

BIC's Recommendations for the Corporate Scorecard Mid-Term Review

In October 2024, the World Bank Group (WBG) released its new [Corporate Scorecard](#), consolidating the previous Scorecard into 22 results indicators. The updated Scorecard is expected to reflect the Bank's shift toward development outcomes. According to the [Bank](#), the Scorecard has three functions: improving transparency and accountability; tracking the effectiveness of operations and informing future work; and communicating WBG investment data and results to strengthen engagement, partnerships, and collaboration with clients and stakeholders.

BIC reviewed the Scorecard following its release in [2024](#) and again in [2025](#), assessing whether it improved transparency and identifying shortcomings in its indicators and methodologies. BIC also examined the Scorecard from a [disability-inclusion perspective](#).

While this is a much more pared-down Scorecard, BIC has chosen to focus on four indicators and issue areas: the [net greenhouse gas \(GHG\) emissions indicator](#), the [transport indicator](#), the [civic and citizen engagement indicator](#), and data disaggregated by disability. This is a non-exhaustive list and does not represent all of BIC's priorities or all of the indicators included in the Scorecard itself; however, the indicators above reflect some of the Bank's updated priorities and align with comments BIC provided on the [Evolution Roadmap](#).

Our interest in the net-GHG and transport indicators is rooted in the Bank's comments that Scorecard outcomes should align with its new mission "to end extreme poverty and boost shared prosperity on a livable planet." This shift signals that climate change has become an institutional priority, prompting BIC to examine how the Bank reports emissions, where transparency efforts could be strengthened, and whether indicators, such as transport, are being used to increase climate ambition and support decarbonization.

As part of the Evolution Roadmap, BIC raised concerns around discrepancies and inadequacies in how data is disaggregated, particularly for marginalized groups such as persons with disabilities. When data is not disaggregated, it becomes difficult to know who is actually benefitting from Bank projects and who is being left out. At the same time, disaggregation needs to be done accurately: metrics meant to capture persons with disabilities should not be calculated against the entire beneficiary population, as this risks overestimating data and obscuring how many persons with disabilities are actually benefitting. Disability inclusion often receives comparatively little attention in Bank-related work, and its intersection with climate risk makes it a useful entry point for examining if the Scorecard captures compounding vulnerability at all.

BIC has been analyzing the intersection between [climate change and disability](#) in Bank-funded [transport](#) and [post-disaster reconstruction](#) projects. Our work has shown that the needs of persons with disabilities are rarely considered in the design and implementation of these

projects, particularly in the design of climate mitigation and adaptation measures. This can lead to further exclusion and new barriers, such as inaccessible transport systems or inaccessible reconstruction. In the new Scorecard, BIC examined whether the [transport](#) and [climate resilience](#) indicators collect data on persons with disabilities and whether the new iteration offers meaningful improvements in this area. While multiple compounding factors can contribute to inaccessible projects, some of these gaps trace back to a lack of meaningful engagement and consultation with persons with disabilities and their organizations throughout the entire project cycle.

BIC has been engaging with the Bank around civic and citizen engagement for close to a decade. The Scorecard's methodology shifts the approach toward measuring the *quality* of engagement, not merely whether it occurs, and includes examining country-level capacity and the broader enabling environment for civic participation. Given the consultation and engagement gaps BIC has identified in our project monitoring with disability organizations, we are interested in how this indicator captures data on persons with disabilities. We are also interested in the implications for Development Policy Financing (DPF), given indications that the methodology will evaluate the quality of engagement in DPF operations, an area where civil society engagement has historically been harder to assess given the nature of policy-based lending.

As part of the Scorecard's [mid-term review](#) (MTR), the Bank has an opportunity to evaluate its effectiveness and address shortcomings. This brief outlines recommendations to support that process: the first section presents cross-cutting recommendations related to indicators, methodologies, and data collection practices, while the second focuses on improvements to specific indicators and approaches to data disaggregation.

Cross-Cutting Recommendations

BIC's review of the Scorecard surfaced four cross-cutting issues that the MTR should address:

1. Back data with on-the-ground verification.

Across several Scorecard methodologies, the Bank's approach relies on reviewing project documents to collect and report data rather than verifying implementation outcomes. As the Scorecard is intended to improve transparency and provide insight into the effectiveness of the Bank's work, this reliance on document review is concerning and insufficient. Document review data should therefore be complemented by on-the-ground verification of implementation, including verification of disability-inclusive measures, rather than relying solely on project design documentation.

- **CCE indicator:** The proposed methodology for the new [Civic and Citizen Engagement](#) (CCE) indicator would collect and report data through reviews of Stakeholder Engagement Plans (SEPs) and Country Partnership Frameworks (CPFs), which would not capture how CCE plans are actually implemented.
- **Net-GHG emissions and transport indicators:** The [Net-GHG emissions](#) and [Transport](#) indicators show the same pattern, even though BIC's project

monitoring work has identified significant gaps between project design and implementation.

- **Disability disaggregation:** Reported figures [reflect project design](#) documentation rather than verified, on-the-ground implementation of disability-inclusive measures.

2. Apply indicators across the World Bank Group's full portfolio.

With fewer indicators included in the revised Scorecard, the Bank has an opportunity to capture and report on its impacts more accurately. Indicators should be applied across the WBG's full portfolio, including all lending instruments in both the public and private sectors.

- **DPF and PforR:** In the public sector, excluding [Development Policy Financing](#) (DPF) and [Program-for-Results](#) (PforR) operations from indicators, such as the Net-GHG emissions indicator, omits a significant portion of the lending portfolio and results in an inaccurate depiction of the Bank's impact. This compounds the existing lack of [transparency](#) and [opacity](#) around DPFs.
- **CCE indicator scope:** The Bank has confirmed that its new CCE indicator will cover all lending instruments and both public and private sectors, but only the proposed methodology for public-sector [Investment Project Financing](#) operations has been released so far, and no data has yet been reported.
- **Disability inclusion scope:** The scope of disability inclusion within the Scorecard is similarly constrained by its attachment to [Environmental and Social Standard 4](#) (ESS4), which excludes DPF and PforR operations. This is particularly concerning given existing evidence that these operations already present [inclusion challenges](#).
- **Private sector:** Given documented [evidence](#) of the private sector using loopholes, such as trade finance, to support fossil fuel investments, alongside persistent shortcomings in transparency and stakeholder engagement, all private-sector operations should be covered by Scorecard indicators.

3. Improve data disclosure.

Beyond the specific indicators discussed below, the Scorecard's overall usefulness as a transparency and accountability tool depends on how clearly its underlying data is disclosed.

- **Disclose baselines:** The net-GHG emissions indicator dataset lacks baseline information. Without initial baseline measurements, it is not possible to assess projects' net impact on emissions reductions.
- **Improve disclosure of underlying data:** For the CCE indicator to be meaningful, the Bank should disclose underlying data for individual projects and country portfolios, rather than reporting only the final aggregate score, and should release a clear timeline for finalizing the CCE indicator methodologies across sectors and all lending instruments, as well as a timeline for when reporting will begin.

- **Improve transparency around verified data, proxy data, and estimates:** Many of the Scorecard's disaggregated data indicators, including those for women and youth, rely on proxy data or estimates rather than direct, verified beneficiary data. However, proxy and estimate data are not clearly identified as such, creating the impression that all reported figures reflect true, verified beneficiary data. The Bank should clearly distinguish verified, beneficiary data from proxy and/or estimate-based data across all Scorecard reporting.

Indicator-Specific Recommendations

Building on these overarching themes, this section examines three specific indicators in greater detail: transport, net-GHG emissions, and disability disaggregation.

Transport:

- **Include references to e-mobility:** The Bank should revise the transport indicator methodology to explicitly include references to e-mobility, including through the definitions of sustainable transport and urban transport criteria.
- **Increase transparency around the types of transport projects:** To strengthen transparency and accountability, the Bank should include a standardized tag within the outcome dataset identifying the type of transport investment (e.g., roads: rural, inter-urban, and highways; railways; ports and waterways; aviation; and urban transport).

Net-GHG Emissions:

- **Disaggregate emissions by sector:** The Bank is already undertaking GHG accounting across sectors and should disclose emissions data by sector within the net-GHG emissions indicator dataset. The dataset should also be updated to include definitions for all acronyms to improve external understanding and validation.
- **Report on achieved results rather than projected results:** The Bank should report GHG emissions reductions based on results achieved rather than results expected. The data included in the Scorecard should be a fact-based quantification of actual results.

Disability Disaggregation:

- **Revise methodology:** The Bank should refine the methodology for the disability-inclusive indicators so that the Scorecard measures how many persons with disabilities are actually benefiting from Bank-funded projects, rather than measuring the total beneficiaries of projects that use universal access. Without changes to the methodology, the data cannot meaningfully demonstrate how many persons with disabilities are benefiting from projects or identify what changes are needed to promote greater inclusion.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ON THE ISSUES RAISED IN THIS REPORT, PLEASE CONTACT BANK INFORMATION CENTER AT:

1030 15th St. NW, Suite 590E
Washington, DC 20005

Email: info@bankinformationcenter.org