cost recovery, size of market) drive the role and effectiveness of PPPs?

Has the World Bank Group’s upstream support achieved its long term outcomes, that is, helped countries to execute PPP transactions? How useful did recipients perceive World Bank Group upstream support when implementing subsequent actual PPP transactions?

- Subsequently, did those PPPs improve access to infrastructure and social services through subsequent PPPs, regardless of World Bank Group involvement in the actual PPP transaction? How did these PPPs work out; that is, is there evidence that these PPPs contributed to improve and inclusive access, quality of service delivery, and increased efficiency? If so, why and why not? Was failure due to shortcomings in upstream work? Note: When assessing World Bank Group–supported projects, rely on your assessment of it under Section IV.
- Is there evidence that PPPs have leveraged scarce public sector resources through private sector funds? Is there evidence that PPPs deliver their services in a sustained manner? What can we learn from successful or failed PPP transactions?

Section IV: Effectiveness of Downstream Support

- Have PPPs that benefited from World Bank Group downstream support (IFC Advisory Services, IFC Investment Services, World Bank lending or non-lending or MIGA) contributed to improved access to infrastructure and social services?
  - Have PPPs actually contributed to improved and inclusive access, quality of service delivery, and increased efficiency?
  - Did these PPPs leverage public sector resources through private sector funds? If not, what prevented private investors to contribute?
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- Have these PPPs provided sustained services over time, that is, beyond project closure/operational maturity?

- Assess what drove success or failure during preparation, bidding and finance. In cases of fully operational PPPs, what factors enabled/impaired sustainability/longevity? In case applicable, what were the reasons for MIGA projects being cancelled?

- How far did country parameters (for example the enabling environment, the country’s income level, absorption capacity, investment climate, and so forth) or sector parameters (for example, lack of cost recovery, size of market etc.) drive the success of these PPPs?

- Can any effects beyond the immediate projects scope, for example, at broader sector level or country level, be observed?

SECTION V: WORK QUALITY AND COORDINATION

- What were the roles of the different World Bank Group entities in the country’s up and downstream work, how was their work quality and what their added value or shortcomings?

  - Were there unique roles of IFC Advisory Services and World Bank (AAA, FBS, and so forth) with regard to advising on transactions, including pipeline management, project preparation, bidding and finance? What did the client appreciate most about their work, what the least? What went right and wrong, and why? Please provide specific examples of where coordination was lacking and what was the result of this - in other words, what would have happened with better coordination? Please refrain from referring to a general lack of coordination.

  - What did the client appreciate most about the role and contribution of IFC Investment Services, MIGA and World Bank loans with regard to financing PPP transactions? What should be improved?

- At the country level, has World Bank Group’s PPP agenda been adequately coordinated?

  - Has the World Bank Group leveraged synergies and exploited the comparative advantages of its various public and private sector arms and its products? Can coordination and collaboration be found at the level of specific projects? If not, have efforts been coordinated at regional sectoral or strategic level?

  - What can we learn from successful or failed World Bank Group coordination across the various units contributing to the PPP agenda?
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- According to the World Bank CD, the IFC Head and their key staff, has the Bank Group been able to deliver a country specific PPP solution?

- With the World Bank and IFC Advisory Services being involved upstream and IFC Investment Services downstream, has the management of conflicts of interest been a potential or real issue? If so, how was it handled?

- From a country perspective, is there a need to adjust the World Bank Group’s organizational structures, processes, and incentives to better enable a coordinated and effective delivery of PPP targeted activities?
  - From the World Bank Group field offices perspective, client, financier or counterpart perspective, is the current organizational set-up, allocation of skills and resources, and functions across the World Bank Group with regard to implementing the PPP agenda, and its embedded incentives systems and standards conducive to an efficient and effective PPP response?

- Looking at both, upstream and downstream work, to what extent was corruption an issue along the entire value chain of a PPP, that is, from pipeline development, setting of specific technical standards, project selection preparation, bidding, and finance?
  - Is there any evidence that corruption led to dropping of projects? Is there any evidence that the lack of competition had an effect on the risk allocation?
  - How well is the country positioned to address systemic corruption risk? What did the World Bank Group do about addressing corruption at the systemic as well as project level?