1. Basic Project Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country:</th>
<th>Mauritius</th>
<th>Project SAP Reference:</th>
<th>P-MU-K00-002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Title:</td>
<td>Economic Recovery Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector:</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Costs (MUSD)</td>
<td>501.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount cancelled (MUA)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan</td>
<td>501.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/31/2009</td>
<td>08/31/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing (MUSD)</td>
<td>471.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR Date</td>
<td>03/06/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR Evaluation Note Date</td>
<td>03/06/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>World Bank ($160 million), EU (UA 178.7 million)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature Date</td>
<td>27/06/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date</td>
<td>27/06/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Completion Date</td>
<td>01/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slippage: 1.8 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Officers (Names)</td>
<td>F. Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation (HQ or FO)</td>
<td>Regional Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From (mm/yy)</td>
<td>To (mm/yy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Negatu</td>
<td>24/06/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Larbi</td>
<td>18 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Rojid</td>
<td>PCR Team Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator/consultant: O. O. Ojo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Reviewer/Task Manager: F. Turay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Project Description (summary from Appraisal Report including addendum/corrigendum or loan agreement)

a. Rationale and Expected Impacts:
In 2005, Mauritius experienced three major shocks: erosion of trade preferences on the EU sugar market, the phasing out of the Multi-fibre Agreement and soaring oil prices. The outcome of the three shocks was a decline in growth performance with the result that unemployment increased, foreign exchange reserves declined and the external current account deficit widened. Government revenue also fell thereby causing a deterioration in the fiscal outlook with a primary balance deficit of 1.7% in 2005/06 and overall budget deficit of 5.5% as against a ratio of 3% in the 1990s. In response to these challenges, Mauritius decided to implement an ambitious reform programme which was aimed at putting the economy back on the path of sustainable growth.

b. Objectives / Expected Outcomes:
The objective of the programme was articulated around the following four pillars: consolidating fiscal performance and improving public sector efficiency; enhancing trade competitiveness; improving investment climate; and democratizing the economy through participation, social inclusion and sustainability.
c. **Outputs and Intended Beneficiaries:**

Outputs were defined with respect to the four policy areas mentioned above. For the *first policy area*, the outputs were: Reduction in top marginal corporate tax rate to 15% by 2009/10; Reduction in expenditure by 0.5% of GDP in 2006/07; removal of ministerial discretion on tax and duty exemption in 2006/07; reduction of primary spending as percentage of GDP relative to 2005/06 by 0.5% in 2006/07; PEFA completed by 2006/07. For the *second policy area*: cut top ad valorem tax rate from 65% to 40% and reduce average tariff by 2%; unify neutral and competitive corporate tax of 15% until 2009/10; in ICT reduce broad band access charges by 25% and provide support training in basic computer literacy skills. For the *third policy area*: improve ranking in Doing Business over 2005 baseline, and each subsequent year; reduce time to start business by simplifying procedures and improve access to foreigners. For the *fourth policy area*: set up and implement Empowerment Programme to spend Rs 5 billion in 5 years; reform primary education sector to increase proportion of teachers with diplomas from 7% to 40% by 2010, and increase proportion of secondary education sector teachers trained from 30% to 50% by 2010; and implement a new income support scheme by re-orientating subsidies on rice and flour to effectively target the needy. The beneficiaries are the people of Mauritius.

d. **Principal Activities/Components:**

The programme had four major components: consolidating fiscal performance and improving public sector efficiency; enhancing trade competitiveness; improving investment climate; and democratizing the economy through participation, social inclusion and sustainability.

---

3. **Evaluation of Design and Implementation** (Evaluator assessment of actual vs. envisioned)

a. **Relevance of Project Design** (and Readiness for Implementation) (The evaluator assesses, independent of the PCR assessment, the Relevance of the project Design):

The economic crisis which resulted from the 2005 shocks called for a programme of adjustment which directly targeted the problems with a consistent set of instruments. The economic reform programme was such a set of consistent policy instruments. Prior to the programme there were studies on the macroeconomic environment, debt sustainability, business climate and poverty profiles in addition to the Bank’s country strategy paper for 2004-08. The programme was thus erected on a solid economic and sector work. Built around four pillars as described above, the programme was aimed at ameliorating the adverse consequences of the shocks and returning the economy to the path of sustainable growth. Thus the programme design was relevant. Its matrix clearly identified the policy actions/instruments needed to achieve the objectives of the programme. The objectives were couched in measurable terms for purposes of monitoring and evaluation while the potential risks that could face programme implementation were clearly stated.

b. **Project Cost** (including Borrower Contribution), Disbursements, and Adherence to Schedules (as relevant to project performance):

The total cost of the programme to the Bank was UA 30 million but other donors contributed an amount equalled to US $ 471.6 million. Bank contribution was disbursed in three tranches of UA 10 million each. The first tranche was delayed by 3 months while the second was disbursed a month ahead of schedule. The third tranche was disbursed one month after the expected date because a waiver was sought because primary spending cut target could not be met due to the adverse impact of the global crisis.

c. **Implementation Arrangements, Conditions and Covenants, and related Technical Assistance:**

The Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MOFED) was the implementing agency. Development partners fully supported the programme. Their interventions were coordinated through joint missions, joint matrix, joint appraisals and joint analysis. The activities of the UNDP were concentrated in providing technical assistance and capacity building.

d. **Monitoring & Evaluation Design, Implementation, & Utilization** (Evaluator assessment):

The appraisal report provided a matrix of actions to be taken as well as the mechanism for measuring results. The appraisal report also required the Borrower to prepare a PCR and for the government to make available all documents relating to the programme to Bank’s supervision missions and external auditors. These measures are all considered adequate.
e. **Other Issues** (such as Safeguards, Fiduciary):
The Bank ensured that its fiduciary requirements, covenants and triggers issues were respected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Evaluation of Performance</th>
<th>(Evaluator assessment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. <strong>Relevance of project objectives</strong></td>
<td>(Assessment of the ex-ante and ex-post relevance (including during implementation):)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2005 Mauritius experienced three major shocks. These shocks caused substantial reductions in growth performance and worsening external account position. The fiscal outlook and the employment situation were also badly affected. Thus the programme which set out to correct the situation and put the economy back on the path of sustainable growth was therefore relevant both ex-ante and ex-post and during the implementation phase.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <strong>Effectiveness in Delivering Outputs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In terms of delivery of outputs, the programme was effective as it delivered on most of its expected outputs as listed in section 2c above. The only area where there was some reservation was in reduction in primary spending as a percentage of GDP. While this was achieved in other years, it was not achieved in 2008/09.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. <strong>Effectiveness in Achieving Outcomes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The programme performed well in delivering on its outcomes except in 3 areas. These are sustainability of public debts, increase share of output and employment in new emerging sectors and increase in exports. Even in these 3 areas, the performance was satisfactory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. <strong>Efficiency in Achieving Outputs and Outcome:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The programme was efficient in achieving its outputs and outcomes. There was no cost over-run but there was a time over-run of 1.8 months. The loan was fully disbursed at completion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. <strong>Project/Development Outcome (PO):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The programme succeeded in reversing the declines that were noticeable at the outset of the programme. GDP growth rate has accelerated, the macroeconomic environment has become more stable, the country’s competitiveness has improved, there has been an increase in private domestic and foreign investment, human capital has been enhanced and there has been some improvement in the poverty outlook.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. <strong>Risk to sustained achievement of Project Outcomes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The major risks to sustained achievement of programme outcome are the uncertainty surrounding the global economy and domestic capacity constraints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. <strong>Additional Outcomes/Impacts (positive and negative, not captured in the logframe):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance indicators prepared by the World Bank showed that in most dimensions of governance is now in the top half of the 50th-75th percentile among 212 countries. The country also led in the Ibrahim index of African governance in 2008. As a result of the improvement in economic performance, there was a reduction in overall poverty situation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. <strong>Performance of Borrower:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Borrower very performed well throughout all the stages of the programme: it complied with fiduciary requirements, conditions and triggers. It was also responsive to Bank supervision mission findings and recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. <strong>Bank Performance (preparation/appraisal – partly ensuring QAE: supervision quality):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bank performed very well right from the outset of the programme to the end. The programme was underlined by quality analytical economic and sector work. The Bank coordinated well with other development partners. Indeed, it carried out studies, missions etc, jointly with them. It carried out series of supervision missions, the back to office reports of which were very informative. The implementation of the programme was adequate—there was a delay of only 1.8 months in implementation. The PCR was submitted on time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| i. **Overall Assessment:** | |
| Overall the performance of the programme was highly satisfactory. It was able to reverse the on-going |
declines in economic performance. The Bank and the Borrower performed highly satisfactorily.

5. Key Lessons, and Recommendations (Evaluator assessment)

a. Lessons Learned:

The PCR identified a few lessons from the implementation of the project.

- Strong government leadership and ownership of a reform programme are essential to its success.
- Prior analytical work is also critical to the success of a programme
- Strong donor collaboration is important to a multi-donor programme
- The absence of the Bank in the field could undermine the outcome of a programme

b. Recommendations:

The PCR template did not contain any recommendations. But the followings can be made on the basis of the reading of the PCR.

For the Bank:

- The Bank should ensure that its presence is felt in all borrowing countries.
- Given the benefits that accrued to the programme from prior analytical work, the Bank should continue to ensure that reform programmes are solidly rooted in strong analytical and economic and sector work.

The followings are stressed for the government:

- The government should make more concerted efforts at reducing the vulnerability of the economy to external shocks.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Ratings:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness in delivering outputs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness in achieving outcomes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency in achieving outputs &amp; outcomes - Timeliness:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency in achieving outputs &amp; outcomes –other criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall efficiency in achieving outputs &amp; outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk to Development outcome:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrower Performance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Performance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of PCR:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a summary of PCR and OPEV ratings together with reasons for disagreement/comments. For the last column, the appropriate section of the PCR review should be cross-referenced to avoid detailed
discussions. Where the evaluator is unable to validate the PCR rating for any criterion, adequate justification should be provided. As a result, of this, the overall project rating could be ‘partly satisfactory’.

### 7. Comments on PCR Quality and Timeliness

PCR quality assessment will be based on some or all of the following criteria and others (as appropriate):

- Quality and completeness of the PCR evidence and analysis to base ratings:  
  *The PCR was complete and its quality was also good. Its completeness formed the basis of its ratings. It is perhaps the best PCR in the series.*

- Objectivity/fairness of PCR assessment:  
  *The PCR was fair and objective in its assessment*

- Internal consistency of PCR assessment: inaccuracies; inconsistencies (in various sections; between texts and ratings; consistency of overall rating with individual component ratings):  
  *The ratings were internally consistent and based on concrete evidence*

- Identification and assessment of key factors (internal and exogenous) and unintended effects (positive and negatives) affecting design and implementation:  
  *The PCR identified all the factors which affected project design and implementation.*

- Adequacy of treatment of safeguards, fiduciary issues, and alignment and harmonization:  
  *The treatment of safeguards and fiduciary issues was adequate. The Bank harmonized its activities with those of other donors. The PCR benefited from the documents of the GBS review meetings.*

- Soundness of data generating and analysis processes (including rates of returns) in support of PCR assessment:  
  *The data generated was adequate for project assessment. The PCR provided useful information particularly in its narrative.*

- Overall adequacy of the accessible evidence (from PCR including annexure and other data provided):  
  *The evidence from the PCR was more than adequate. Although it did not use the computer-generated Excel format, it followed the format closely in a Word format. This enabled it to put in more information than the excel format would have allowed. It was also more readable because its font was bigger.*

- Extent to which lessons learned (and recommendations) are clear and based on the PCR assessment (evidence & analysis):  
  *The lessons learnt flew directly from the narrative in the PCR but there were no recommendations.*

- Overall clarity and completeness of the PCR:  
  *The PCR was clear, readable and complete*

- Other (to be specified) *The PCR is perhaps the best in the series evaluated by the reviewer. It is complete and showed a good understanding of what a PCR is all about.*

The PCR quality will be assessed as highly satisfactory/exemplary (4), satisfactory (3), unsatisfactory (2) or highly unsatisfactory (1).

Comments on the extent of compliance of the PCR with PCR guidelines and pertinent OPEV guidelines:

- PCR Timeliness; rated as timely (exemplary = 4) or late/unsatisfactory (1):  
  *The PCR was timely—it was produced within 6 months of project completion. The rating is 4.*

- Extent of participation of Borrower, co-financiers and Bank field office, rated as high/exemplary (4), or substantial/significant (3), or moderate (2), or negligible (1):  
  *The Borrower did not participate in the PCR mission but the mission but it benefited from its views and documents as well as those of development partners. The Bank did not have a field mission in Mauritius. Rating on this criterion is 3.*

- Other aspects (to be specified)

- Project is part of series and suitable for cluster evaluation [X]  
- Project is a Success Story [X]  
- High priority for impact evaluation  
- Performance evaluation is required to sector/country reviews [X]  
- High Priority for thematic or special evaluation studies (Specify)  
- PPER is required because of incomplete validation rating  

Major areas of focus in future evaluation work:

a) The project could be a good candidate for cluster evaluation
b) It could also be part of a sector and country review
c)

Follow Up Action by OPEV:

Cluster evaluation
Division Manager Clearance Director Signing Off

Data sources for validation:

- Task managers/Bank staff interviewed/contacted (in persons, by phone & email)
- Documents/reports and database

Documents
1. ADB, Mauritius: Proposal for an ADF Loan to finance the Economic Recovery Programme (ADB/BD/WP/2007/12)
7. Loan agreement between the Republic of Mauritius and the African Development (Development Budget Support Loan for the Economic Reform Programme.
Attachment: PCR Evaluation Note Validation Sheet of Performance Ratings
PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT EVALUATION NOTE
Validation of PCR Performance Ratings

PCR Rating Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>Very Good</strong> – Full achieved with no shortcomings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>Good</strong> – Mostly achieved despite a few shortcomings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>Fair</strong> – Partially achieved. Shortcomings and achievements are roughly balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Poor</strong> – Very limited achievement with extensive shortcomings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTS</td>
<td>Unable to score/rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Non Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Sub-Criteria</th>
<th>PCR Work Score</th>
<th>OPEV Review</th>
<th>Reason for deviation/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of project Objectives &amp; Design</td>
<td>Relevance of project Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Project objectives were relevant to country development priorities.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Project Objectives could in principle be achieved with the project inputs and in the expected time frame.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Project Objectives were consistent with the Bank’s country or regional strategy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Ex-post Relevance of objectives</td>
<td>Not rated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ex-post, the programme remained relevant to the country’s development objectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Relevance of project Design -Project Design & Readiness for Implementation | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. The log frame presents a logical causal chain for achieving the project development objectives. | 4 | 4 | |
| 2. The log frame expresses objectives and outcomes in a way that is measurable and quantifiable. | 4 | 4 | |
| 3. The log frame states the risks and key assumptions.                      | 2 | 2 | |
| 4. Project conditionality was matched with country capacity and political    | 3 | 3 | |
5. Project design includes adequate risk analysis. | 4 | 4
6. Financial management, procurement, monitoring and/or other systems were based on those already in use by government and/or other partners. | 4 | 4
7. Responsibilities for project implementation were clearly defined. | 4 | 4
8. Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan were agreed upon during design. | 4 | 4
9. Baseline data were available or were collected during design. | 3 | 3

**Achievement of Project Outputs**

| Output 1 | 4 | 4 |
| Output 2 | 4 | 4 |
| Output 3 | 4 | 4 |
| Output 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Output 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Output 6 | 4 | 4 |
| Output 7 | 4 | 4 |
| Output 8 | 4 | 4 |
| Output 9 | 4 | 4 |
| Output 10 | 4 | 4 |
| Output 11 | 4 | 4 |
| Output 12 | 4 | 4 |
| Output 13 | 4 | 4 |
| Overall Output weighted Score | 4 | 4 |

**Achievement of Project Outcomes**

| Outcome 1 | 4 | 4 |
| Outcome 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Outcome 3 | 4 | 4 |
| Outcome 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Outcome 5 | 3 | 3 |
### Outcome Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL PROJECT OUTCOME SCORE**: 4

### Additional Outcomes (not captured in the logframe)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment &amp; Climate Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Reduction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Development</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Efficiency in achieving outputs & outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness (in adhering to the original closing date)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates of returns (Specify if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Criteria (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL PROJECT EFFICIENCY**: 4

### Risk to Sustained achievement of Project Outcome**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Risks (Specify common risk factors to be a basis for rating) the major risks are implementation capacity constraints, uncertainties in the global economy and the vulnerability of the economy to external shocks.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The output ratings have to be weighted by the relative output costs (see PCR format).
** Overall risk to sustained achievement of project outcome is rated as follows:
  - High (H): 4
  - Substantial/significant (S): 3
  - Moderate (M): 2
  - Negligible (N): 1

The Overall rating is given Very Good, Good, Fair and Poor. Overall rating is the sub-criteria average.
### Design and Readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Sub-Criteria</th>
<th>PCR Work Score</th>
<th>OPEV Review</th>
<th>Reason for disagreement/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bank Performance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Design and Readiness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Project Objectives were relevant to country development priorities.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Project Objectives could in principle be achieved with the project inputs and in the expected time frame.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Project Objectives were consistent with the Bank’s country or regional strategy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The log frame presents a logical causal chain for achieving the project development objectives.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The log frame expresses objectives and outcomes in a way that is measurable and quantifiable.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The log frame states the risks and key assumptions.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Conditionality is matched by country capacity and political commitment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Project design includes adequate risk analysis.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Financial management, monitoring and/or other systems are based on those already in use by government and/or other partners</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Responsibilities for project implementation were clearly defined.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan were agreed upon during design.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Baseline data were available or were collected during design.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Design and Readiness Sub-Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Sub-Criteria</td>
<td>PCR Score</td>
<td>OPEV Review</td>
<td>Justification/ Reason for deviation/Disconnect/ Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Performance</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Bank complied with:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental Safeguards</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fiduciary Requirements</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project Covenants/Triggers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bank provided quality supervision in the form of skills mix provided and practicality of solutions.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bank provided quality management oversight.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PCR was delivered on a timely basis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Sub-Score</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL BANK PERFORMANCE SCORE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Overall rating is given Very Good, Good, Fair and Poor. Overall rating is the sub-criteria average.

(i) **Very Good (HS)** : 4  
(ii) **Good (H)** : 3  
(iii) **Fair (US)** : 2  
(iv) **Poor (HUS)**: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Sub-Criteria</th>
<th>PCR Score</th>
<th>PCR-EVN Validation</th>
<th>Justification/ Reason for deviation/Disconnect/ Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borrower Performance</td>
<td>Design and Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Responsibilities for project implementation are clearly defined.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan are agreed upon and baseline data are available or are being collected</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Baseline data were available during programme design</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Design and Readiness Sub-Score</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Borrower complied with:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Sub-Criteria</td>
<td>PCR Score</td>
<td>PCR-EVN Validation</td>
<td>Justification/ Reason for deviation/ Disconnect/ Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &amp; E Design</td>
<td>M &amp; E Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design Score</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &amp; E Implementation</td>
<td>M &amp; E Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bank performance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Borrower Performance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation Score</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Overall rating is given Very Good, Good, Fair and Poor. Overall rating is the sub-criteria average.

(i) **Very Good** (HS) : 4
(ii) **Good** (H) : 3
(iii) **Fair** (US) : 2
(iv) **Poor** (HUS): 1
OVERALL M & E PERFORMANCE SCORE  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>PCR-EVN (1-4)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUALITY OF PCR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Extent of quality and completeness of the PCR evidence and analysis to substantiate the ratings of the various sections:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The quality of the PCR was good. Its ratings were derived from its narrative and the narrative contained useful information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Extent of objectivity PCR assessment scores</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The PCR was very objective and fair in its review and ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Extent of internal consistency of PCR assessment ratings; inaccuracies; inconsistencies (in various sections; between texts and ratings; consistency of overall rating with individual component ratings)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The ratings were consistent across evaluation criteria and based on concrete evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Extent of identification and assessment of key factors (internal and exogenous) and unintended effects (positive and negatives) affecting design and implementation:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The coverage of the PCR on all these issues was complete and informative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Adequacy of treatment of safeguards, fiduciary issues, and alignment and harmonization</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Its treatment of fiduciary issues and harmonization were adequate. Mention should also be made of its discussion of donor collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Extent of soundness of data generating and analysis processes (including rates of returns) in support of PCR assessment:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The data generated to support its assessment were of sound quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Overall adequacy of the accessible evidence (from PCR including annexure and other data provided)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PCR evidence was accessible but the PCR template did not contain any recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Extent to which lessons learned (and recommendations) are clear and based on the PCR assessment (evidence &amp; analysis):</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The lessons are all drawn from the PCR assessment and evidence. They are therefore adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Extent of overall clarity and completeness of the PCR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>In general, the PCR appears adequate and without major shortcomings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (to be specified)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR Quality Score</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>The quality of the PCR is satisfactory, the best in the series.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PCR Compliance with Guidelines (PCR/OM; OPEV)
| 1. PCR Timeliness (On time = 4; late = 1) | 4 | The PCR was completed within 6 months after project completion. |
| 2. Extent of participation of Borrower, Co-financiers & field office in PCR preparation*** | 3 | The Borrower did not participate in the PCR mission. The mission however benefited from its views/documents as well as those of other donors. The Bank did not have a field office in Mauritius during programme implementation. |
| 3. Other aspect (Specify) |  |  |
| PCR Compliance Score | 3 | PCR complied with the guidelines. |

*** rated as high/exemplary (4), or substantial/significant (3), or moderate (2), or negligible (1)