## 1. BASIC INFORMATION
### a. Basic project data
- **Project title:** Fufulso–Sawla Road Project
- **Project code:** P-GH-DB0-016
- **Instrument number(s):** 2100155019117
- **Project type:** Investment
- **Sector:** Transport
- **Country:** Ghana
- **Environmental categorization (1-3):** 2

### Processing Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Events</th>
<th>Disbursement and Closing date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date approved: 24 Nov 2010</td>
<td>Original disbursement deadline: 31 Dec 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date signed: 02 Dec 2010</td>
<td>Original closing date: 31 Dec 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of entry into force: 02 Dec 2010</td>
<td>Revised disbursement deadline: 30 Jun 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date effective for 1st disbursement: 6 Mar 2011</td>
<td>Revised closing date: 29 Dec 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date of actual 1st:** 23 Nov 2011

### b. Financing sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financing source/ instrument (MUA)</th>
<th>Approved amount (MUA):</th>
<th>Disbursed amount (MUA):</th>
<th>Percentage disbursed (%):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loan: ADF</td>
<td>109,720,000.00</td>
<td>80,784,631.23</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant:</td>
<td>860,000.00</td>
<td>1,117,149.52</td>
<td>129.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (ex. Co-financiers):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>110,580,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>81,901,780.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>74.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Co-financiers and other external partners:

**Execution and implementation agencies:** Ministry of Roads and Highways; Ghana Highway Authority

### c. Responsible Bank staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>At approval</th>
<th>At completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Director</td>
<td>Mr. E.G. Taylor-Lewis/Mr. J. Litse</td>
<td>Mr. Abdellatif Bernoussi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country Manager</strong></td>
<td>Mr. A. Jeng</td>
<td>Mrs. Marie-Laure Akin-Olugbade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Director</td>
<td>Mr. R. Rakotobe/G. Mbesherebusa</td>
<td>Mr. Amadou Oumarou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Manager</td>
<td>Mr. H. Kamoun/Mr. A. Kies</td>
<td>Mr. Jean Kizito Kabanguka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Manager</td>
<td>Mr. J.K. Nyasulu/Ms. Lydie Ehouman</td>
<td>Ms. Mam Tut Wadda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Task Manager</td>
<td>Mr. R. Sherman/Mr. M. Kane</td>
<td>Mrs. Sheila Enyonam Akyea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR Team Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Sheila Enyonam Akyea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR Team Members</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Peter Ofori-Asumadu (Consultant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Summary from Appraisal Report including addendum/corrigendum or loan agreement, and taking into account any modification that occurred during the implementation phase.

The project was to address development constraints caused by poor road infrastructure in the Northern Region of Ghana, one of the more impoverished and isolated regions of the country. It consisted of the construction of a 147.5 km road between Fufulso and Sawla as well as associated socio-economic infrastructure. The estimated project cost, exclusive of taxes and duties, was UA 110.58 million, comprising UA 86.06 million in foreign costs and UA 24.52 million in local costs. The project was to be financed by an ADF (UA 109.72 million) Grant and Government of Ghana (GOG)’s counterpart funds (UA 0.86 million). GOG’s contribution was intended to cover compensation and resettlement costs as well project coordination related costs.

a. Rationale and expected impacts:
Provide a brief and precise description on the project/programme rationale (concerns/questions raised), expected impacts and the intended beneficiaries (directly or indirectly impacted by the project/programme). Highlight any change that occurred during the execution phase.

The Fufulso-Sawla road was earmarked by GOG for upgrading to enhance regional and national integration and because it had a high priority ranking in the trunk road network of the country. It was an important national road as it was the shortest link between Tamale (the largest city in Northern Ghana and the Northern Region Capital) and Wa (the capital of the Upper West Region). This road was considered important in the development of the area, but its poor condition severely hampered mobility and access to socio-economic infrastructure.

The primary and direct project beneficiaries of the project would include the inhabitants in the immediate vicinity of the road. Other project beneficiaries included diverse stakeholders at local, regional, and national levels.

b. Objectives/Expected Outcomes:
Provide a clear and concise description of the project objectives, expected outcomes, and intended beneficiaries. In so doing, highlight any revision/amendment.

The sector goal was to provide an integrated, viable and sustainable transport infrastructure to meet the goals of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) regional integration
strategy.

The project objective was to enhance accessibility along the Fufulso-Sawla road and improve livelihoods of the beneficiaries in the project area of influence.

The expected outcomes included better access to an all-season road within two km of their homes, reduced transport costs by 30 per cent, reduced travel time by two hours, more tourists and revenue from visitors to Molo National Park, and fewer traffic accidents.

c. Outputs and intended beneficiaries:
Provide a clear and concise description the expected outputs and intended beneficiaries. In so doing, highlight any revision/amendment.

Outputs included construction of 147.5 km of road, awareness campaigns, tourism-related infrastructure, access roads, weighbridges, community water supply, rehabilitation of existing schools and health facilities, markets, lorry parks and a grain storage area. Beneficiaries included local inhabitants, tourists, and road users.

d. Principal activities/Components:
Provide a clear and concise description of the principal activities/components. In so doing, highlight any revision/amendment.

Road construction works (UA94.48 million):

- Construction of 147.5 km of road between Fufulso and Sawla including lined drains at major settlements along the road;
- Environmental and social impact measures;
- Sensitization of project area inhabitants on HIV/AIDS and STIs; malaria and water related diseases; road safety; and environmental protection;
- Construction of infrastructure in support to tourism (parking spaces, sign posts along the road and in the Mole National Park; construction of a conservation museum at the entrance to the Mole National park;
- Construction of 6 km of access roads and drive ways to socioeconomic infrastructure along the road;
- Construction of two permanent weighbridge stations;
- Works construction supervision

Ancillary works (UA8.21 million):

- Water supply for the communities along the road corridor;
- Support to women's agro-processing activities along the road corridor;
- Rehabilitation of existing schools (classrooms, equipment/furniture, sanitation, boreholes, fencing) along the road corridor;
- Rehabilitation of existing health facilities: a) Health posts and Community Health Services Compounds (CHPS) (works, equipment and solar panels), b) Construction of an accident
center midway along the road (at the existing District Hospital at Damongo and provision of ambulances);

- Construction of markets and lorry parks in Larabanga, Busunu, Fufulso, Sawla and Damongo;
- Rehabilitation of the grain storage area at Damongo
- Design and supervision of ancillary works

Studies (UA1.54 million)
- Road studies

Project Management (UA 6.31 million)
- Project coordination;
- Technical assistance to the Project Coordination Unit (PCU)
- Project impacts monitoring and evaluation
- Financial and technical auditing

Compensation and resettlement (UA 0.05 million)
- Compensation and resettlement costs for project affected persons (PAPs).

3. PROJECT PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

RELEVANCE

a. Relevance of the project development objective:
Evaluation of the relevance ex-ante and ex-post (including during the implementation phase). The relevance of the project objective (during the evaluation ex-ante and the post-evaluation) in terms of alignment with country’s development priorities and strategies, the beneficiary needs (including any changes that may have occurred during the implementation), applicable Bank sector strategies, the Bank country/ regional strategy, and general strategic priorities of the Bank. This criterion equally assesses the extent to which the project’s development objective was clearly stated and focused on outcomes and the realism of the intended outcomes in the project setting.

Reviewer’s rating 4 (fully achieved). Ghana developed a Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy (GPRS II, 2006 – 2009), which was anchored on three pillars: i) Private Sector Competitiveness; ii) Human Resource Development; and iii) Good Governance. GPRS II highlighted the importance of transport infrastructure as an enabler for economic growth and poverty reduction. In 2010 GPRS II was replaced by the Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda, (GSGDA I, 2010-2013 and followed by GSDGDA II, 2014-2017). The strategic vision of the GSGDA II was to reduce poverty while achieving the Millennium Development goals within the context of the country’s long-term policy objective of achieving middle-income status by 2020 and becoming a leading agro-industrial country.

The Borrower considered transport infrastructure to be a critical means to achieve sustainable economic growth and to reduce poverty. Transport was a key focus area of the Bank’s Ghana Ten Year Strategy 2013-2022 whose five core operational priorities were: infrastructure development, regional integration, private sector development, governance and accountability, as well as skills and technology. The overall thrust of the Fufulso-Sawla road project was to support the improvement of the investment environment through transport infrastructure development. It was intended to contribute to the Country Strategy Paper transport objectives of improving trade corridors and accessibility to markets.

b. Relevance of project design (from approval to completion):
The evaluator should provide an assessment of the relevance of the project design regardless of the one provided in the PCR. The
evaluator will also comment on the PCR conclusion for this section, and will provide an evaluation of the relevance of the project design. The latter assesses the soundness and the timing of eventual adjustments, or technical solutions to ensure the achievement of the intended results (outcomes and outputs), the adequacy of the risk assessment, environmental and social protection measures, as well as the implementation arrangements. For Programme Based Operations (PBO), an assessment will be made on the relevance of the prior actions, the policy dialogue and the extent to which the operation could have been more pro-poor in its design.

Reviewer’s rating 4 (fully achieved and included innovative ideas). The feasibility study and detailed engineering design considered for the Fufulso-Sawla road took into account both local generated and diverted traffic that would result from the improvement in the road surface condition as indicated by the origin-destination surveys that were carried out. The project road was in a rural setting and in terms of implementation, was sub-divided into two lots: Lot 1 (Fufulso-Larabanga, km 0+000 to 80+000) and Lot 2 (Larabanga-Sawla, km 80+000 to 147+500). The design comprised construction to double bituminous surface treatment standard with 7.3m two-way single carriageways plus 2.5m shoulders on each side of the road.

The feasibility and detailed design studies for the road were completed in 2003. However, an update of the design was carried out in 2010 and economic rates of return were reassessed prior to project appraisal. Pre-existing flooding problems, primarily due to inadequate or non-existent road drainage structures, were mitigated by the provision of roadside earth drains, lined drains and culverts. Even though there were no facilities regarding the development of ICT infrastructure and water service lines in the project area, provision was made in the project design for the installation of protective/service ducts (transverse) for utility services at the settlement areas along the road. This was to help prevent unnecessary future road cutting for installation of services. In this project, the payment of compensation prior to the commencement of the works was a condition precedent to first disbursement. This assisted in averting delays due to the removal of both authorized and unauthorized structures from the right of way (ROW) to ensure the works commenced in a timely manner.

The project also sought to provide integrated solutions to rural development, through ancillary works including the construction/rehabilitation of key socioeconomic infrastructure, such as educational and health institutions, markets and lorry parks, water supply through construction of a water treatment plant, provision of boreholes, and rain water harvesting, women’s agro-processing centers, grain storage centers, and tourism facilities. This was fully discussed with the local communities.

EFFECTIVENESS

c. Effectiveness in delivering outputs:
Evaluation of the extent to which the project achieved its stated results (obtained from the logical framework) based on the last Implementation Progress and Results Report (IPR) and by considering accurate reporting of direct or indirect evidence on intended and unanticipated outputs. In the absence of sufficient data (as direct evidence), indirect evidence (such as project outcomes and other pertinent processes/elements of the causal chain) should be used particularly in the evaluation of the extent to which the project is expected to achieve its stated results/ objectives. The absence of sufficient data to assess the effectiveness should be indicated (and clearly detailed in the PCR quality evaluation section). The PCR score should equally be indicated in this section.

The reviewer rating for outputs is 4 (fully achieved). The 147.5 km road was fully completed including an increase in scope to include widening, major culverts and drainage crossings. Socio-economic infrastructure (20 per cent of the cost) was completed that included 41 boreholes (as opposed to the target of 20. Some 88 per cent of these were solar powered. It also included a water treatment plant at Fufulso
providing water to 7,000 people and creating a by-product of fertilizer from residual sludge. Nine schools were rehabilitated (target seven) including classrooms, teacher’s quarters, and water and sanitation facilities. Four of the five proposed markets with lorry parks were constructed. Six km of access roads to Molo Park were all completed as planned and in addition a further 6.75 km of access roads were built to serve Damango Hospital, the Fufulso Water Treatment Plant, and the agricultural college. Two axle load control stations were also constructed as planned.

There are two outputs that need explanation namely: the tree planting activity was incomplete when the PCR mission took place. The remaining seedlings of the approved tree-types were being nursed for planting during the next rainy season and the proposed market/lorry park that should have been constructed at Larabanga was replaced (by agreement) with a parking lot at the Mystic Stone Tourist Center and a long bus-bay because a market had already been constructed in the town. The eight community health post services were all upgraded to Health Centers and the Damango Hospital rehabilitation induced the University of Development Studies to use it as a teaching hospital. All the other outputs exceeded the respective anticipated targets set during the appraisal.

The project benefited women in that a total of 536 women were temporarily employed during the road and ancillary works construction. Provision of the ancillary facilities such schools and hospitals including quarters for the teachers, and promoted the education of girls and easier access to health care and freed up more time for women to attend to activities that would improve their livelihoods. Access to clean drinking water also helped eliminate water borne diseases such as Guinea worm, which was prevalent in the area. Furthermore, the provision of potable water in the PA has positively impacted women who are mainly responsible for finding water for the family. Petty trading, which mostly involves women, along the road (including handicrafts for tourists and food produce) has been on the increase and provision of markets and lorry parks helped create venues closer to their homes for them to trade.

Monthly/Quarterly Reports and Payment Certificates were submitted as required, but the Borrower Completion Report was still under preparation at the time of the PCR mission. Audit reports, (technical and financial) were submitted as scheduled. There were no adverse findings in financial management.

d. Effectiveness in delivering outcomes:
Evaluation of the extent to which the project achieved its intended set of outcomes (including for Program Based Operations (PBOs) where complementary measures are necessary for their implementation, namely public awareness, policy dialogue and institutional arrangements for instance). The evaluator should make an assessment based on the results of the last project Implementation Progress and Results (IPR). The evaluator shall indicate the degree to which project outcomes (intended and unanticipated) as well as reasons for any eventual gap were discussed in the PCR.

Improved road network in good and fair condition. The target was 75 per cent and 70 per cent was achieved (93.3 per cent of target). This was a difficult indicator to achieve because the network goes well beyond the project road. Increased trade was anticipated between Ghana and the other ECOWAS countries. The targeted increase was US$ 52 million. The actual increase was US$ 394.5 million. While this far exceeds the target there were issues of attribution with this indicator. However, it is likely that it was fully achieved. The Rural Access Indicator (which assesses the percentage of people with all-season access to transportation) had a target of 85 per cent and 84.9 per cent was achieved, so this target can be considered achieved. Vehicle operating costs for road users was to be reduced by 30 per cent and 52.3 per cent was achieved. In cost terms this was a reduction from US$ 1.13/km to US$ 0.62/km. Travel time was to be reduced from five hours to three hours. The actual figure achieved was two hours and 25 minutes. The
number of visitors to Mole National Park was to increase by 16,000, but 17,742 was achieved. This figure could have been higher, but the number of overseas visitors was lower than expected because of an Ebola outbreak in 2014. Nevertheless, the income received tripled. The number of people with access to potable water increased by 34,000, while it became unnecessary to travel 87.5 km to the nearest hospital as there was now one at Damango. A new stream of income now comes from the markets/lorry parks.

e. Project development outcome:
The ratings derived for outcomes and output are combined to assess the progress the project has made towards realizing its development objectives, based on the rating methodology recommended in the Staff Guidance Note on project completion reporting and rating (see IPR Guidance Note for further instruction on development objective rating).

Reviewers rating 4 (fully achieved). Although two out of the seven outcomes, namely improved road network condition and improved access to all-season public transportation within two km of their homes, scored 93.3 and 99.8% of the targeted values respectively, they had a national rather than a local dimension. All other outcomes exceeded their targets.

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.

The PCR does not provide numbers for the categories of user (although they were obviously calculated), but as seen below in all cases the percentages exceeded 100. Just over half of the beneficiaries were women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual (A)</th>
<th>Planned (B)</th>
<th>Progress towards target (% realized) (A/B)</th>
<th>% of women</th>
<th>Category (e.g. farmers, students)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Users (Transport operators, travellers, pedestrians)</td>
<td>Road Users (Transport operators, travellers, pedestrians)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>Students, vehicle operators, traders, importers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational institutions</td>
<td>Educational institutions</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>Students, pupils, tutors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health institutions</td>
<td>Health institutions</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>Patients, medical personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism industry</td>
<td>Tourism industry</td>
<td>110.9</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, trade and processing industries</td>
<td>Agriculture, trade and processing industries</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>Farmers, Traders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating 4.

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.

Some unanticipated outcomes were:

- The number of fuel service stations in Damango has increased from one to five and the biggest provision shop in Damango has increased six fold in size;
- As a result of the implementation of the Fufulso Water Treatment Plant the residual sludge can be
used as fertilizer for farming;
  - Due to the improvements to the Damango and Sawla health facilities a safety net has been provided for pregnant women and vulnerable groups. The Damango Hospital reported zero maternal mortality since August 2014 to the time of the PCR mission.
  - A new hotel has been established at the Mole Park, which will boost tourism in the area.

EFFICIENCY

h. Timeliness:
The timeliness of project implementation is based on a comparison between the planned and actual period of implementation from the date of effectiveness for first disbursement. For Programme Based Operations (PBOs), the timely releases of the tranche(s) are assessed through this same criterion.

Planned project duration was 3.92 years and actual was 4.00. The ratio of planned and actual implementation time was 0.98. Reviewer rating 4 (fully achieved).

Despite scope increase, the project experienced only a one-month delay from the planned schedule. This was achieved due to the following actions:
  - Approval was given for an advance procurement action and this averted an additional 13 months delay in completing the project.
  - The contracts for the ancillary works were approved as sub-contracts to the two main contracts (Lots 1 & 2) and this averted management problems including delays that would have resulted if these smaller contracts had been awarded directly to local contractors and suppliers.

i. Resource use efficiency:
Provide and assessment of physical implementation (based on outputs delivered) against resources used (based on cumulative commitments) at completion for all contributors to the project (the Bank, Government, and others). This criterion would normally not apply to PBOs, as there is often no direct link between the outputs and the amount of contribution (in which case the rater would indicate N/A).

Reviewer rating 4 (fully achieved). The ratio of the median percentage physical implementation and the commitment rate was 1.37. Civil works for both contracts were fully completed at the time of the PCR mission with recommendations made for identified defects to be corrected within the contracts’ defects liability periods. All other activities were deemed satisfactorily completed during the PCR mission including the furniture and equipment supplied to the schools and health facilities. The project was able to implement more socio-economic facilities than anticipated due to savings on the project (i.e. Boreholes - 20 proposed, but 41 constructed and access roads 6km proposed, but 12.75km constructed).

Due to depreciation of the cedi, the project had to approve additional funds up to 50 per cent of the original contract sums to cover price contingencies. This was not specific to the project but widespread on all infrastructure projects implemented in the country during this period. The project was able to absorb these costs due to the low contract amounts.

j. Cost-benefit analysis:
Provide an assessment of the timeliness of the development outputs, and the extent to which costs of the costs have been effective and have been provided in the most efficient manner. The PCR rating should be discussed. The evaluator should verify whether the benefits of the project (achieved or expected) exceed its actual costs. To achieve this, evidences will mainly be based on a comparison between Economic Rates of Return (ERR) calculated at appraisal, the mid-term review and completion. When commenting PCR ratings, the degree of utilization of valid sources for evidence justifying the rating assigned should be taken
into consideration. The evaluator should ensure of the validity of assumptions and that the same model was used for the calculation of others ERRs. For PBOs for which this calculation model does not apply, an assessment could be done with regards to the contribution of policy reforms to economic growth. In the absence of sufficient evidence, an appropriate rating should be assigned.

Reviewer rating 3 (substantially achieved). The standard cost benefit analysis methodology comparing the scenarios “with” and “without” the project over 20 years was the basis of the economic analysis using the HDM-IV model. The calculation of the economic internal rate of return (EIRR) was based on the estimated levels of traffic, as well as the economic costs and benefits of the various components of the project. Economic costs were assessed to include the costs of capital investment as well as construction and routine and periodic maintenance costs. The project benefits such as vehicle operating costs, time savings and salvage value served as inputs to the model. Other benefits (included at completion, but not quantified at appraisal), stemmed from better drinking water, the eradication of Guinea worm disease, improved access to health care and education facilities, and stimulus to tourism and trade were also included. The EIRR at appraisal was 17.62 per cent, while at completion it was 20.1 per cent at a 12 per cent discount rate. The ancillary works represented about 20 per cent of the project cost. While this result is satisfactory no details were given of the methodology used and assumptions made for the benefits of the ancillary works. For example, it is known that the tourism and trade figures were influenced by other factors.

k. Implementation progress:
The assessment of the Implementation Progress (IP) on the PCR is derived from the updated IPR and takes into account the all applicable IP criteria assessed under the three categories: i) Compliance with covenants (project covenants, environmental and social safeguards and audit compliance), ii) project systems and procedures (procurement, financial management and monitoring and evaluation), and iii) project execution and financing (disbursement, budget commitments, counterpart funding and co-financing).

Reviewer rating 3 (substantially achieved). Although the IP rated the project satisfactory there were some issues that lowered the rating: the fact that progress on site four months after the official date of commencement was 0%, the mobilization of the supervising consultant team was significantly delayed, while lack of access to a quary site along the road and granting of custom duty and taxes exemptions caused further delays. Some types of loan conditions regarding taxes and levies would be better excluded from the loan conditions and rather advanced through development policy or sector reform loans. It must however be noted that none of the project objectives were jeopardised. PRC Rating 2.64.

SUSTAINABILITY

1. Financial sustainability:
Provide an assessment of the extent to which funding mechanisms and modalities (eg. Tariffs, user fees, maintenance fees, budgetary allocations, other stakeholder contributions, aid flows, etc.) have been put in place to ensure the continued flow of benefits after completion, with particular emphasis on financial sustainability. For PBOs, the assessment should focus on financial sustainability of reforms, as well as the Bank’s policy dialogue to promote financial sustainability of the reforms.

Reviewer rating 3 (substantially achieved). The Road Fund is the main source of funding for road maintenance in Ghana. The main contributors to the Road Fund are a fuel levy (currently 70 per cent), road and bridge tolls, vehicle licensing, and international transit fees (30 per cent). Though the fuel levy and some others fees were adjusted in 2014 (e.g. the fuel levy was increased from GHS 0.023/l in 2003 to GHS0.073/l in 2014), Government was not able to meet its pledge in 2001 made in a Policy Letter to the International Development Agency to increase the fuel levy by US$0.01/l annually till it reached the equivalent of US$0.095 in 2009. The 2014 rate was eroded by the depreciation in the local currency. This
implied that adequate funds might not be available for road maintenance. The Ghana Highway Agency (GHA) received an average of US$36 million annually from the road fund for the period 2012-2014. This was less than 50 per cent of maintenance needs. However, GoG increased the fuel levy to US$0.10/l beginning January 2016 through an Energy Sector Levy Act, (Act 899, 2015). This increased the total Road Fund revenue by 259 per cent in 2016. This will allow for 100 per cent maintenance provided that this level is continued.

Regarding the socio-economic infrastructure there is little information. The District Assemblies intended to use their technical committees to ensure that budgets were appropriated and adequate maintenance carried out on the facilities provided. Any future evaluation should ascertain whether this intention was being carried out. The West Gonja District Assembly intended to award the Fufulo Water Treatment Plant to a private firm to manage and maintain the facility. This also could be checked in any subsequent evaluation.

m. Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities:
Provide an assessment of the extent to which the project has contributed to the strengthening of institutional capacities – including for instance through the use of country systems – that will continue to facilitate the continued flow of benefits associated with the project. An appreciation should be made with regards to whether or not improved governance practices or improved skills, procedures, incentives, structures, or institutional mechanisms came into effect as a result of the operation. For PBOs, this should include an assessment on the contributions made to building the capacity to lead and manage the policy reform process; the extent to which the political economy of decision-making was conducive to reform; the Government’s commitment to reform; and how the design reinforced national ownership.

Reviewer rating 3 (substantially achieved). The formation of a Project Coordinating Unit (PCU) under the GHA contributed to resolving the challenges in project implementation. The technical assistance provided by the consultant in particular assisted in the orderly execution and management of the project. The directive from the GoG for the PCU to directly process interim payment certificates (IPC) so that they no longer went through the bureaucracy at the Regional Coordinating Councils and Ghana Highway Authority Head Office, greatly reduced delays associated with IPC processing and payment. IPC processing, which previously lasted for over four months, was reduced to a maximum of two months with few exceptions. Speedy IPC processing and payments reduced liquidity constraints on the contractor. According to the PCR there is a need to train more of the staff of GHA in the procurement, disbursement and fiduciary procedures of the Bank.

The involvement of the opinion leaders and local authorities (West Gonja, Central Gonja and the Sawla-Tuna-Kalba districts.) ensured that local area specific challenges impacting negatively on project implementation, such as acquisition and access to borrow sites, clearing of illegal and legal structures in the right of way, were readily resolved.

n. Ownership and sustainability of partnerships:
Provide an assessment of whether the project has effectively involved relevant stakeholders, promoted a sense of ownership amongst the beneficiaries (both men and women) and put in place effective partnerships with relevant stakeholders (e.g. local authorities, civil society organizations, private sector, donors) as required for the continued maintenance of the project outputs. For PBOs, the assessment should measure the extent to which the Government’s capacity to conduct consultations during policy dialogue and the extent to which the Bank supported the Government in deepening the consultation processes.

Reviewer rating 4 (fully achieved). The Fufulo–Sawla project lies in one of the more impoverished and isolated regions of Ghana. The potential of the improved road to enhance access to socio-economic infrastructure was regarded as a major event and therefore engendered strong acceptance and ownership
The development approach whereby ancillary works were included, involving the upgrading of facilities such as health, water, education, market, lorry park, tourism etc. - further increased the community benefits and acceptance of the project. The potential to enhance access to the rich agricultural lands beyond the Mognori bridge, the rehabilitation of the grain storage shed at Damango culminating in a reduction in post-harvest losses and improvements at the Mole Park with the attendant increase in the number of tourists visiting the area, were expected to lead to improved livelihoods through employment generation, increased income for businesses and a reduction of poverty.

Acquisition and access to borrow sites, clearing of illegal and legal structures in the right of way were some of the challenges faced during project implementation. The involvement of the opinion leaders and local authorities in resolving these challenges was useful and timely. Decisions regarding the nature and location of specific facilities were resolved with their assistance. This model has Government support and is to be replicated across the country. A delegation from the Transport Sector from Togo conducted a study tour to learn about the project.

Environmental and social sustainability:
Provide an assessment of the objectivity of the PCR rating on the project’s implementation of environmental and social mitigation/enhancement measures with regard to the Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP), the capacity of country institutions and systems, as well as the availability of funding to ensure the environmental and social sustainability of the operation. This criterion would normally only apply to Environmental Category I and II projects.

Reviewer rating 3, (substantially achieved). The Environmental and Social Management Plan implementation was timely and satisfactory. There was adequate governmental and institutional capacity to ensure the sustainability of the project. Most environmental impacts such as erosion, dust and pollution were mitigated during project implementation. Watering of the road during construction, grassing of slopes along the road and planting of trees (about 16,000 at the time of PCR mission instead of the proposed 20,000) among other measures has been accomplished. The replacement of trees cut as a result of construction works and planting additional ones will assist in the restoration of the vegetation and to generally improve the environment. The remaining trees will be planted in the next rainy season.

The project had positive socio-economic impacts and improved conditions of people living in the zone of influence.

4. PERFORMANCE OF STAKEHOLDERS

a. Bank performance:
(Preparation/approval, ensure of Quality at Entry (QAE) : quality of the supervision, completion) : Provide observations on the objectivity of the PCR ratings and feedback provided by the Borrower, and if necessary, re-assess the Bank’s performance throughout the project cycle (design, implementation, completion) by focusing on evidence from the PCR in relation to 7 criteria defined in the PCR Guidance Note.

Reviewer rating 4 (fully achieved). According to the Borrower, the Bank performed satisfactorily in overall project implementation. There were no significant deficiencies. The Bank performed satisfactorily in preventing and resolving project problems; was quick in terms of responses and approvals to correspondences. The Borrower attributed this to the presence of Bank staff at the Ghana Field Office. The Bank effected prompt payment, mostly within the stipulated 56 days in the contracts, to the contractor. The Bank performed creditably by organizing procurement, fiduciary and disbursement workshops and seminars for Borrower staff.
According to the self-evaluation, the project design was adequate to achieve the project objectives. The design review prior to implementation enabled the project to be presented with the best technical solution moving forward. The objectives were relevant to Ghana’s developmental priorities as outlined in the Ghana CSP (2005-2009). The Bank complied with all the agreements that were signed under the project and proactively facilitated the successful completion of the project by identifying problems that could hinder progress and helping to resolve them in a timely manner. The setting up of a local Bank Field Office allowed for frequent Bank supervision missions and consultations, which led to recommendations and action plans that improved project implementation. The Bank also facilitated the setting up the PCU comprising persons that were requested to individually sign a performance contract and a TA to assist the PCU. These arrangements helped to avoid substantial delays and cost overruns on the project.

b. Borrower performance:
Provide observations on the objectivity of the PCR ratings, and if necessary, re-assess the Borrower’s performance throughout the project cycle (design, implementation, completion) by focusing on evidence from the PCR in relation to questions defined in the PCR Guidance Note.

Reviewer rating 3 (substantially achieved). The performance of the implementing agency in ensuring quality preparation and implementation was largely satisfactory. The advanced procurement action (APA) approved by the Bank helped in reducing the procurement of works and services by the agency. Though delays in the procurement processes and line of approvals contributed to about a year delay in starting the project it would have been worse had the APA not been in place. Monitoring and Evaluation of the project was satisfactory. The PCU kept good track of activities, and within schedule. Recommendations and action plans were followed, and advice was sought from the Bank local staff when issues needed to be clarified. Approvals from the Bank were sought as needed for any work plan modification, procurement, changes or site relocation. The Borrower ensured active participation of the relevant stakeholders in project implementation. Notwithstanding the minor start up challenges, the PCU performed satisfactorily over the project duration. The Borrower’s completion report was still in preparation at the time of the PCR mission. Rating 3.

c. Performance of other stakeholders:
Provide observations on the objectivity of the PCR ratings, and if necessary, re-assess the other shareholders’ performance throughout the project cycle (design, implementation, completion) by focusing on evidence from the PCR in relation to relevant questions specific to each stakeholder (co-financiers, NGO, contractors and service providers).

Reviewer rating 3 (substantially achieved). The opinion leaders, traditional authorities and the local authorities were instrumental in the acquisition and access to borrow sites and clearing of illegal and legal structures in the right of way, and this enhanced the progress of works. The local authorities also assisted in the acquisition of sites for the water treatment plant, schools, markets, clinics, etc. The consultant also discharged his assignment satisfactorily except that all decisions on design changes and claims were passed on to GHA without an independent opinion. During the supervision the consultant displayed appreciable knowledge of the project objectives and strategies to achieve them.

The consultant ensured approvals were sought for any major changes in design, time and management of the project. Supervision of contractors was effectively undertaken and issues arising out of the project were promptly brought to the attention of all stakeholders. Progress reporting was on schedule and reports were
submitted to the Bank in good time. The contractors, to a large measure, also co-operated with the consultant and other stakeholders of the project to ensure speedy progress of the work. The contractors’ executed their duties satisfactorily.

5. SUMMARY OF OVERALL PROJECT PERFORMANCE

a. **Overall assessment:**
Provide a summary of the project/programme’s overall performance based on the PCR 4 key components (Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Sustainability). Any difference with the PCR and the reasons that have resulted in them should be mentioned. For cases with insufficient evidence (from the PCR and other documents) available, the evaluator should assign a partly satisfactory rating (to be revised) until a post project performance evaluation (e.g. PPER, PER or PRA) is complete.

With high relevance, high effectiveness, and satisfactory efficiency and sustainability this project overall was rated 4 highly satisfactory with only minor weaknesses. Many of the outcome targets were exceeded and virtually all the outputs were achieved.

b. **Design, implementation and utilization of the M&E (appreciation of the evaluator):**
Provide an assessment of planned and actual cost of the design, implementation and utilization of the M&E system. Design : To which extent the project M&E system was explicit, adequate and realistic to generate and analyse relevant data; Implementation : To which extent relevant data was collected – Elements of M&E implementation and effectiveness in the PCR; Utilization : degree of utilization of data generated for decision-making and resource allocation – elements of M&E utilization in the PCR.

The M&E design was satisfactory and well implemented, but there is insufficient information to ascertain whether the Borrower used the tracking information for decision-making. The overall M&E performance score was 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. This project is in line with the country’s priorities, as a developing country with a huge shortfall in infrastructure needs, as outlined in the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy II and the Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda. With this project, the Bank has provided support to the Government’s efforts at improving road infrastructure as well as education, health, agriculture, tourism, water, trade and environmental sustainability. The infrastructure provision will facilitate integration of the project area into regional markets. **As written this is a conclusion not a lesson.**

2. Most of the donor partners in the transport sector face similar issues to those confronted in this project. The transport sector-working group requested the Bank to share its experiences on this project and also shared best practices on other donor funded transport projects. These interactions should continue. **Agreed.**

3. Past and recent experiences with road projects in Ghana demonstrated the need for a dedicated PCU. This ensures smooth project implementation and minimizes procurement and disbursement delays. **Agreed.**
4. This project successfully brought together different development sectors under one package to deliver a socio-economic program. Additionally, packaging the ancillary works with the main road contract instead of tendering as different contracts ensured that all works were delivered under the responsibility of one main contractor (for each of the two lots). The Government intends to replicate this model. *Agreed.*

5. Supervision was continuous, hands on and more than the prescribed “twice in a year”. This allowed continual assessment of progress, more interaction with stakeholders and led to timely and realistic technical solutions. *As written this is a conclusion not a lesson.*

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.

*The reviewer is in agreement with these recommendations.*

1. Maintain the Transport Sector Working group. Regularly meet, dialogue and share experiences to improve policies in the transport sector.

2. The continuous use of the PCU for Bank financed projects is recommended. The PCU in the Fufulso project contributed significantly in meeting project implementation targets and achieving project objectives.

3. With the increasing size of the road network, the Government of Ghana should implement and maintain measures to frequently raise and adjust Road Fund annual revenues so that maintenance requirements can be met. Implementing agencies should also prioritise road maintenance as a first call on their annual roads budget.

4. The District Assemblies need to ensure that they budget to maintain the facilities placed under their care. Adequate monitoring and auditing of revenues collected by agents (communities or private sector) for this purpose is essential.

5. Capacities of ministries, departments and agencies in the transport sector must be enhanced. This will lead to improved project implementation and achievement of project objectives. Continuous training in donor guidelines should be provided as this will reduce or eliminate the back and forth submissions of reports and approvals.

6. Slow payment of Interim Payment Certificates for Counterpart Funds can retard progress of the entire project. A solution is to ensure that a year’s estimated payments are deposited into an escrow account to be replenished annually. This improves the contractor’s cash flow and timely completion of projects.

7. COMMENTS ON PCR QUALITY AND TIMELINESS
The overall PCR rating is based on all or part of the criteria presented in the annexe 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-finanicer, and the bank’s external office(s) are rated as follows: Very Good (4), Good (3), Fair (2), Poor (1).

The PCR was in general satisfactory, reviewer rating 3. Most information was available to support the ratings, except that the cost benefit analysis covering the assumptions and details for assessing the socio-economic benefits was not described in the PCR. There was also a tendency to exaggerate the impacts by using words such as “immensely” and “tremendously”. There was insufficient information to understand the extent to which the Borrower and the field office contributed to PCR preparation.

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”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>PCR</th>
<th>PCREN</th>
<th>Reason for disagreement/ Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELEVANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of project development objective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of project design</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EFFECTIVENESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development objective (DO)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EFFICIENCY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource use efficiency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-benefit analysis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inadequate information concerning calculation of socio-economic benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation progress (IP)</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUSTAINABILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial sustainability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Some doubt about continuing Borrower commitment to sufficient funds for maintenance, despite recent legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership and partnerships</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental and social sustainability</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL PROJECT COMPLETION RATING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank performance:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrower performance:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance of other shareholders:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall PCR quality:</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Very Good</strong> – Fully 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>IDEV review</th>
<th>Reasons for deviation/comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELEVANCE</strong></td>
<td>Relevance of the project development objective (DO) during implementation.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance of project design (from approval to completion)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL RELEVANCE SCORE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EFFECTIVENESS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Effectiveness in delivering outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome1</td>
<td>improved network condition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Just below target; 93.3 per cent achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome2</td>
<td>increased trade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attribution issues, but likely achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome3</td>
<td>access to all-season road</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Target 85 per cent. 84.9 per cent achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome4</td>
<td>reduced transport cost</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Target 30 per cent; actual 52.3 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome5</td>
<td>reduced travel time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Target 3 hours, actual 2 hours 25 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome6</td>
<td>increased tourists</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Except international tourist deterred by Ebola outbreak; local tourist numbers made up for this. Target 16,000 visitors; actual 17,742.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome7</td>
<td>increased tourist revenue</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Target increase of GHS 139,438; actual GHS 462,764.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness in delivering output</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output1</td>
<td>147.5 km road</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fully achieved including widened scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Sub-criteria</td>
<td>PCR work score</td>
<td>IDEV review</td>
<td>Reasons for deviation/comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output2 HIV/AIDS awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Over 50,000 people reached by campaigns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output3 Tree planting</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Incomplete. Balance of trees (27 per cent) to be planted in next rainy season</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output4 Boreholes and pipelines</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Target 20 boreholes; 41 achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output5 Classrooms, teacher’s quarters and school sanitation</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Target seven schools rehabilitated; nine achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output6 Accident Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Completed as planned. 78 per cent reduction in fatalities due to close proximity of center.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output7 Compounds and health posts</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eight completed and upgraded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output8 Markets and lorry parks</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>All except one completed. In the one case a market had already been built and so a second was unnecessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output9 Access roads</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Six km planned and 12.5 km actually constructed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output10 Axle load control</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Two control centers built as planned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output11 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Borrower completion report not yet submitted, but all other reporting completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output12 Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>All completed satisfactorily including urban transport planning and detailed design for Accra NE roads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output13 Audits</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Completed with no adverse findings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Development objective (DO)**

| Development objective rating | 4 | 4 | Project completed successfully |

**Beneficiaries**

| Beneficiary1 Road Users (various) |  | 4 | Actual figures not provided in PCR, which used percentages. All achieved more than 100 per cent. |
| Beneficiary2 Socio-economic related |  | 4 | Actual figures not provided in PCR, which used percentages. All achieved more than 100 per cent |

**Unanticipated outcomes (positive or negative not considered in the project logical framework) and their level of impact on the project (high, moderate, low)**

| Institutional development | 3 | |
| Gender | 3 | Some useful disaggregated information |
| Environment & climate change | 3 | Except for tree planting no issues. |
| Poverty reduction | 4 | Substantial but not quantified progress |
| Private sector development |  | |
| Regional integration | 3 | Road is important link with neighbouring state |
### Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Sub-criteria</th>
<th>PCR Work score</th>
<th>IDEV review</th>
<th>Reasons for deviation/comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EFFECTIVENESS OVERALL SCORE

#### EFFICIENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-criteria</th>
<th>PCR Work score</th>
<th>IDEV review</th>
<th>Reasons for deviation/comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness (based on the initial closing date)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource used efficiency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-benefit analysis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation progress (from the IPR)</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OVERALL EFFICIENCY SCORE

#### SUSTAINABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-criteria</th>
<th>PCR Work score</th>
<th>IDEV review</th>
<th>Reasons for deviation/comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial sustainability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Road Fund revenue increased in 2014, but some doubt as to ability to continue with new rate because of difficult economic conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership and sustainability of partnerships</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental and social sustainability</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Satisfactory except for tree planting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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).*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Bank supervision (mix of skills in supervisory teams, etc)</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of responses to requests</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL BANK PERFORMANCE SCORE** | 4 | 4 |

**BORROWER PERFORMANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of preparation and implementation</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with covenants, agreements and safeguards</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of timely counterpart funding</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness to supervision recommendations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures taken to establish basis for project sustainability</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of preparing requests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL BORROWER PERFORMANCE SCORE** | 3 | 3 |

**PERFORMANCE OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeliness of disbursements by co-financiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functioning of collaborative agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of policy dialogue with co-financiers (for PBOs only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of work by service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness to client demands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS** | 3 | 3 |

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, IMPLEMENTATION AND UTILIZATION OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION (M&E)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Sub-criteria</th>
<th>IDEV Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E DESIGN</td>
<td>M&amp;E system is in place, clear, appropriate and realistic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan were duly approved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>In appraisal report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existence of disaggregated gender indicator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline data were available or collected during the design</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>In most but not all cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other, specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL M&amp;E DESIGN</td>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>The M&amp;E function is adequately equipped and staffed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL M&amp;E IMPLEMENTATION SCORE</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E UTILIZATION</td>
<td>The borrower used the tracking information for decision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Insufficient information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL M&amp;E UTILIZATION SCORE</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL M&amp;E PERFORMANCE SCORE</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PCR QUALITY EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>PCR-EVN</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1-4)</th>
<th>QUALITY OF PCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Extent of quality and completeness of the PCR evidence and analysis to substantiate the ratings of the various sections</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Extent of objectivity of PCR assessment score</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Extent of identification and assessment of key factors (internal and exogenous) and unintended effects (positive or negative) affecting design and implementation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Adequacy of treatment of safeguards, fiduciary issues, and alignment and harmonization</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Extent of soundness of data generating and analysis process (including rates of returns) in support of PCR assessment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Overall adequacy of the accessible evidence (from PCR including annexure and other data provided)</td>
<td>3</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Extent of overall clarity and completeness of the PCR</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR QUALITY SCORE</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PCR compliance with guidelines (PCR/OM ; IDEV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1-4)</th>
<th>PCR COMPLIANCE SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. PCR Timeliness (On time = 4; Late= 1)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Extent of participation of borrower, Co-financiers &amp; field offices in PCR preparation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other aspect(s) (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR COMPLIANCE SCORE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** rated as Very Good (4), or Good (3), or Fair (2), or Poor (1)
References

1. Ghana Fufulso-Sawla Road Project, Project Appraisal Report, 2010
2. Ghana Fufulso-Sawla Road Project, PCR, November 2015.
3. Various supporting documents from project files.