

# PCR EVALUATION NOTE FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

## 1. BASIC INFORMATION

### a. Basic project data

Project title: Education III Project		
Project code: P-KE-IAZ-001	Instrument number(s): African Development Fund (ADF) Loan No. 2100150007214 and Grant No. 2100155002031:	
Project type: Investment Project	Sector: Social Sector-Education	
Country: Kenya	Environmental categorization (1-3) : Category 2	
<b>Processing Milestones</b>	<b>Key Events</b>	<b>Disbursement and Closing date</b>
Date approved: 17 December 2003	Cancelled amount: USD 976,450 of the bursary funds under the grant was reallocated for fertilizer purchase within the Bank's Africa Fertilizer Facility as agreed between the Bank and Government of Kenya	Original disbursement deadline: 31 December 2010
Date signed: 3 June 2004	Supplementary financing:	Original closing date: 31 December 2010
Date of entry into force : 24 November 2004	Restructuring:	Revised disbursement deadline: 31 December 2012
Date effective for 1st disbursement: Loan 4 May 2005; Grant 19 May 2004	Extensions (specify dates): 1 January 2012 to 31 December 2012. <b>To be checked: the extension was for 2 years from 12/2010 to 12/2012</b>	Revised closing date: 31 December 2012
Date of actual 1st : Loan 4 May 2005; Grant 19 May 2004		

### b. Financing sources

Financing source/ instrument (MUA)	Approved amount (MUA) :	Disbursed amount (MUA) :	Percentage disbursed (%) :
Loan:	24.26	13.87	57.19
Grant:	6.75	6.25	92.66
Government:	3.63	5.41	148.96
Other (ex. Co-financiers):	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>TOTAL :</b>	<b>34.64</b>	<b>25.53</b>	<b>66.25</b>

Co-financiers and other external partners:

Execution and implementation agencies: Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MOEST)

### c. Responsible Bank staff

Position	At approval	At completion
Regional Director		Gabriel Negatu
Sector Director	Alice Hamer	Agnes Soucat
Sector Manager	Ag. Felix Bongjoh	Boukary Savadogo
Task Manager	Sarr Baboucarr	Ruth K. Charo
PCR Team Leader		Ruth K. Charo
PCR Team Members		Budali Issahaku, Patrick Owuori and Walter Otero

### d. Report data

PCR Date : 17 June 2013		
PCR Mission Date: 27 May 2013	From: 27 May 2013	To: 03 June 2013
PCR-EN Date: October 2014		
Evaluator/consultant : <b>Tesfaye Teklu</b>		Peer Reviewer/Task Manager: <b>Foday Turay</b>

---

## 2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

---

The Education III Project was approved in December 2003 to improve access and quality of secondary education in poor districts, support children with special learning needs, and strengthen technical and vocational education and training in Kenya. The Bank and the Government of Kenya committed a total of UA 34.6 million and signed the protocol of agreement in June 2004. The project was closed in December 2012.

### **a. Rationale and expected impacts:**

Address problems of access (affordability), quality and inequity in secondary education. The expected impacts are increased access and utilization of secondary education services, improved learning outcomes, and enhanced employability of skills.

### **b. Objectives/Expected Outcomes:**

The specific objectives of the project are to: (1) improve access and quality of secondary education in poor districts and zones; (2) support for children with special needs; and (3) develop/strengthen technical and vocational education and training (TVET). The expected outcomes are improved access and utilization of educational services (such as increased enrolment and attendance) and learning outcomes (such as improved literacy and enhanced marketable skills) especially among the needy and disadvantaged students.

### **c. Outputs and intended beneficiaries:**

There is a range of outputs that emerge from the project (see below by component for simplification): (1) number of secondary schools with rehabilitated/new classrooms, science laboratories and learning/teaching materials; (2) teachers trained in maths and science; (3) students benefitting from bursary support; (4) number of schools provided with specialized teaching aids; (5) number of in-serviced teachers with specialized teaching methods; and (6) number of youth polytechnics refurbished and provided with equipment.

### **d. Principal activities/Components:**

The four components of the projects are: (1) improved access and quality of secondary education in poor districts and zones; (2) support for children with special learning needs (special education); (3) development/strengthening of TIVET education and Training; and (4) project management. The activities are listed below in section 3 (b).

---

## 3. PROJECT PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

---

### RELEVANCE

#### **a. Relevance of the project development objective:**

The specific objectives of the project were threefold: (1) improved access and quality of secondary education in poor districts and zones; (2) support for children with special needs; and (3) develop/strengthen relevant technical and vocational education and training (TVET). These objectives were consistent with Kenya's vision 2030 priorities for education and training, the framework of the 2003-2007 Kenya's Economic Recovery Strategy, the Poverty Reduction Strategic Plan of 2001 (PRSP) (2001), and the sector-wide goal improving access, affordability and quality of education and training services. In addition, the project's objectives were also in line with the Bank's 2003-2007 Country Strategy Plan (CSP) for Kenya with regard to access to quality secondary education, enhancing employability of skills, gender equality, and poverty reduction.

The PCR as well as the PCREN rate the relevance of the project's objectives satisfactory (3).

---

---

**b. Relevance of project design (from approval to completion):**

Detail discussion is lacking about the process leading to the formulation of the project. However, the logical framework in the appraisal reports depicts the internal logic.

For achieving the triple objectives, the inputs/activities are organized in four components:

Component one aims at increasing physical access and improving conditions for the teaching of science and mathematics across 350 secondary schools in poor provinces/districts of the country. It also strives to provide adequate bursary support to poor and needy students, especially girls. The activities under component one include construction/rehabilitation of classrooms equipped with furniture, rehabilitation of science laboratories, provision of learning materials in mathematics and science, training of secondary school teachers in maths and science teaching, and equipping teachers with essential knowledge and skills in HIV/AIDS prevention and guidance and counselling.

Component two focuses on provisioning more access and learning opportunities in secondary schools and non-formal education centers to disadvantaged children and those with special educational needs. The activities of this special needs education component comprise of providing specialized teaching aids for students with disabilities and in-service training of teachers on specialized and inclusive teaching methods.

Component three aims at developing a more relevant and appropriate national TVET system through a pilot intervention on revitalization of youth polytechnics, and support for review and development of a national training Strategy.

Component four is strengthening capacity for effective project management. At the headquarters, this constitutes establishing within the MOEST a Steering Committee and a Project Coordination Unit (PCU) composed of staff with project management responsibilities as well as component coordinators. District project coordinators are also established. In addition, the component includes training and logistical support to enhance operational and supervision activities.

There is a range of outputs that emerge from the four components. The outputs from component, which targets 350 secondary schools, are (1) number of schools with rehabilitated/new classrooms, science laboratories and learning/teaching materials; (2) teachers trained in maths and science; and (3) students benefitting from bursary support. The outputs under component two are number of schools provided with specialized teaching aids and number of in-serviced teachers with specialized teaching methods. The output under piloting TVET system is number of youth polytechnics refurbished and provided with equipment.

These outputs enable to improve delivery of secondary education services including catering to special educational needs of disadvantaged children, increase in secondary school enrolment and attendance, improved learning achievements such as increased transition and passing rates, and enhanced employable skills.

The performance in the results chain is conditional on sets of assumptions and mitigation of risks. This is the first instance where the design shows up notable deficiency. The consequence of failing to anticipate risk and develop mitigation strategy is illustrative in the design of Education III, which did not anticipate the emergence of the 2005 policy and institutional changes at the Ministry of Education and assessed its impact on project implementation. As it turned out, the project had to pause its operation until the Bank adopted/adapted a decentralized procurement procedure. There are other design issues that are not also adequately treated in the design such as the specification of the criteria for identifying poor districts for locating schools or students for bursary assistance (leaving to district administrators should be justified), non-resolution of land ownership for non-formal education (NFE) centers, and aligning project size and complexity to implementation capacity. The project M&E system is standard and incomplete for tracking change in outcome at facility level.

PCR rates design relevance 2. The PCREN does not agree with the characterization of the design relevance in the PCR and its rating. The PCREN rates 3.

---

---

## EFFECTIVENESS

### **c. Effectiveness in delivering outputs:**

As per the PCR, the majority of the outputs were achieved. Given the long period of implementation difficulties (see section 3k), the outputs apparently were achieved rapidly in the closing years. No summary table showing output by year is indexed for a proper time characterization. Quality of output was not also subjected to technical auditing. With these limitations known, the PCREN rates the overall output performance 3 (satisfactory) in line with the PCR.

### **d. Effectiveness in delivering outcomes:**

Correct outcome indicators were identified (increased GER, increased transition rate, improved completion rate, improved mean score in science and mathematics, and reduced gender gap). None of these indicators were rated. A more cautionary instance is in order since it is possible that one draws different conclusions depending on one's choice of "the data, type of analysis and narrative". Here are three cases.

Case I: A simple projection from the difficulties to which the project was subjected including the records from the recent supervisor reports showing the project was not fully functional at the end of the project casts doubt on significant outcome achievement.

Alternatively (case II), one draws a different positive outlook from the following types of perceptions of beneficiary communities:

- "Though a number of construction works are not yet completed, it was reported that they have restored confidence of parents in some of the schools and the enrolment levels are beginning to go up".
- "The equipment and textbooks were only supplied recently but teachers interviewed were optimistic that they will impact positively on student performance".
- "Provision of laboratory equipment and text books spurred interest in sciences and increased the number of students opting for science-related subjects in national examinations".
- "In all the beneficiaries' schools that were visited by the PCR mission, the mission was informed that the bursaries have improved retention of brilliant but needy children".

Case III is where the PCR attempts to establish a quantitative evidence on the project's outcome performance as the following inferences illustrate:

- "In almost all the schools visited by the PCR mission, there was evidence on improved learning environment and performance" (facility-based observation).
- "With the new classrooms and laboratories coupled with Government's effort to deploy additional teachers in the target schools, enrollments in these schools increased which contributed to the overall increase in enrollment and transition rates" (impact evaluation type of statement).
- "The completed facilities as well as provision of furniture, equipment and learning support materials contributed to increased enrolment and improved quality of learning specifically in math and sciences" (impact evaluation type of statement).
- "Bursary support for needy students enabled increased enrollment and retention of needy students" (impact evaluation).

These quotes refer to two different evaluation designs and results. The first quote states simply there are changes in education outcomes from some baseline at facility-level (at school). The other quotes are claiming cause-effect relation between the project and educational outcomes. The most desirable for the PCR type of outcome evaluation is the first type, i.e. observing change in outcome at facility level.

---

---

Knowing that the outcome performance was not properly monitored at facility-level, which of the above approaches is/are appropriate to infer about the outcome performance? Case I suggests at best a modest improvement in outcome at the closure of the project. Case II suggests a positive outlook on the future outcome results. Although the quantitative evidence in case III is not yet developed, it nevertheless reinforces the positive perceptions of beneficiary communities.

The PCREN concurs with the PCR rating of 2 since there was no substantial realization of outcomes at project level at the project completion. However, the performance is expected to improve overtime.

**e. Project development outcome:**

There is positive progress along the results chain. Performance in output is satisfactory. But the project's outcome performance is unsatisfactory. The PCREN rates unsatisfactory (2) the expected positive impact on school attendance and learning outcomes. The PCREN is also unsure whether the project has addressed the inequity and poverty reduction dimensions of the project.

**f. Beneficiaries:**

Using evidence, the evaluator should provide an assessment of the relevance of the total number of beneficiaries by categories and disaggregated by sex.

**g. Unanticipated additional outcomes (positive or negative, not taken into consideration in the project logical framework):**

This includes gender, climate change, as well as social and socio-economic- related issues. Provide an assessment of the extent to which intended or unanticipated additional and important outcomes have been taken into consideration by the PCR. The assessment should also look at the manner the PCR accounted for these outcomes.

\*\*Concerning additional outcomes not anticipated at appraisal, the ministry has documented the project's bursary administration approach with an aim to review its existing bursary modalities to improve targeting of deserving needy students. The studies relating to TIVET provided input to the new TIVET bills.

**EFFICIENCY**

**h. Timeliness:**

The original closing date was December 2010 but closed in December 2012. The PCREN agrees with the unsatisfactory rating of PCR (2).

**i. Resource use efficiency:**

The PCR rates resource use efficiency satisfactory (3) since the "Project outputs as set out at appraisal were mostly exceeded within the available project budget although project implementation was delayed by 4 years and costs of materials had risen".

The PCREN considers the PCR has not factored some important issues that have implications to resource use efficiency either positively or negatively (or, the PCR has not demonstrated it has accounted for these issues). First, the reason for substantial undisbursed loan amount (42.9%) was not explained. Was the project deemed incapable or risky to absorb the loan amount? Second, there are increased transaction costs because of additional resources to manage decentralized procurement and financial management such as monitoring and supervising works at school level. Third, resource use efficiency is not independent of time distribution of project's output and cost; there is opportunity cost for delay in benefit stream. Finally, quality of output matters in assessing resource use efficiency.

---

---

The PCREN rates the resource use efficiency unsatisfactory (2)

e

**j. Cost-benefit analysis:**

N/R

**k. Implementation progress:**

Here is a timeline that shows the project was not adequately operational until it was close to its closure. The project was declared effective for first disbursement in May 2005 (11 months since effectiveness). Implementation stalled between 2005 and 2008 until the Bank approved in July 2008 the shift to decentralized procurement as per the request of the Government of Kenya. The mid-term review in 2009 reported progress on training district project implementation committees (DPICs) and school management boards on project implementation and decentralized procurement modalities. However, the Bank and the Ministry of Education acknowledge during the mid-term review the challenges in decentralised procurement with regard to financial accountability, proper record keeping and quality of outputs. Hence, extension was granted for 2 years from 31st December 2010 to 31st December 2012.

As per supervisory mission report after the mid-term review, the implementation challenges continued over the coming years. Here are examples of the types of challenges the project continued to experience:

- Bank procedures for procurement and disbursement were deemed cumbersome at the school level and close monitoring of each school by both the Bank and the Ministry was challenging.
- It takes considerable time from initiation of a procurement process to delivery of goods or services; often due to poor knowledge of the process, inappropriateness of the procurement modes, and poor management of procurement contracts by the project coordination units.
- Collection of satisfactory special account justification documents from the 350 schools turned out to be daunting for monitoring procedures and funds. Timely review and posting of the same by the Bank was also challenging which contributed to further delays.
- The decentralized procurement enabled engagement of local contractors. Over 600 works contracts were awarded in the target schools. The majority of the local contractors operated in inadequate oversight and supervision, and did not deliver on time.

Overall, the project shows implementation weakness on several dimensions, particularly in less than satisfactory performance in decentralized procurement and disbursement. The project periodically suffered inadequate attention due to “competing” tasks assigned to the Ministry staff and heavy workload of works officers. The project relied on support of the local works officers for construction supervision at school level. But Clerks of work were not deployed uniformly across the country for the entire project duration due to budgetary constraints.

PCR rates project implementation effectiveness 2 and the PCREN concurs.

## **SUSTAINABILITY**

**l. Financial sustainability:**

For the project to provide sustained access to quality secondary education and improve learning achievements with employable skills, it is crucial that it maintains the physical assets created (e.g. the constructed/rehabilitated classrooms and laboratories) and retains and enhance the productivity of the trained school teachers. In addition, it requires funding for replenishing teaching and learning materials. The level of financing has to be commensurate with future growth in demand for secondary education. Given the importance that Education V attaches to

---

---

affordability to needy and vulnerable secondary school age children, the sustainability of the bursary assistance should be integral to the sustainability strategy.

Other than the expressed intention of the Ministry of Education to incorporate the additional operating cost into regular budgets (e.g. funding infrastructure maintenance and salaries to secondary school teachers), there are no other mechanisms developed in the project sustainability strategy. With regard to funding the bursary program, the project suggests non-governmental entities including schools and their communities to seek mechanisms to sustain the bursary fund.

The PCREN differs from the PCR rating (3) and scores 2 (unsatisfactory) since there are no developed funding modalities other than public financing for continuous affordable access to secondary education for the needy and the vulnerable in Kenya.

**m. Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities:**

Whilst the devolution of the government structure has posed challenges to the implementation of the project (Education III), it has important institutional qualities. It enables to take development projects to the people to participate and manage. As demonstrated in the project, for example, there are schools' management committees that elect board of governors whose constituency includes parents and notable village leaders. The committees prioritize schools' needs, undertake procurement of works, determine bursary beneficiaries, and seek ways to fund bursary assistance. The board provides overall oversight on project implementation. The decentralization also permits participation of local contractors and suppliers, and thereby creating the environment for expansion of labor market for works contract.

With the development of institutions comes development of capacities for a wide spectrum of the population. For example, the project was instrumental in training District Project implementation Committees and School Management Boards in Bank procurement, financial management, and M&E. The project Coordination Committee at the center, project districts and target schools that were involved in project implementation gained valuable experience and skills.

Notwithstanding the short-term challenges, the PCREN considers the decentralization framework provides a path for institutional sustainability for affordable access to quality education in future. The PCREN too rates 3.

**n. Ownership and sustainability of partnerships:**

The participation of key stakeholders at the district and school levels in the decentralized framework of the project demonstrates ownership of the project. The influence of school committees in setting priorities in accordance with schools' needs, undertaking procurement of works, and supporting funding bursary assistance also demonstrates ownership. The project has done satisfactory job (3) in establishing the basis for a broad-based ownership and partnership

**o. Environmental and social sustainability:**

The project is an Environmental Category II project. There were no specific environmental plan at appraisal. There were no specific funds budgeted towards environment management.

The PCR as well as the PCREN rate 2 the project's contribution to environmental sustainability

---

## **4. PERFORMANCE OF STAKEHOLDERS**

---

---

**a. Bank performance:**

The Bank in collaboration with the Ministry of Education of the Government of Kenya (“the Borrower”) and consultations with stakeholders including the Development Partners (DPS) developed the Education III project that was in line with country’s education sector policy objectives and priorities. It ensured the Borrower fulfilled the financing conditions for effectiveness and disbursement within an acceptable time framework. However, the Borrower’s request in 2005 for the Bank to shift to decentralized framework slowed the implementation of the project until the Bank approved the proposal in 2008.

The Bank in particular adopted decentralized mode of procurement. The Bank and the Borrower acknowledged the challenges in decentralized procurement, and implemented measures for establishing requisite institutions at the center, district and school levels, as well as strengthening their capacity through training in Bank’s procurement, financial and monitoring rules and procedures. In addition, the Bank involved stakeholder participation such as district project implementation committees (DPICs) and schools in evaluation of tenders and managing the project, as well as identifying bursary beneficiaries.

The Bank carried out a project mid-term review in June 2009 and regular biannual supervision missions. In the face of numerous implementation difficulties, the Bank demonstrated reasonable (but not necessarily adequate) commitment, capability and flexibility in adapting its rules of procedure in procurement, identifying and resolving problems arising at different stages of the project cycle, and enabling project execution without substantial deviations from the planned activities and outputs. However, some of the notable problems are the Bank’s own making, which could have been mitigated if the design adequately analyzed the potential risk and developed strategies including whether to decentralize or not without the Borrower’s proof of readiness to shift to devolved government structure.

The PCR rates the Bank’s performance 3 and the PCREN rates 2 (unsatisfactory).

**b. Borrower performance:**

The Government of Kenya (“the Borrower”) set its long-term vision and its policy priorities in education, which guided the formulation of Education III project to be jointly financed with the African Development Bank (“the Bank”). The conditions for effectiveness of the Bank’s financing were met within an acceptable time frame. However, the Borrower’s proposal for the Bank to implement the project within yet undeveloped decentralized administrative framework stalled its operation for a prolonged time (2005 -2008). The project re-started effectively in 2008 but its readiness was limited as late as 2010 to absorb the project funds.

The Borrower in collaboration of the Bank implemented measures to strengthen the institutions and their capacity for effective implementation of the project at all administrative levels. However, the Borrower continued to experience implementation challenges related, for example, to: (1) managing and enforcing small private works contracts over large geographical spread, (2) monitoring closely the project at each of the 350 schools, (3) cumbersome Bank procedures for procurement and disbursement at school level notwithstanding training in Bank rules and procedures in disbursement, procurement and monitoring and evaluation, (4) shortage of trained manpower such as Clerks of work for construction supervision at school level, and (5) delays in collection of satisfactory special account justification documents from the 350 schools and consequently replenishments of funds for payment to contractors. The Borrower provided counterpart funds albeit with some delays in some financial years.

Overall, the performance of the Borrower was less than satisfactory in design, implementation and results (2).

**c. Performance of other stakeholders:**

The main “other” stakeholders in this project are contractors and suppliers. The decentralized procurement opened the possibility for engagement of local contractors. Over 600 works contracts were awarded in the target schools. Most of the works contracts as well as goods suppliers were, however, behind their contract schedule and delivery

---

---

of works and goods. Several factors contribute to their slow performance and unmet quality standards; (1) inadequate supervision, (2) delayed payments from the Government and the Bank, and (3) inadequate technical and financial capacity of contractors.

Under the decentralized procurement, the tender documents were simplified and contracts conditions were less strict. In addition, there was inadequate staff such as Clerks of work to supervise the geographically dispersed contractors. Hence, there were too many small contracts that operated in inadequate oversight and supervision. Furthermore, selection of inexperienced contractors and limited financial capacity of local contractors led to delays in works execution as they had to wait for payments before proceeding with work, which is aggravated by delays in collection of satisfactory special account justification for reimbursement from the Bank. These factors contribute in non-adherence to work plans and activity schedules, and consequently in lowered performance both in quantity and quality.

The PCREN rates these contractors 2 (unsatisfactory) in their preparedness and performance.

---

## **5. SUMMARY OF OVERALL PROJECT PERFORMANCE**

---

### **a. Overall assessment:**

Overall assessment rating is 2.4 (unsatisfactory). Partially developed design, considerable implementation difficulties, sizable but unaudited outputs, unrealized but expected-to-improve outcomes, significant inefficiency and inadequately charted financial sustainability path. The shift to decentralized administrative structure promises to enhance beneficiary participation and management, but requires improved capacity including financial management.

### **b. Design, implementation and utilization of the M&E (appreciation of the evaluator):**

The M&E system is the standard I/O system where data are collected on activities and outputs, procurement performance, and financial performance including findings from audit reports. The statistics derived from such monitoring system are reported quarterly by the project's PIU. On the other hand, the results chain in the logical framework suggest a design and implementation of a comprehensive M&E system that monitors project's outcomes too. From the perspective of the latter, the project's M&E system is unsatisfactory in design and implementation, and consequently in use.

PCREN rating 3

---

## **6. EVALUATION OF KEY LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

### **a. Lessons learned:**

Provide a brief description of any agreement/disagreement with all or part of the lessons learned from the PCR after analysis of the project performance with regards to each of the key components of the evaluation (Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Sustainability). List the PCR main new and/or reformulated pertinent (and generic) lessons learned for each of these components here. It is recommended that no more than five lessons learned are discussed. Key questions and targeted audience must also be specified for each lesson learned.

1. Due diligence is necessary at design stage to account for factors that affect project performance such as uncertain property rights in land or policy shift. The project experienced prolonged delay in implementation because of major education reform in 2005 that should have been anticipated in 2003 or 2004.
2. Target schools and districts were involved in project implementation at all levels through the decentralized arrangements. This enhanced project ownership.

### **b. Recommendations:**

Provide a brief description of any agreement/ disagreement with all or part of the recommendations from the PCR. List the PCR main new and/or reformulated recommendations (requiring more actions by the Borrower and/or the Bank) here.

None that are significant for the PCREN to recommend

---

## 7. COMMENTS ON PCR QUALITY AND TIMELINESS

The overall PCR rating is based on all or part of the criteria presented in the annex and other: The quality of the PCR is rated as highly satisfactory (4), satisfactory (3), unsatisfactory (2), and highly unsatisfactory (1). The timeliness of the PCR is rated as on time (4) or late (1). The participation of the Borrower, co-financier, and the bank's external office(s) are rated as follows: Very Good (4), Good (3), Fair (2), Poor (1).

The PCR is rated fair (2). It demonstrates some weakness (vulnerability) in understanding the evaluation criteria, supporting rating with empirical evidence, utilizing non-project specific data for rating, and establishing influential factors for explaining performance.

## 8. SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION

This is a summary of both the PCR and IDEV ratings with justification for deviations/comments. Appropriate section of the PCR Evaluation should be indicated in the last column in order to avoid detailed comments. The evaluator must provide a reasonable explanation for each criterion the PCR rating is not validated by IDEV. Consequently, the overall rating of the project could be "equally satisfactory".

Criteria	PCR	PCREN	Reason for disagreement/ Comments
<b>RELEVANCE</b>			
Relevance of project development objective	3	3	
Relevance of project design	2	3	The APR shows the internal logic of the project. However, its content is deficient in risk analysis, establishing objective criteria for selecting pro-poor districts for placing schools and allocation of bursary fund, and aligning project size to implementation capacity.
<b>EFFECTIVENESS</b>			It is uncertain how much the project has realized its target outputs and outcomes. However, the project promises positive impact on school attendance and learning outcomes in future.
Output	3	3	
outcome	2	2	No substantial realization at project completion
Development objective (DO)	3	2	
<b>EFFICIENCY</b>			The weakness in project implementation manifests not only in mere time overrun, but also in resource use inefficiency. On the other hand, the inefficiency indicates the scope for improving in future.
Timeliness	2	2	
Resource use efficiency	3	2	
Cost-benefit analysis			
Implementation progress (IP)	2	2	
<b>SUSTAINABILITY</b>			
Financial sustainability	3	2	Sustaining the benefits arising from the project requires more than a mere incorporation into the government budget. There are no pathways on financing the assets

			built including trained manpower, and the bursary program.
Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities	3	3	The shift towards administrative and financial devolution promises a broad-based institutional sustainability.
Ownership and partnership	3	3	
Environmental and social sustainability	2	2	
<b>OVERALL PROJECT COMPLETION RATING</b>	2.6	2.4	More because of its design relevance and significant but unaudited output performance. Much less on its efficiency and outcome records.
Bank performance:	3	2	Subjecting a stand-alone project into a new decentralized administration without undeveloped capacities is flawed
Borrower performance:	3	2	The Borrower is jointly responsible
Performance of other shareholders:		2	Mainly because of poorly managed and enforced works contracts
Overall PCR quality:		2	Ratings with 1 are particularly problematic

---

**9. PRIORITY FOR FUTURE EVALUATIVE WORK: PROJECT FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT, IMPACT EVALUATION, COUNTRY/SECTOR REVIEWS OR THEMATIC EVALUATION STUDIES:**

- **Project is part of a series and suitable for cluster evaluation**
- **Project is a success story**
- **High priority for impact evaluation**
- **Performance evaluation is required to sector/country review**
- **High priority for thematic or special evaluation studies (Country)**
- **PPER is required because of incomplete validation rating**

**Major areas of focus for future evaluation work:**

- a) Performance evaluation is required for sector/ country review
- b) Cluster evaluation (institutional support)
- c) Sector evaluation (budgetary support or public finance management reforms)

**Follow up action by IDEV:**

Identify same cluster or sector operations; organize appropriate work or consultation mission to facilitate a), b) and/or c).

**Division Manager clearance**

**Director signing off**

---

---

**Data source for validation:**

- Task Manager/ Responsible bank staff interviewed/contacted (in person, by telephone or email)
- Documents/ Database reports

**Attachment:**

- PCR evaluation note validation sheet of performance ratings
- List of references

## PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT EVALUATION NOTE

### Validation of PCR performance ratings

PCR rating scale:

Score	Description
4	<b>Very Good</b> – Fully achieved with no shortcomings
3	<b>Good</b> – Mostly achieved despite a few shortcomings
2	<b>Fair</b> – Partially achieved. Shortcomings and achievements are roughly balanced
1	<b>Poor</b> – very limited achievement with extensive shortcomings
UTS	Unable to score/rate
NA	Non Applicable

Criteria	Sub-criteria	PCR work score	IDEV review	Reasons for deviation/comments
RELEVANCE	Relevance of the project development objective (DO) during implementation	3	3	
	Relevance of project design (from approval to completion)	2	3	The APR shows the internal logic of the project. However, it content is deficient in risk analysis, establishing objective criteria for selecting pro-poor districts for placing schools and allocation of bursary fund, and aligning project size to implementation capacity.
<b>OVERALL RELEVANCE SCORE</b>				
EFFECTIVENESS*	<b>Effectiveness in delivering outcomes</b>			
	Increased GER (gross enrolment rate)			No project-specific baseline value and change in the indicator
	Increased transition rates			Ditto
	Improved completion rates			Ditto
	Improved mean score in science and mathematics			Ditto
	Reduced gender disparity index			Gender parity index improved in favor of girls
	Overall outcome score	2	2	No record of substantial realization at project completion

Criteria	Sub-criteria	PCR work score	IDEV review	Reasons for deviation/comments
<b>Effectiveness in delivering output</b>				
	Number of classrooms rehabilitated (target exceeded)			Not rated as per the guidelines. The PCREN could not validate the reported statistics
	Number of classrooms constructed (exceeded)			Ditto
	Number of new science laboratories constructed (exceeded)			
	Number of schools provided with learning/teaching materials (target achieved)			
	Number of students benefitting from Bursary Support (achieved)			
	Number of schools provided with specialized teaching aids for students with special needs (achieved )			
	Number of teachers in-serviced on specialized and inclusive teaching methods (partial)			
	Number of Non Formal Education(NFE) Centers upgraded (zero output)			
	Number of Youth Polytechnics(YPs) refurbished and provided with equipment (achieved)			
	Number of NFE teachers in serviced on HIV/Aids, guidance and counseling (exceeded target)			
	Overall output score	3	3	For the majority of the implementation period, the project was not operational or experiencing implementation challenges as summarized in section 3(k). The pace at which the outputs was achieved in the closing years raises question on the quality that requires technical auditing.
<b>Development objective (DO)</b>				
	Development objective rating	3	2	The uncertainty in the project's outcomes casts doubt on the realization of the development objective
<b>Beneficiaries</b>				
	Beneficiary1			The list is a repetition of the outputs. Interesting but missing are statistics on needy students benefitted or effect on gender disparity

Criteria	Sub-criteria	PCR work score	IDEV review	Reasons for deviation/comments
	Beneficiary2			
	<b>Unanticipated outcomes (positive or negative not considered in the project logical framework) and their level of impact on the project (high, moderate, low)</b>			
	Institutional development			The decentralized administrative framework is enabling beneficiaries to participate in project design and implementation.
	Gender			
	Environment & climate change			
	Poverty reduction			
	Private sector development			The project induced emerging local private works contractor market
	Regional integration			
	Other (specify)			
<b>EFFECTIVENESS OVERALL SCORE</b>				
EFFICIENCY	Timeliness (based on the initial closing date)	2	2	
	Resource used efficiency	3	2	
	Cost-benefit analysis			
	Implementation progress (from the IPR)	2	2	
	Other (specify)			
<b>OVERALL EFFICIENCY SCORE</b>				
SUSTAINABILITY	Financial sustainability	3	2	
	Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities	3	3	
	Ownership and sustainability of partnerships	3	3	
	Environmental and social sustainability	2	2	
<p>*The rating of the effectiveness component is obtained from the development objective (DO) rating in the latest IPR of the project (see Guidance Note on the IPR).  The ratings for outputs and outcomes are determined based on the project's progress towards realizing its targets, and the overall development objective of the project (DO) is obtained by combining the ratings obtained for outputs and outcomes following the method defined in the IPR Guidance Note. The following method is applied: Highly satisfactory (4), Satisfactory (3), Unsatisfactory (2) and Highly unsatisfactory (1).</p>				

Criteria	Sub-criteria	PCR Work score	IDEV review	Reasons for deviation/comments
BANK PERFORMANCE	Proactive identification and resolution of problems at different stage of the project cycle			
	Use of previous lessons learned from previous operations during design and implementation			
	Promotion of stakeholder participation to strengthen ownership			
	Enforcement of safeguard and fiduciary requirements			
	Design and implementation of Monitoring & Evaluation system			
	Quality of Bank supervision (mix of skills in supervisory teams, etc)			
	Timeliness of responses to requests			
<b>OVERALL BANK PERFORMANCE SCORE</b>				
BORROWER PERFORMANCE	Quality of preparation and implementation			
	Compliance with covenants, agreements and safeguards			
	Provision of timely counterpart funding			
	Responsiveness to supervision recommendations			
	Measures taken to establish basis for project sustainability			
	Timeliness of preparing requests			
<b>OVERALL BORROWER PERFORMANCE SCORE</b>				
PERFORMANCE OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS	Timeliness of disbursements by co-financiers			
	Functioning of collaborative agreements			
	Quality of policy dialogue with co-financiers (for PBOs only)			
	Quality of work by service providers			
	Responsiveness to client demands			
<b>OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS</b>				
The overall rating is given: Very Good, Good, Fair and Poor.				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Very Good (HS) : 4</li> <li>(ii) Good (H) : 3</li> <li>(iii) Fair (US) : 2</li> <li>(iv) Poor (HUS): 1</li> </ul>				

**DESIGN, IMPLEMENTAION AND UTILIZATION OF MONITIRING AND  
EVALUATION (M&E)**

Criteria	Sub-criteria	IDEV Score	Comments
M&E DESIGN	M&E system is in place, clear, appropriate and realistic		
	Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan were duly approved		
	Existence of disaggregated gender indicator		
	Baseline data were available or collected during the design		
	Other, specify		
<b>OVERALL M&amp;E DESIGN SCORE</b>			
M&E IMPLEMENTATION	The M&E function is adequately equipped and staffed		
<b>OVERALL M&amp;E IMPLEMENTATION SCORE</b>			
M&E UTILIZATION	The borrower used the tracking information for decision		
<b>OVERALL M&amp;E UTILIZATION SCORE</b>			
<b>OVERALL M&amp;E PERFORMANCE SCORE</b>		3	The PCREN does not have the details to evaluate the M&E design, performance and use. However, it infers from the quarterly reports it is a standard M&E system. Since what is required is a comprehensive M&E that captures outcomes, the project's M&E is unsatisfactory.

## PCR QUALITY EVALUATION

Criteria	PCR-EVN (1-4)	Comments
<b>QUALITY OF PCR</b>		
1. Extent of quality and completeness of the PCR evidence and analysis to substantiate the ratings of the various sections	1	The understanding and interpretation of the evaluation guidelines, and the rigor of analyses are unsatisfactory
2. Extent of objectivity of PCR assessment score	2	The use of “data/statistics” to support text is not credible
3. Extent of internal consistency of PCR assessment ratings; inaccuracies; inconsistencies; (in various sections; between text and ratings; consistency of overall rating with individual component ratings)	2	The gap between the text and rating is the most notable
4. Extent of identification and assessment of key factors (internal and exogenous) and unintended effects (positive or negative) affecting design and implementation	1	Often not organized to decipher influential factors
5. Adequacy of treatment of safeguards, fiduciary issues, and alignment and harmonization	2	
6. Extent of soundness of data generating and analysis process (including rates of returns) in support of PCR assessment	1	Drawing on non-project data without proper integration is problematic
7. Overall adequacy of the accessible evidence (from PCR including annexure and other data provided)	2	
8. Extent to which lessons learned (and recommendations) are clear and based on the PCR assessment (evidence & analysis)	2	Issues, lessons and recommendations are not properly differentiated.
9. Extent of overall clarity and completeness of the PCR	1	
Other (specify)		
PCR QUALITY SCORE	2	In the range between “poor” and “fair”
PCR compliance with guidelines (PCR/OM ; IDEV)		
1. PCR Timeliness (On time = 4; Late= 1)	4	
2. Extent of participation of borrower, Co-financiers & field offices in PCR preparation	UTS	
3. Other aspect(s) (specify)		
PCR COMPLIANCE SCORE	4	
*** rated as Very Good (4), or Good (3), or Fair (2), or Poor (1)		

## References

African Development Bank. 2014. Kenya – Comments on financial statements and audit report of the Education III Project for the year ended 30 June, 2013.

African Development Bank. 2013. Kenya – Education III Project. Project completion report for public sector operations (PCR)

Republic of Kenya and African Development Bank Group. 2013. Aide Memoire – Project completion report mission of the Education III project, 27 May-5 June 2013.

Republic of Kenya and African Development Bank Group. 2012. Aide Memoire – Supervision mission of the Education III project, 30 November and 3-7 December 2012.

Republic of Kenya and African Development Bank Group. 2012. Aide Memoire – Supervision mission of the Education III project, 1-12 October 2012.

African Development Bank Group. 2010. Mid-term review report for the Education III project in Kenya, 21st June-1st July 2010. OSHD.2

African Development Bank Group. 2009. Republic of Kenya – Country portfolio performance review report. Country and Regional Department-East (OREA)

Republic of Kenya, Ministry of Education. Various dates. Education III Project – Quarterly project progress reports. Nairobi, Kenya.

African Development Fund. 2003. Republic of Kenya – Strengthening and expanding access to appropriate secondary education and skills acquisition. Appraisal Report