

## PCR EVALUATION NOTE FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

<b>1. BASIC INFORMATION</b>			
<b>a. Basic project data</b>			
Project title: Gambia - Artisanal Fisheries Development Project (GAFDP)			
Project code: P-GM-AAF-002	Main Loan (NTF): 2200160000019		
Project type: Investment	Sector: Fisheries		
Country: The Gambia	Environmental categorization (1-3): 2		
<b>Processing Milestones</b>	<b>Key Events</b>	<b>Disbursement and Closing date</b>	
Date approved: 15 December 1999	Cancelled amount: 0.22Million	Original disbursement deadline: 30 June 2007	
Date signed: 19 January 2001	Supplementary financing: Yes	Original closing date: 31 December 2007	
Date of entry into force: 22 October 2001	Restructuring:	Revised disbursement deadline: 30 June 2009	
Date effective for 1st disbursement: 27 June 2002	Extensions (specify dates): 30 June 2009 (2 years)	Revised closing date: 31 December 2009	
Date of actual 1st: 27 February 2003			
Project code: P-GM-AAF-005	Supplementary Loan (NTF): 2200160000689		
Project type: Investment	Sector: Fisheries		
Country: The Gambia	Environmental categorization (1-3): 2		
<b>Processing Milestones</b>	<b>Key Events</b>	<b>Disbursement and Closing date</b>	
Date approved: 09 June 2009	Cancelled amount:	Original disbursement deadline: 30 June 2011	
Date signed: 13 July 2009	Supplementary financing:	Original closing date: 31 December 2011	
Date of entry into force: 10 December 2009	Restructuring:	Revised disbursement deadline: 30 June 2012	
Date effective for 1st disbursement: 10 December 2009	Extensions (specify dates): 30 June 2012	Revised closing date: 31 December 2012	
Date of actual 1st: 06 January 2010			
<b>Financing source/ (MUA)</b>	<b>Approved amount (MUA) :</b>	<b>Disbursed amount (MUA) :</b>	<b>Percentage disbursed (%) :</b>
Loan (main)		2.9	92.0
Loan (supplementary)		5.0	88.5
Government:		1.23	16.4
Other (co-financer -BADEA):		4.43	100
<b>TOTAL :</b>		<b>13.56</b>	<b>88.9</b>
Co-financiers and other external partners: BADEA			
Execution and implementation agencies: Ministry of Fisheries and Water Resources			

<b>c. Responsible Bank staff</b>		
<b>Position</b>	<b>At approval</b>	<b>At completion</b>
Regional Director		Mr. Frank PERRAULT (ORWB)
Sector Director	Mr. Chuku-Dinka R SPENCER	Mr. Abdirahman BEILEH
Sector Manager	Mr. Sami Zaki MOUSSA (Main Loan) Mr. Ken B JOHM (Supplementary Loan)	Mr. Ken B. JOHM
Task Manager	Mr. Andy KHUMBANYIWA (Main Loan) Mr. Jean Louis KROMER (Supplementary Loan)	Mr. Olagoke OLADAPO
Alternate Task Manager		Mr. Timothy MKANDAWIRE
PCR Team Leader		Mr. Olagoke OLADAPO
PCR Team Members		Mr. Emanuel Ajani, Consultant Fisheries Expert Mr. Mamadi B. Ceesay, Consultant Agro-Economist
<b>d. Report data</b>		
PCR Date: 05 July 2013		
PCR Mission Date:	From: 18 March 2013	To: 02 April 2013
PCR-EN Date: October 2014		
Evaluator/consultant : <b>Tesfaye Teklu</b>		Peer Reviewer/Task Manager: <b>Foday Turay</b>

## **2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The Gambia Artisanal Fisheries Development Project (GAFDP) aims to increase fish production and income of fishermen and women and thereby contribute to the improvement of nutritional standards of the population. The Bank approved the initial (main) NTF loan in December 1999. The Government of the Gambia and the Bank signed the loan agreements in January 2001. This part of the loan was extended for two years and closed in December 2009. Upon the request of the Government, the Bank re-appraised the project and approved an additional NTF loan in June 2009. The loan was signed in July 2009. The additional loan was closed in December 2012.

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

Despite substantial coastal and inland water bodies for fish production, the sector was faced by hosts of factors that constrained its development. Among the main constraints were lack of appropriate onshore facilities and absence of fisheries port. The stakeholders consulted during the appraisal of the project expressed their strong desire for construction/rehabilitation of key infrastructures such as jetty, market and inland landing facilities.

The project was expected to: (1) improve fish production arising from increase in water resources exploited, increase in productivity (catch rate per fishing day) and reduced harvest loss; (2) improve access and utilization of credit; (2) improve distribution (amount of fish landed) and marketing, (4) expand market and enhance competitive price determination; (5) increase in incomes of fishermen and fish traders, especially women; and (6) increase in fish per capita consumption.

The intended direct beneficiaries were the fishing communities, but would also benefit indirectly the fish consuming population at large.

---

**b. Objectives/Expected Outcomes:**

The specific objective of GAFDP was to increase fish production and income of fishermen and women and thereby contribute to the improvement of nutritional standards of the population. The expected outcomes of the project included increase in quantity and quality of fish landed and marketed, improvement in income of fishing communities (artisanal and industrial fishers, processors and traders), and increase in fish consumption and consequently improved nutritional standards of the population.

**c. Outputs and intended beneficiaries:**

The outputs of the project included: (1) construction of Banjul jetty capable of serving artisanal and industrial operators; (2) construction of Bakoteh fish market; (3) rehabilitation of three inland fish landing sites including access roads; (4) training of fisheries staff and project beneficiaries; (5) provision of line of credit; and (6) formation of community fisheries centers. The intended beneficiaries were fishing communities, fisheries staff, and communities at large using the infrastructure such as the access roads.

**d. Principal activities/Components:**

Five components: (1) improvement of fisheries facilities and infrastructure; (2) strengthening of the Fisheries Department; (3) monitoring, control and surveillance (4) credit program; and (5) project management.

Component 1: Construction of the Banjul fisheries jetty and associated facilities, rehabilitation of the three landing sites in Albreda, Bintang and Tendaba, and construction of a central market in the Serekunda area at Bakoteh.

Component 2: Training of fisheries staff and project beneficiaries (i.e. community fisheries centers members).

Component 3: Establishing a monitoring, control surveillance mechanism to improve fish resource management and reduce illegal fishing.

Component 4: Opening a line of credit for fishing communities

Component 5: Strengthening project implementation unit (PIU) to coordinate and manage the project.

The supplementary loan (2009-2011) was primarily for components 1 (improvement of fisheries facilities/ infrastructure) and five (support to project management).

---

**3. PROJECT PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT**

---

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

The project's objective of increasing fish production and income of fishermen and women and thereby contributing to the improvement of nutritional standards of the population was consistent with the country's poverty reduction goal.

The initial project (2001-2009) was identified, within the framework of the 1999-2001 Country Strategy Paper, to support the Government of the Gambia efforts in poverty reduction (PRSP I, 2003-2007).

---

---

The relevance of the objective of the project continued throughout the duration of the implementation of the initial project (2005-2009) as well as the implementation of the supplementary loan (2009-2012). The objective in particular was in line with pillar 2 of the PRSP II 2007- 2011 and pillar 2 of the AfDB/World Bank Second Joint Assistance Strategy (2008-2011), both related to enhancing the capacity and output of productive sectors (agriculture, fisheries, industry, trade, tourism and infrastructure). These objective was also relevant ex-post.

The PCREN rates 4 (highly satisfactory)

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

The Government of the Gambia sought the assistance of the African Development Bank (ADB) Group to finance the Gambia Artisanal Fisheries Development Project (GAFDP) to address the absence of on shore facilities by construction or rehabilitation of the Banjul jetty, a fish market and three fish in landing facilities. In addition to the construction/rehabilitation of the key infrastructures and training fisheries staff and project beneficiaries, the project intended to provide a line of credit to relax capital constraint for fishing activities and to promote organization of beneficiaries into community fishery committees (CFCs) to manage the infrastructures.

As shown in the logical framework of the project, the outputs of the project constitute landing sites, market center, trained manpower, availability of loanable funds, and fishery committees. These outputs in turn contribute to the realization of the project's outcomes that include increased fish production, expanded fish market, increase in income accruing mainly to fishing communities (artisanal and industrial fishers, processors and traders). The growth performance in the fishing sector potentially contributes to improved seafood consumption and human nutrition.

The re-appraisal logical framework shows some learning from the main loan of the project (2002-2009), which experienced implementation delays and cost escalation that necessitated additional external financing to complete the core component of the project (2009-2011). In retrospect, some of the causes could be traceable to the faulty design of the initial project such as under estimation of the cost of the project and/or not aligning project size and complexity to capacity to implement including financing (e.g. bundling the project with "many" components), and/or not properly monitoring world prices for key imported goods such as oil and domestic macro market such as exchange rate and inflation.

After all, design matters for effectiveness of a project. The lessons learned are reflected in the re-appraisal. The PCREN rates the relevance of the project design 3 (satisfactory).

## **EFFECTIVENESS**

**c. Effectiveness in delivering outputs:**

The evidence presented in the PCR, which is also replicated below, shows the project was effective in surpassing its output targets despite the delays in implementation. All the key infrastructures achieved their targets (construction of Banjul jetty, construction of Bakoteh fish market, and rehabilitation of three inland fish landing sites including access roads).

All the four technical assistants as set at the appraisal were recruited. The project was able to surpass the training target by 2% with 40% of the 340 beneficiaries (CFC) were women. The project was able to increase the number of the credit beneficiaries by 877 people compared with the appraisal target of 3,496

---

---

beneficiaries. The credit disbursement target of 20% beneficiaries being women was surpassed as 58% of the credit beneficiaries were women.

The results achieved in the participatory management of fish landing infrastructure and delivery of credit to the fisheries sector were particularly considered as success stories.

The PCREN is uncertain about the magnitude/strength/quality of these results. The PCREN recognizes that these outputs were achieved over a long period of implementation and hence a time perspective is necessary in characterizing the output performance. But the evidence presented in the PCR does not allow a temporal characterization. There is also uncertainty about the quality of the outputs (are the works, for example, technically audited?). Finally, there is little information how the output targets were set to form the bases to assess the output performance.

Notwithstanding these issues, the PCREN concurs with the PCR to rate the output performance satisfactory (3).

**d. Effectiveness in delivering outcomes:**

These outputs are expected to materialize in outcomes such as: (1) increase in fish productivity (e.g. increase in catch rate per fishing day) and production; (2) improved quality of fish produced (e.g. reduced spoilage rate); (3) improved access and utilization of credit; (4) improved distribution (amount of fish landed) and marketing; (5) reduced volatility of fish price because of expanded market for fish; (6) increase in incomes of fishermen and fish traders, especially women; and (7) increase in fish per capita consumption.

The PCR reports some of these outcome indicators, i.e., increased bonga production, increased annual incomes of fisherfolk, and increased per capita fish consumption. The indicator values were drawn from MFWR annual fisheries statistics and FAO. Based on data points between 2001 and 2012, the PCR concludes the project was largely effective in achieving outcomes. And it rates highly satisfactory.

There are several reasons to doubt such strong rating. First, the project was not fully operational until the end of 2011. The core component of the project, which was the construction/rehabilitation of the fisheries facilities and infrastructure was implemented in the period between 2009 and 2011. Second, the data points reported could be simply picking “trend” factors that are not necessarily related to the project. Third, there is no evidence that shows the fisheries statistics were capturing the change in outcome indicators among the catchment population in the project areas. Finally, the MFWR has self-interest in the results it reports, which potentially contaminates the objectivity.

Recognizing the substantive outputs achieved, the PCREN rates the project satisfactory in its outcome performance.

**e. Project development outcome:**

The satisfactory progression along the results chain (i.e. satisfactory performance in outputs converting into satisfactory outcomes) indicates the project is achieving its objective of improving the wellbeing of the fishing communities (increase in production and income of artisanal and industrial fishers, processors and traders) and the population at large through improved seafood consumption and nutritional standards.

The PCREN and the PCR both rate satisfactory (3) the expected positive impact on achieving the project’s objective.

---

---

**f. Beneficiaries:**

1124 recipients of local training (fisheries assistants and community fishers center managers), female (46%)

4373 credit beneficiaries (fish traders, fisher, fish processors and engine repairers), female (58%)

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

**EFFICIENCY**

**h. Timeliness:**

The PCREN agrees with the PCR unsatisfactory rating of the timeliness of the project (2).

**i. Resource use efficiency:**

As per the evaluation guidelines, the PCR shows the project delivered “all or more outputs than expected within the available budget”. The PCR rates highly satisfactory (4).

However, such measure of resource use efficiency masks the project’s design and implementation experience that has implication to resource use efficiency and cost. The original (old) loan was declared effective for first disbursement in June 2002. The date of actual first disbursement for the NLF loan was February 2003 which, together with the Government, financed four out of the five components. The project was declared complete and closed in June 2009; after nearly 7 years. However, the construction/rehabilitation of fisheries facilities and infrastructure, which was the core component of the project, was incomplete in 2009 because of escalation of cost and financing gap of UA 5.5 million. The Bank re-appraised the project and approved an additional NTF loan in June 2009. The additional loan was implemented over a period of two and half years (January 2010-June 2012) and closed in June 2012.

The project experienced delays at start up and implementation, cost escalations, and additional loan to achieve its output targets. These facts are not evident in the highly satisfactory rating of the resource use efficiency of the project. The PCREN rates satisfactory (3)

**j. Cost-benefit analysis:**

The PCR reports economic rate of return (ERR) of 28% at appraisal and 32% at completion for the main loan. The ERR for supplementary loan at appraisal was 29%. These estimates establish the economic worthiness of the project, more strongly at completion.

The PCREN lacks the information to assess the estimates and hence it is unable to rate (UTR).

**k. Implementation progress:**

The project experienced difficulties both at entry (1999-2002) as well as its implementation phase (2003-2012).

The project was appraised in April 1999 and approved in May 2001. The initial loan agreement was signed by the Bank and the Government in January 2001. The loan agreement entered into force in October 2001. The loan was declared effective for first disbursement in June 2002. The date of actual first disbursement

---

---

for the NLF loan was February 2003. In fact, access to the special account was approved by the Government in July 2003; 2.6 years from the date of signing of the agreement.

The loan from the second co-financer, BADEA, which was allotted to finance the infrastructure component of the project, was declared effective for first disbursement in January 2005; four years later from the date of signing of the agreement. The project had thus difficulty from its start up.

The project experienced considerable cost escalation during its implementation period. As it is shown in the project re-appraisal report, the project cost increased from UA 10.15 million to UA 15.65 million, resulting in a financing gap of UA 5.5 million. Several factors contributed to the cost escalation: (1) cost underestimate at project appraisal, (2) rise in price of building materials and crude oil in world market, and (3) delays in procurement procedures. The 2009 country portfolio performance review designated the project potentially problematic (PPP) because of the problems it encountered at early stage and aging compared with other projects.

In the face of escalating cost, the BADEA funding for the infrastructures was not sufficient without additional infusion of finance. Upon the request of the Government, the Bank approved a supplementary loan of UA 5.0 million mainly through the NTF source to make up for the financing gap to build the fisheries facilities and infrastructure. The supplementary loan was implemented over a period of two and half years (January 2010-June 2012), after the closure of the main loan in June 2009.

In short, the long-time operated project achieved satisfactory outputs but the process experienced challenges due to unsatisfactory harmonization/coordination of co-financing, underestimation of project cost at appraisal and not aligning of project size and complexity with implementation capacity (instead of focusing on two or three components, especially the core ones). On the other hand, the project demonstrated its compliance with the loan requirements, i.e. satisfactory performance in compliance with project covenants like environmental safeguards and audit compliance, financial management and reporting, and the standard monitoring reports.

The PCREN agrees with the satisfactory rating of the PCR (3)

## **SUSTAINABILITY**

### **I. Financial sustainability:**

There are two types of risks recognized in the project design that threaten the sustainability of the project: (1) poor operation and maintenance of the market and landing sites, and (2) absence of qualified staff to manage the project. The suggested mitigation measure for the sustenance of the facilities (i.e. maintenance) was to form a public-private type of management involving stakeholders in design, implementation and sustenance of the facilities.

The project achieved notable progress in instituting community-based participatory management systems. The management of the facilities was entrusted to the Gambia Ports Authority for Jetty and Kanifing Municipal Council for Bakoteh Fish Market. Community Fish Centers committees, which represent the fishery community, manage the inland landing sites.

The project entered contractual agreements with these management entities to ensure that operation and maintenance of the infrastructures. Integral into these agreements was the adoption of infrastructures management business plans striving for financial viability.

The recurrent cost of the fishing infrastructure was to be covered by the revenues generated by the management of the fishing port, fish market and inland landing sites (e.g. landing fees, tariffs, user fees

---

---

on facilities used by the fishery community). The Gambia Government and the Gambia Ports Authority were to apply, for example, appropriate and competitive tariffs and prices that attract optimal number of fishing vessels to keep the Jetty fully utilized and profitable.

The progression towards public-private type of business partnership and self-financing scheme indicates the project was on a path towards financial sustainability, especially if the project and CFCs were also able to develop and implement business plans involving beneficiary communities for inland landing facilities.

The PCREN rates satisfactory (3)

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

The project is notable particularly in its contribution towards instituting decentralized management systems, i.e. delegating the management of the Banjul fishing jetty and central market, and promoting co-management arrangements between beneficiary communities and authorities (e.g. the CFCs managing the inland landing facilities). The CFCs were attracting other countries to visit and learn from their management practices.

The project had carried out a series of training in management skills, fish quality control assurance and environmental training for operators in the artisanal and industrial fisheries respectively. Such training would enable the operators in both the artisanal and industrial fisheries to manage their businesses better in particular the management of the fisheries infrastructure provided for community fisheries centers (CFCs).

The PCREN rates satisfactory (3)

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

The project approach of combining a bottom-up approach (community participation) with a top-down approach (central government intervention in a framework of increasing decentralization) instils sense of project ownership. The mainstreaming of the participation of beneficiary communities through the project's decision making process and strengthening their capacity would improve the project acceptability and effectiveness.

PCREN rates satisfactory to the project's efforts to promote ownership and partnership.

**o. Environmental and social sustainability:**

The government along with the stakeholders prepared an environmental and social management Plans (ESMP) at the early stage of project implementations. The implementation of these plans significantly guided the mitigation and monitoring of all environmental and social issues.

The construction of infrastructure took environmental and climate proof elements into consideration to minimize impact on the environment. Participatory workshops and training of beneficiaries were undertaken on sustainable fishing practices including the use of appropriate gear, closure periods and appropriate waste disposal mechanisms.

The National Environmental Agency provided the relevant capacity and human resources needed for the implementation of the ESMP.

The PCREN rates satisfactory (3)

---



---

## **4. PERFORMANCE OF STAKEHOLDERS**

---

### **a. Bank performance:**

The Bank contributed to the formulation of the project involving participation of stakeholders. The Bank performed reasonably well in assisting the PIU in implementing the project despite frequent change in task managers. The Bank ensured the project management adhered to the loan conditions. It closely monitored the progress of the project by fielding 12 missions. It was actively involved in the resolution of problems at different stages of the project cycle. One issue that arose during implementation was the response to the request of the Government of the Gambia for supplementary loan (UA 5 million) to fully implement the project. The Bank timely approved the supplementary loan, which was critical for completion of the key component of the project. The Bank also provided guidance to ensure that appropriate measures were taken by the borrower to establish sustainable mechanisms for the sustainability project outcomes and outputs.

PCREN rates satisfactory (3)

### **b. Borrower performance:**

The Borrower initiated and participated in the development of the project, as well as mobilization of external financing. The Borrower was slow but fulfilled the commitments stipulated in the loan agreements. However, its counterpart contribution was low through the project duration. The project regularly reported progress in its performance.

The Borrower contributed to the strengthening of institutions (e.g. CFCs and public-private partnership in project management). It also promoted self-financing schemes for the sustainability of the benefits of the project ex post.

Overall, the performance of the Borrower, particularly the Ministry of Fisheries and Water Resources (MOFWR) and the associated implementing agencies, was satisfactory. The PCREN rates 3.

### **c. Performance of other stakeholders:**

---

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

---

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

Overall, the PCREN rates the project performance satisfactory: (1) objective highly relevant, (2) design satisfactory, (3) implementation effectiveness weakly satisfactory, (4) positive progression towards achieving project objective, (5) inefficiency indicates there is still scope for improving economic worthiness, and (6) mechanisms are in place for sustainability.

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

Standard M&E and reporting. PCREN rates satisfactory (3)

---

---

## 6. EVALUATION OF KEY LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

---

### a. Lessons learned:

1. Delay in implementation has the potential to escalate cost results either in downsizing a project or requiring additional funding. GAFDP required supplementary loan to fully implement the project over an extended period of time.
2. The causes for implementation delay and cost escalation are many; poor design (not properly estimating the cost at entry, non-aligning project size to capacity to implement, and insufficiently accounting for risks/threats) and weakness in implementation (poor coordination/harmonization of co-financing). The GAFDP demonstrates the effect of the occurrence of multiple factors in a project's life time.

### 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.

---

## 7. COMMENTS ON PCR QUALITY AND TIMELINESS

---

PCREN rates 2

---

## 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	4	4	
Relevance of project design	3	3	
<b>EFFECTIVENESS</b>			
Development objective (DO)	3	3	
<b>EFFICIENCY</b>			
Timeliness	2	2	
Resource use efficiency	4	3	The rating does not properly capture the inefficiency of the project
Cost-benefit analysis	4		The ERRs reported in the PCR show the economic worthiness of the project. The PCREN could not confirm.
Implementation progress (IP)	3	3	Despite the long duration and difficulties
<b>SUSTAINABILITY</b>			
Financial sustainability	3	3	

Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities	3	3	
Environmental and social sustainability	3	3	
<b>OVERALL PROJECT COMPLETION RATING</b>	3.25	3.1	Satisfactory
Bank performance:	3	3	
Borrower performance:	3	3	
Performance of other shareholders:	3	3	
Overall PCR quality:		2	

---

**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			
	Relevance of project design (from approval to completion)			
<b>OVERALL RELEVANCE SCORE</b>				
EFFECTIVENESS*	<b>Effectiveness in delivering outcomes</b>			
	Outcome1			
	Outcome2			
	<b>Effectiveness in delivering output</b>			
	Improved jetty infrastructure and facilities constructed and operational			Progress to target is 100% (PCR)
	Three inland fish landing sites rehabilitated and operational			Progress to target is 100% (PCR)
	Construction of central modern fish market, Bakoteh			Progress to target is 100% (PCR)

Criteria	Sub-criteria	PCR work score	IDEV review	Reasons for deviation/comments	
	Training of fisheries staff and project beneficiaries			Progress to target is 102% (PCR)	
	Line of credit established and credit distributed			Progress to target is 125% (PCR)	
	<b>Development objective (DO)</b>				
	Development objective rating				
	<b>Beneficiaries</b>				
	Beneficiary1				
	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				
	Gender				
	Environment & climate change				
	Poverty reduction				
	Private sector development				
Regional integration					
Other (specify)					
<b>EFFECTIVENESS OVERALL SCORE</b>					
EFFICIENCY	Timeliness (based on the initial closing date)				
	Resource used efficiency				
	Cost-benefit analysis				
	Implementation progress (from the IPR)				
	Other (specify)				
<b>OVERALL EFFICIENCY SCORE</b>					

Criteria	Sub-criteria	PCR work score	IDEV review	Reasons for deviation/comments
SUSTAINABILITY	Financial sustainability			
	Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities			
	Ownership sustainability and of partnerships			
	Environmental and social sustainability			
<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.				
(i) Very Good (HS) : 4				
(ii) Good (H) : 3				
(iii) Fair (US) : 2				
(iv) Poor (HUS): 1				

### **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>			



## 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	2	Limited rigor in analysis to substantiate text
2. Extent of objectivity of PCR assessment score	2	Sometimes not supported by empirical evidence
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	Disconnect between rating and text
4. Extent of identification and assessment of key factors (internal and exogenous) and unintended effects (positive or negative) affecting design and implementation	1	Rare in conceptualizing in cause-effect framework to identify 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	Limited
7. Overall adequacy of the accessible evidence (from PCR including annexure and other data provided)	2	Limited
8. Extent to which lessons learned (and recommendations) are clear and based on the PCR assessment (evidence & analysis)	2	Opportunity missed to learn from the project. The PCREN identifies two lessons to draw from the project documents
9. Extent of overall clarity and completeness of the PCR	1	
Other (specify)		
<b>PCR QUALITY SCORE</b>	<b>2</b>	
PCR compliance with guidelines (PCR/OM ; IDEV)		
1. PCR Timeliness (On time = 4; Late= 1)		
2. Extent of participation of borrower, Co-financiers & field offices in PCR preparation		
3. Other aspect(s) (specify)		
<b>PCR COMPLIANCE SCORE</b>	<b>2</b>	
*** rated as Very Good (4), or Good (3), or Fair (2), or Poor (1)		

## **References**

African Development Bank. 2013. The Gambia Artisanal Fisheries Development Project (GAFDP). Project completion report for public sector operations (PCR)

African Development Group. 2013. The Gambia – AfDB/World Bank Joint Assistance Strategy, 2012-2015. Regional Department West II (October).

African Development Bank Group. 2009. The Gambia – Country Portfolio Performance Report. Regional Department West II (October).

African Development Group. 2009. The Gambia Artisanal Fisheries Development Project (GAFDP). Supplementary loan project appraisal report (March).