



## 1. Project Data

<b>Project ID</b> P163592	<b>Project Name</b> CASA1000 CSP - Kyrgyz Republic	
<b>Country</b> Central Asia	<b>Practice Area(Lead)</b> Social Sustainability and Inclusion	
<b>L/C/TF Number(s)</b> IDA-62190,IDA-67560,IDA-D2940,IDA-D7050,TF-A6612	<b>Closing Date (Original)</b> 30-Jun-2023	<b>Total Project Cost (USD)</b> 30,648,880.60
<b>Bank Approval Date</b> 10-Apr-2018	<b>Closing Date (Actual)</b> 31-Dec-2024	
	<b>IBRD/IDA (USD)</b>	<b>Grants (USD)</b>
Original Commitment	10,000,000.00	1,000,000.00
Revised Commitment	32,000,000.00	1,000,000.00
Actual	30,909,969.65	995,812.00

<b>Prepared by</b> Katharina Ferl	<b>Reviewed by</b> Vibecke Dixon	<b>ICR Review Coordinator</b> Avjeet Singh	<b>Group</b> IEGSD (Unit 4)
--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---	--------------------------------

## 2. Project Objectives and Components

### a. Objectives

According to the PAD (p.) and the Financing Agreement of August 8, 2019 (p. 6) the objective of the project was “to engage communities in the development of social and economic infrastructure in order to enhance services, livelihoods and inclusion in target villages near the CASA1000 Transmission Line.”

When the project received Additional Financing (AF) in June 2020, the objective of the scope was revised by one word to reflect the expansion of the project’s target area. The revised objective was “to engage



communities in the development of social and economic infrastructure to enhance services, livelihoods, and inclusion in target *oblasts* near the CAS1000 transmission line". (The Kyrgyz Republic is divided into seven oblasts. Batken, Osh, and Jalalabad oblasts were included in this project while Chuy, Issyk-Kul, Naryn, and Talas oblasts were covered by the World Bank's Third Village Investment Project (VIP3), a community driven development project).

The objective will be parsed as follows:

- i. to engage communities in the development of social and economic infrastructure to enhance services in target *oblasts* near the CAS1000 transmission line;
- ii. to engage communities in the development of social and economic infrastructure to enhance livelihoods in target *oblasts* near the CAS1000 transmission line;
- iii. to engage communities in the development of social and economic infrastructure to enhance inclusion in target *oblasts* near the CAS1000 transmission line.

**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 included three components:

**Component 1: Support for community-led investments in social and economic infrastructure: (appraisal estimate US\$8.95 million, AF US\$16.50 million, actual US\$25.02 million):** This component included three subcomponents:

Subcomponent 1A: Support for electricity improvements within target villages: This subcomponent was to finance sub-grants to approximately 37 communities in the Corridor of Impact (COI) for: i) village level electricity improvements; ii) alternative energy sources (as determined by communities). The procedures for implementation of sub-grants under this subcomponent was to follow a participatory process (planning, decision making, management, and monitoring) similar to that developed for subcomponent 1B but limited to community prioritization within an agreed menu of electricity/energy-related options.

Subcomponent 1B: Support for social infrastructure and services in target villages: This subcomponent was to provide sub-grants to communities to fund the priority social infrastructure and services projects related to water, education, health, transport, and agriculture in the villages in the corridor impact selected through the youth-led, participatory decision-making process established in subcomponent 2A.

Subcomponent 1C: Support for livelihoods facilities in selected Aily Aimaks (AAs) (AAs are sub-districts): This subcomponent was to finance the construction of a limited number of livelihood facilities or selected productive/economic infrastructure in partnership with local entrepreneurs or entrepreneur groups. This subcomponent was to expand the focus of support including all communities located in the 22



targeted AAs, i.e. the funding of livelihood facilities was to be targeted at, and be accessible to, all residents of the estimated 132 communities in the AAs that were traversed by the Transmission Line.

When the project received AF in 2020, the scope of this component was increased to support an additional 145 AAs, approximately, with health-related and livelihoods-related investments in Osh, Jalalabad, and Batken Oblasts. Subgrant distribution to AAs for investments in subcomponents 1B and 1C were to follow the same principles and methodology as for the parent project, taking account of the AA population, poverty and remoteness and any specific exposure to shocks (such as natural hazards or COVID-19).

**Component 2: Support for community mobilization, youth engagement and communications (appraisal estimate US\$1.30 million, AF US\$3.0 million, actual US\$2.90 million):** This component included three subcomponents:

Subcomponent 2A: Support for community mobilization and youth engagement: This subcomponent was to support the activities needed to ensure that Component 1 investments in social and economic infrastructure were to be decided by communities and responsive to needs of all community members. This explicitly included the poor and vulnerable. The objective of this subcomponent was to build local institutional capacity and engage communities in subproject needs assessment, planning, implementation, management, and monitoring, as well as O&M where relevant.

Subcomponent 2B: Communications: This subcomponent was to implement a Communications Action Plan to build support for the project by improving community understanding of the project's benefits and opportunities, establish trust, and manage expectations. Activities were to include dissemination of information, feedback mechanisms, and training of communication staff.

When the project received AF financing the scope of subcomponents 2A and B was increased to support an additional 145 AAs, approximately. Also, a subcomponent was added:

Subcomponent 2C: Livelihoods Support Program for target communities: This subcomponent was to finance a Livelihoods Support Program (LSP) in the expanded target areas to help vulnerable community members establish or reestablish their livelihoods. This new subcomponent was to respond to the local market/needs and value chain assessments requested by communities under component 1. Qualified local economic research firms were to work with target communities to identify opportunities, assess markets and capacities, and formulate value chain action plans.

**Component 3: Project management, and monitoring and evaluation (appraisal estimate US\$750,000, actual US\$2.69 million):** This component included two subcomponents:

Subcomponent 3A: Project management and coordination: This subcomponent was to cover the incremental costs of the Community and Development and Investment Agency (ARIS) for project management.

Subcomponent 3B: Monitoring and evaluation: This subcomponent was to finance activities related to tracking project progress, conducting evaluations, and reporting outcomes.

The AF was to strengthen project management and M&E under component 3 to implement the expanded scope under components 1 and 2.



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

**Project Cost:** The project was planned to cost US\$32.0 million. Actual cost was US\$30.9 million.

**Financing:** The project was financed by an IDA credit (IDA-62190) in the amount of US\$5.0 (of which US\$4.6 million was disbursed), an IDA grant (IDA-D2940) in the amount of US\$5.0 million (of which US\$4.7 million was disbursed), a grant from the CASA1000 Multi Donor Trust Fund (TF-A6612) the amount of US\$1.0 million (which completely disbursed), an AF IDA credit (IDA-67560) in the amount of US\$10.5 million (of which US\$10.2 million was disbursed), and an AF IDA grant (D7050) in the amount of US\$10.5 million (of which US\$10.3 million was disbursed).

**Borrower Contribution:** It was not planned for the Borrower to make any contribution.

**Dates:**

The project was approved on April 10, 2018, was signed on December 5, 2019, and became effective on February 3, 2020. The project's original closing date was June 31, 2023, and the project's actual closing date was on December 31, 2024.

On June 26, 2020, the project was restructured to extend the closing date of the CASA-1000 multi donor trust fund (CASA1000 MDTF) grant TF-A6612 until March 31, 2022.

On July 30, 2020, the project received AF (IDA credit) in the amount of US\$10.5 million and an additional IDA grant in the amount of US\$10.5 million to expand the project's geographic scope (from 42 to 187 sub-districts).

On June 30, 2023, the project was restructured to extend the closing date of the parent project as well as the CASA 1000 Multi Donor Trust Fund to December 31, 2024, to align the end dates all the IDA credits, grants, and Trust Fund.

### 3. Relevance of Objectives

#### Rationale

**Country/region and sector context.** According to the PAD (para. 2), at the time of appraisal, the Kyrgyz Republic had abundant hydropower, which could supply 90 percent of domestic energy needs. However, there was an imbalance relative to demand, surplus power and wastage in the summer and perennial power shortages in winter.

This issue in combination with low tariffs and under-maintenance of energy assets, caused severe economic disruption, impacting productivity and the welfare of the population. Therefore, the government committed to investment in the construction and rehabilitation of aging hydropower plants.



In 2006, the Kyrgyz Republic entered into a regional agreement with Tajikistan, Afghanistan, and Pakistan to leverage its excess summer energy supply and create a regional electricity market—the Central Asia South Asia Regional Electricity Market.

In March 2014, the World Bank approved the first phase of this agreement, which was the implementation of the Central Asia South Asia Electricity Transmission and Trade Project (CASA1000), which aimed to establish commercial and institutional arrangements and the construction of transmission infrastructure to enable a trade of roughly 1,300 megawatts of electricity from the Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan to Afghanistan and Pakistan.

The 3 km-wide corridor surrounding the Transmission Line (referred to as the “Corridor of Impact” or “Col”) followed the Kyrgyz-Uzbek border and included communities in 7–8 *rayons* (administrative districts) in Jalal-Abad, Osh and Batken Oblasts that were economically and socially vulnerable, had limited access to public infrastructure and services, and suffered from winter energy shortages.

According to the PAD (para. 7) community-based projects had aimed to address the poverty context in the Kyrgyz Republic before. Even though extreme poverty decreased from 15.4 percent in 2005 to 1.3 percent in 2024, a large proportion of the population remained vulnerable. Almost 70 percent of all poor households were located in rural areas, and poverty varied greatly by region, with almost half of the country’s poor concentrated in two southern oblasts (Jalal-Abad and Osh) where the population faced a chronic lack of access to basic infrastructure and services, such as utility services, water supply, sewage, telephone services, and central gas supply. The main purpose of this project was to support the implementation of the CASA1000 transmission line and to limit tension due to the transmission line being constructed through the area without the local communities benefiting from it at all.

**Alignment with the Government strategy.** The objective of the project supported the country’s National Development Strategy 2018-2040 which emphasizes the importance of including young people in national development, promoting socioeconomic development of the regions and ensuring that social development in the regions is aimed at stimulating productive employment and supporting the most vulnerable population.

Furthermore, the project was aligned with the government’s “Development Program to 2026” strategy, which promotes, as its three guiding principles regional and human capital development and resilience as well as infrastructure.

**Alignment with the World Bank strategy.** The objective of the project was in line with the World Bank’s most recent Country Partnership Framework (CPF) (FY24-28) for the Kyrgyz Republic. Particularly, objective 3.1 “improve service delivery for human capital development” and objective 3.2 “enhance economic empowerment and voice of vulnerable groups”. Also, the project’s objective supported objective 2.2 “enhancing sustainability and increasing renewable capacity in the energy sector” and objective 2.3 “strengthening infrastructure resilience to climate and disaster risks”.

The objective was pitched at the outcome level. Overall, the relevance of the objective was High.

## Rating

High



## 4. Achievement of Objectives (Efficacy)

### OBJECTIVE 1

#### Objective

To engage communities in the development of social and economic infrastructure to enhance services in target oblasts near the CASA1000 transmission line

#### Rationale

**Theory of change:** The project's theory of change stated that project inputs/activities such as providing sub-grants for social and economic infrastructure in Corridor of Impact (COI) villages were to result in several outputs. These outputs were to include social infrastructure and services (e.g. schools, kindergarten, electricity services, water supply) being improved. These outputs were to result in the outcome of enhanced services to create social support for the transmission line.

#### Outputs:

- 82 percent of relevant subprojects supported climate change adaptation or mitigation, exceeding the target of 80 percent.

Outputs that the project delivered, which were not included in the Results Framework and hence had no target values:

- **Health:** 115 subprojects completed, including refurbishment of 83 health facilities, supply of medical equipment, construction of 30 first aid posts providing services to more than 80,000 people, purchase of two ambulances.
- **Education:** 116 subprojects completed, including modernization of 50 school and kindergarten buildings and purchase of equipment for 66 educational institutions.
- **Irrigation and drinking water:** 26 subprojects completed resulting in access to clean drinking water provided to 30,000 people.
- **Energy:** 77 electricity subprojects completed in corridor of impact villages (improving supply, extending networks, installing streetlights), and 5,000 new subscribers connected to the grid.

#### Outcomes:

- 84 percent of female and 81 percent of male beneficiaries reported that village/Aiyi Aimak investments met their needs, exceeding the target of 75 percent of beneficiaries.
- 85 percent of women and 87 percent of men reported that investments in social infrastructure supported post-COVID-19 needs, exceeding the target of 80 percent of women and 80 percent of men.
- 97 percent of villages had improved electricity supply for household and/or productive purposes as a result of project support, exceeding the target of 80 percent.



Data from the endline survey showed the following:

- Within the corridor of impact (where villages received electricity investments through this project since they were not to benefit from the transmission line), 70 percent of respondents reported improvements in services, compared to 59 percent outside the corridor of impact. When the project closed, 99 percent of the households within and outside the corridor of impact were connected to the grid. 83 percent of households were satisfied with the quality of their electricity service compared to 67 percent at baseline. The ICR did not state how many households had already been connected to the grid prior to project implementation, making an assessment of the achievement challenging.
- The percentage who did not have to leave their villages for accessing health care increased from 66 percent at baseline to 73 percent of respondents at endline. At endline, 62 percent of respondents reported that health care services had improved during the last 12 months.
- The percentage of respondents with children under the age of 18 in the household reported that education had improved during the last 12 months increased from 69 percent at baseline to 79 percent at endline. Almost half of those respondents reported that there was no problem with education in their community. Among those who reported problems, the key issues were lack of schools, poor school infrastructure, and poor teaching quality.
- The percentage of respondents who reported that water provision had improved during the last 12 months increased from 32 percent at baseline to 46 percent at endline. However, 12 percent of respondents stated that it had become worse. According to the World Bank team (October 14, 2025), the share reporting degradation decreased from 21 percent at baseline to 12 percent at endline.
- The percentage of respondents who stated that roads improved increased from 28 percent at baseline to 47 percent at endline. However, 14 percent of respondents stated that roads had got worse. The ICR did not state the baseline.

Overall, while the project substantially met or exceeded the targets, the project lacked indicators with an actual target number (in figures) to show the actual scale of the project such as number of beneficiaries, number of households, number of villages, number of communities, or similar), before and after AF in addition to all the indicators with percentages which would have helped give a better sense of the extent of the project achievement.

**Rating**  
Substantial

## **OBJECTIVE 2**

### **Objective**

To engage communities in the development of social and economic infrastructure to enhance livelihoods in target oblasts near the CASA 1000 transmission line

### **Rationale**

**Theory of change:** The project's theory of change stated that project inputs/activities such as providing sub-grants for livelihood facilities and training which were to result in several outputs. These outputs were to



include e.g. apple storage facilities, ICT centers etc. being constructed and operationalized as well as beneficiaries being trained on business development modules. These outputs were to result in the outcome of increased social support for the transmission line through enhancing livelihoods.

**Outputs:**

- 2,676 women were able to earn additional income as a result of project investments, exceeding the target of 2,000 women. This indicator was the only indicator in the project's Result Framework for which the target was set in figures and not in percentages. However, the target of this indicator was not increased despite a significant increase in funding and expansion in target areas.
- 91 percent of female and 93 percent of male beneficiaries reported that village investments in livelihood facilities supported the establishment of livelihoods, exceeding the target of 80 percent.

Outputs that the project delivered which were not included in the Results Framework, and hence had no target values:

- 81 economic subprojects supported in four different sectors including agriculture, handicrafts and garment manufacturing, tourism and digital technology. These subprojects created 1,256 jobs (63 percent of these jobs were for women).
- 4,000 beneficiaries, of who 78 percent were female, were trained and mentored on critical business development modules for self-employment.
- Social infrastructure investments created 326 jobs for women.

**Outcomes:**

- 100 percent of target communities had improved livelihoods facilities as a result of project support, achieving the target of 100 percent. According to the World Bank team (November 7) 77 villages were targeted under the parent project and 150 AAs were targeted under the AF. A total of 328 social infrastructure investments in the social sector were implemented, of which 142 under the parent project and 186 under the AF.
- 100 percent of target communities had improved access to social infrastructure facilities as a result of project support, achieving the target of 100 percent.

While the project achieved all of its output and outcome targets, it would have also been useful to measure the project's achievement on the outcome level such as "percentage of women's income increased" or a benchmark of 'women with at least a certain threshold of income' increased. Overall achievement of this objective was Substantial.

**Rating**  
Substantial

**OBJECTIVE 3**  
Objective



To engage communities in the development of social and economic infrastructure to enhance inclusion in target oblasts near the CASA 1000 transmission line

### **Rationale**

**Theory of change:** The project's theory of change stated that project inputs/activities such as conducting community mobilization and youth engagement activities including setting up the Corridor Village Investment Associations (CVIAs), selecting and training youth and community members for relevant project roles, as well as engaging communities in a youth-led community mobilization process to identify and prioritize needs were to result in several outputs. These outputs were to include CVIAs being established and functional, youth and community members being trained for certain roles, and inclusive community engagement processes functioning. These outputs were to result in the outcome of enhancing inclusion for the purpose of creating support for the transmission line.

### **Outputs:**

- 100 percent of target communities effectively completed the agreed community mobilization and social accountability process, exceeding the target of 80 percent.
- 80 percent of target communities selected their highest priority subproject, achieving the target of 80 percent.
- 52 percent of subproject investments were prioritized in women's groups, exceeding the target of 50 percent.
- 100 percent of target communities empowered young women and men to facilitate community mobilization, exceeding the target of 80 percent.
- 100 percent of target of Aiyl Okmotu expanded the Local Development Strategy with youth development and livelihood activities, exceeding the target of 80 percent. 89 percent of male and 91 percent of female beneficiaries in target communities reported that youth engagement activities were effective in supporting the community, exceeding the target of 70% of male and 70 percent of female beneficiaries.

Outputs that the project delivered which were not included in the Results Framework and hence had no target values:

- A database of vulnerable community groups and a physical map were developed.
- 856 trainings of vulnerable community members including 4,055 participants were conducted.
- 2,000 vulnerable community members developed business plans.

### **Outcomes:**

- 91 percent of beneficiaries in target communities reported that their engagement in decision making over village investments was effective, exceeding the target of 75 percent. However, it is not clear how "effective" was defined and measured.

Data from the endline survey showed the following:

- 901 villages, 77 under the parent project and 824 under the AF, participated in a needs assessment, planning and decision-making for social infrastructure.



- The percentage of respondents who reported that they played at least a somewhat influential role in affecting the outcome of local decisions regarding services and infrastructure increased from 58 percent at baseline to 67 percent at endline.
- In COI villages, the percentage of respondents who felt influential in local decision-making increased from 17 percent at baseline to 72 percent at endline, compared to a three percentage point increase in villages outside the COI.
- The percentage of respondents who reported that local decisions reflected their preferences fairly or very well increased from 29 percent at baseline to 49 percent at endline.
- The percentage of respondents who reported that their Aiy! Bashi (village head) was mostly or very responsive to problems with public services in their community increased from 58 percent in 2021 to 69 percent in 2024.
- When the project closed, 83 percent of beneficiaries in target communities reported that the project was an effective solution to the local impacts of the transmission line, exceeding the target of 70 percent.
- 100 percent of target communities empowered young women and men to facilitate community mobilization, exceeding the target of 80 percent.
- 91 percent of young female and male beneficiaries reported that their role/voice in decision making was enhanced as a result of project support, exceeding the target of 75 percent.

Outcomes measured through the baseline and endline surveys:

Enhanced voice and decision making:

- The percentage of respondents agreeing that a person under 30 should be allowed to be a leader in the village grew from 71 percent at baseline to 83 percent at endline and the percentage of respondents who thought young people should be allowed to participate in community development increased from 78 percent to 89 percent.
- The percentage of respondents who believed that women should be allowed to be village leaders increased from 68 percent at baseline to 73 percent at endline and the percentage of respondents who thought they should be allowed to participate in community development increased from 75 percent at baseline to 81 percent at endline.
- The percentage of non-Kyrgyz respondents who felt that local decisions reflected their preferences increased from 18 percent at baseline to 44 percent at endline. Also, the percentage of non-Kyrgyz respondents who felt influential in local decision making increased from 43 percent at baseline to 64 percent at endline.
- The percentage of households in the poorest quintiles reported that a household member attended a village meeting the last year, increased from 40 percent at baseline to 49 percent at endline. However, this is still significantly lower than the share of wealthiest households who attended a meeting (63 percent). The percentage of poorest respondents who reported feeling influential in local decision making increased from 50 percent at baseline to 60 percent at endline which was also significantly lower than the feeling of the wealthiest respondents (78 percent).

Enhanced inclusion in access to services and livelihoods:



- The percentage of non-Kyrgyz respondents who were satisfied with the price of electricity increased from 61 percent at baseline to 87 percent at endline, exceeding the satisfaction level of Kyrgyz respondents.
- At endline, 7 percent of youth and poor respondents reported looking for work, compared to 5 percent at baseline. According to the World Bank team (October 14, 2025) the survey did not include a follow-up question to identify the reason.

While the project was able to achieve/exceed all output and outcome targets and enhance inclusion in target *oblasts* near the CASA1000 transmission line it is not entirely clear to what extent these outcomes can solely be attributed to project interventions.

**Rating**  
Substantial

## OVERALL EFFICACY

### Rationale

While the project was able to achieve or exceed all of its output and outcome targets and reported substantial improvements in key areas such as improvements in services, increased influence in local decision making as well as inclusion in access to services and livelihoods, it was not entirely clear to what extent these outcomes can solely be attributed to project intervention since there was no control group of *oblasts*. Also, other similar projects had been operating in the same areas, making it difficult to assess which outcomes can be attributed to which project. Furthermore, it would have been useful to include indicators measuring the actual number of beneficiaries etc., for the project to demonstrate the scope and extent of its achievements. However, overall, the achievements of all objectives are rated Substantial with minor shortcomings.

### Overall Efficacy Rating

Substantial

## 5. Efficiency

### Economic efficiency:

The PAD (para. 86) stated that since the precise community investments were not known during project preparation as the communities had not chosen them yet, it was not possible to conduct a precise economic analysis. However, given the experience of village investment in these *oblasts*, the PAD was able to anticipate the types of investments in the defined subcomponents under a likely grant distribution scenario. Furthermore,



the PAD quantified some of the economic benefits of the infrastructure/services in order to provide a potential rate of return. It was expected that investments were made in electricity infrastructure, social infrastructure, and livelihood facilities. The PAD stated the costs and benefits for these investments and conducted an Economic Internal Rate of Return (EIRR) of 34 percent and a Net Present Value (NPV) of US\$21.8 million, applying a discount rate of six percent.

The ICR (para. 53) conducted a cost benefit analysis for six types of investments including electricity upgrades, health facilities, village roads, piped drinking water, schools and livelihoods facilities. Investments resulted in the following EIRRs and NPVs:

Electricity upgrades: EIRR of 25.5 percent and NPV of US\$6,788.

Health facilities: EIRR of 17.7 percent and NPV of US\$6,569.

Roads and sidewalks: EIRR of 20% and NPV of US\$11,00.

Drinking water: EIRR of 13.3 percent and NPV of US\$961,650

These results indicate that the project was a worthwhile investment.

#### **Operational efficiency:**

The project experienced several implementation delays. According to the ICR (para. 71), it took 20 months for the project to be signed due to the World Bank issuing notice of a threat to suspend disbursements for all ARIS-managed World Bank financed projects due to senior management issues in ARIS and non-compliance in a separate project ARIS managed. Also, the ratification process was lengthy due to coordination issues. Furthermore, the project experienced issues with village selection and in the coordination with the National Electric Grid for the Kyrgyz Republic since the planned line for the transmission line had changed so the number of target villages increased substantially from the planned 37 villages to 77 villages. In addition, according to the ICR (para. 76), escalating border hostilities with Tajikistan in April 2021 and September 2022 impacted logistics and increased barriers to community mobilization activities. Sanctions imposed upon Russia resulted in higher costs and uncertainties of supplies, all resulting in delays. However, when the project closed, the IDA financing was fully disbursed.

According to the World Bank team (November 14, 2025), the implementation of the project was closely aligned with the timeline of the CASA-1000 transmission line project. The project was designed as an associated facility, and its rollout intentionally coincided with key phases of the CASA-1000 construction schedule particularly in communities directly affected by transmission line works. As the transmission line progressed through different sections, the project's interventions were sequenced to provide timely community support, manage localized impacts, and respond to emerging needs on the ground.

Despite several operational delays, the project's overall efficiency is rated 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 <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
ICR Estimate		0	0 <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable

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

## 6. Outcome

Relevance of the objective was High. Efficacy was rated Substantial with minor shortcomings and Efficiency were Substantial. The project’s overall outcome rating is thus Satisfactory.

a. **Outcome Rating**  
Satisfactory

## 7. Risk to Development Outcome

The risks to the project’s development outcomes can be classified into the following categories:

**Government commitment:** According to the World Bank team (October 14, 2025), the government continues to demonstrate strong commitment to the project’s objectives. This commitment is reflected in the design of the new project, the National Community Initiatives Project (NCIP), a nationwide program that builds on the approaches, tools, and community-driven mechanisms introduced under the Community Support Project (CSP). The NCIP indicates the government’s intention to sustain and scale up the project’s model at the national level.

**Financial:** According to the World Bank team (October 14, 2025), the project was designed with sustainability mechanisms to ensure continued financing after closing. All infrastructure assets were transferred to municipal ownership with established Operation and Maintenance (O&M) plans and budget allocations. For economic sub-projects, repayment schemes and profit reinvestment mechanisms were built into agreements with business partners, allowing revenues to be used for ongoing operations and expansion. Therefore, there is no financial risk to the sustainability of project outcomes.

**Technical:** According to the World Bank team (October 14, 2025), while the project provided a strong foundation through providing training and building capacity, the long-term sustainability of these capacities will depend on how actively participants continue to apply and build on the skills acquired. The project’s emphasis on citizen engagement and local ownership was intended to reinforce resilience and promote



ongoing community-led development, but the extent of sustained outcomes will need to be assessed over time.

## 8. Assessment of Bank Performance

### a. Quality-at-Entry

According to the PAD (para. 63) the project design was built on lessons learned from other community driven development (CDD) projects. These lessons included: i) involving local communities and stakeholders in needs identification, implementation and conflict-sensitive participatory M&E to improve services and infrastructure; ii) focusing on outreach, capacity building and economic opportunity for vulnerable groups such as youth, minorities, and women; and iii) programming to address the underlying drivers of conflict and instability (e.g. inter-ethnic relations, youth idleness/potential recruitment to violence, relations between communities and local authorities).

The PAD (para. 82) identified the following risks as Substantial: i) political and governance due to corruption in the public sector; ii) sector and policy risks because of the project being positioned with the energy sector and the ongoing discussions on energy reforms; iii) community risks associated with the poor quality of electricity in target areas; iv) institutional capacity risk following the identification of non-compliances in subproject selection in a previous World Bank project; and v) fiduciary given that a large part of the project funds were to be utilized for sub-grants to communities as well as overall systemic fiduciary weaknesses. The World Bank team mitigated these risks by working closely with ARIS to improve transparency, establish tighter internal controls, and strengthen the internal audit function, launching village electricity supply improvements in the first year of implementation, close monitoring by the World Bank of the sub-grant implementation, in particular, the eligibility and selection process of beneficiaries, and providing technical assistance related to fiduciary issues. The World Bank did not adequately identify the risk of substantial delays due to a two-year period for the project to become effective, challenges in defining the corridor of impact, coordination and capacity problems with the regional electricity companies, as well as increase in cost of goods and construction materials. There were minor shortcomings in the project's Results Framework including attribution concerns for some achievements.

### Quality-at-Entry Rating

Satisfactory

### b. Quality of supervision

The World Bank team conducted 14 supervision missions over the course of eight years of project implementation. According to the ICR (para. 92), the World Bank team was candid about implementation issues including delay in project effectiveness and in finalizing the list of villages impacted by the CASA1000 transmission line, challenging coordination with regional electricity companies, and the COVID-19 pandemic. The World Bank addressed these issues by providing technical support and preparing AF as well as revising the project's Results Framework to reflect the change in scope. Also, according to the



World Bank team (November 14, 2025), the co-TTL of the CASA-1000 project was also a team member of this project participated in all supervision missions. Meetings between the two projects were held to provide implementation updates and ensure smooth alignment across the portfolios.

Furthermore, according to the ICR (para. 92) the World Bank facilitated exchanges to share good practices within and outside the country. Finally, the World Bank team hired an Internal Communication and Technology (ICT) expert for the development of the project's digital platform.

### **Quality of Supervision Rating**

Satisfactory

### **Overall Bank Performance Rating**

Satisfactory

## **9. M&E Design, Implementation, & Utilization**

### **a. M&E Design**

The objective of the project was outcome oriented. Overall while the indicators were adequate, there were some shortcomings. For example, the Results Framework did not include adequate PDO indicators to “enhanced livelihoods” e.g. in terms of jobs created. Many indicators were in terms of percentage and including the data in absolute values would have given a better sense of the scope of achievement. According to the PAD (para. 77), ARIS was to be responsible for the project's M&E activities. A baseline evaluation was to be carried out before project effectiveness, and the project was to include mid-term and final evaluations as well as community scorecards to report on interim results via qualitative community feedback, project progress reports and minutes of community meetings. Overall, the proposed data collection methods and analysis were appropriate.

### **b. M&E Implementation**

According to the ICR (para. 79) M&E data were collected by ARIS regularly and tracked and reported in Implementation Status Reports (ISRs). A beneficiary feedback mechanism provided feedback from beneficiaries. The ICR also stated that ARIS had high M&E capacity, and its Management Information System (MIS) was robust. Also, ARIS worked closely with the World Bank on M&E including to ensure that the community scorecards were in line with the PDO indicators to provide appropriate data as well as to finalize the methodologies for calculating indicators and data collection tools. When the project's scope was increased in 2020, the targets of the indicators were adjusted accordingly.

According to the World Bank team (October 14, 2025), several core M&E functions are likely to be sustained. ARIS has an established M&E unit with dedicated staff, digital data collection tools, and reporting systems that were strengthened under the project. These systems continue to be used in the new National Community Initiatives Project (NCIP), which adopts similar Results Frameworks and community-level monitoring tools.



### **c. M&E Utilization**

According to the World Bank team (October 14, 2025), M&E data were regularly used to guide implementation and inform management decisions. Progress reports and results indicators were reviewed quarterly by ARIS and the World Bank team to track performance and identify emerging bottlenecks. Evidence from monitoring helped adjust targeting of livelihood grants, prioritize villages with lower infrastructure coverage, and allocate resources to higher-demand services. Qualitative feedback from communities was also used to refine project processes and enhance citizen engagement. During COVID-19, M&E data were essential in identifying disruptions and adapting timelines and delivery modalities accordingly. Overall, M&E served as a management tool rather than a compliance exercise.

### **M&E Quality Rating**

Substantial

## **10. Other Issues**

### **a. Safeguards**

The project was classified as category B and triggered the World Bank's safeguard policies OP/BP 4.01 (Environmental Assessment) and OP/BP 4.12 (Involuntary Resettlement). The project prepared an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and developed a total of 340 Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) for sub-projects in consultations with stakeholders. According to the ICR (para. 84) the ESMPs included gender-based violence (GBV) risk mitigation measures.

The project developed a Resettlement Policy Framework as well as conducted social screening and monitoring activities. According to the World Bank team (November 14, 2025), this project and the CASA-1000 project operated under separate arrangements for land acquisition and involuntary resettlement, each guided by its own standalone Resettlement Policy Framework. In line with the agreement established between the two PIUs at the outset, any grievances related to CASA-1000 that were received by this project's field staff were systematically referred to the National Electric Grid of Kyrgyzstan, the implementing agency for CASA-1000, for follow-up. These cases were then managed in accordance with the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) established under CASA-1000.

When the project received AF, the safeguard instruments of the parent's project were updated to include labor and the management of risks related to gender based violence. Also, given the emergency nature of the AF, a waiver was given to complete the revision of the ESMF after appraisal.

At closure, the project's safeguard compliance was rated Satisfactory.

### **b. Fiduciary Compliance**



**Financial Management:** The ICR (para. 87) stated that the project’s Financial Management (FM) performance was rated satisfactory throughout implementation. Also, the project complied with the World Bank’s financial covenants. According to the World Bank team (October 14, 2025) all of the external auditor’s opinions were unqualified. However, in November 2022, the project experienced high FM staff turnover. The ICR did not state whether this had a negative impact on implementation and how this issue was addressed.

When the project closed, FM was rated Satisfactory.

**Procurement:**

According to the World Bank team (October 14, 2025), the project followed the World Bank’s procurement guidelines. However, the project experienced several procurement related delays due to slow coordination between ARIS and the regional electricity companies (under subcomponent 1A), limited market response due to the specialized nature of the works resulting in the need to rebid, technical complexity of medical equipment and the need to prepare appropriate procurement packages, changes in the exchange rate and supply due to geopolitical upheaval. The World Bank team and ARIS addressed these issues by: i) enhancing coordination and communication between ARIS, regional electricity companies, and local stakeholders to streamline decision-making and approvals, ii) adjusting procurement packaging and bidding documents to better reflect market conditions and attract qualified bidders and iii) extending procurement timelines when necessary to allow for proper preparation and review.

When the project closed, the procurement rating was Moderately Satisfactory.

**c. Unintended impacts (Positive or Negative)**

NA

**d. Other**

---

**11. Ratings**

Ratings	ICR	IEG	Reason for Disagreements/Comment
Outcome	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Bank Performance	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Quality of M&E	Substantial	Substantial	
Quality of ICR	---	Substantial	

**12. Lessons**



The ICR (p. 27-29) included several lessons learned which were adapted by IEG:

- **Community benefit sharing can help to build public support, reduce risks, and deliver lasting local development.** The CASA1000 CSP in the Kyrgyz Republic showed that early integration of benefit-sharing mechanisms through participatory planning, tangible community benefits, and flexible management can strengthen trust and mitigate opposition. CSP's adaptability also enabled rapid scaling during the COVID-19 crisis, underscoring the value of flexible, community-driven approaches.
- **Livelihood support programs can work well when they integrate skills, finance, networks, and technical assistance while ensuring access to markets and value chains.** In the CASA1000 CSP, this comprehensive approach, combined with piloting locally tailored models, sustaining mentorship for 12–24 months, and focusing on group-based support, helped enhance women's participation, reduce costs, and build more sustainable livelihood opportunities.
- **Digital platforms can expand participation in community planning, when their reach is balanced with inclusivity and the quality of engagement.** In the CASA1000 CSP, an online platform dramatically increased participation, reaching one in three adults and enabling engagement during COVID-19 but success required targeted support, such as youth helping older residents overcome digital barriers.
- **Linking an add-on project to the main project and ensuring appropriate implementation timing can contribute to a smooth implementation.** The co-TTL of the main project was also a team member of this add-on project ensuring coordination and alignment of the implementation timelines

### 13. Assessment Recommended?

No

### 14. Comments on Quality of ICR

The ICR provided an adequate overview of project preparation and implementation and an appropriate Economic analysis. The ICR was sufficiently outcome driven. The ICR included useful lessons learned which were grounded in the project experience. A shortcoming was the length of the ICR which was nearly double the suggested guideline of 15 pages. Overall, the quality of the ICR is rated Substantial.

#### a. Quality of ICR Rating

Substantial

