

PCR EVALUATION NOTE FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

1. BASIC INFORMATION

a. Basic project data

Project title: Congo Brazzaville: Technical Assistance Project To Develop National Skills For Support To Growth Sectors

Project code: P-CG-KFO-005 Instrument number(s):

Project type: Capacity Building Sector: Governance and Public Finance

Country: Congo Environmental categorization (1-3) : 1

Processing Milestones	Key Events	Disbursement and Closing date
Date approved: 06 Jun 2013	Cancelled amount:	Original disbursement deadline: 24 months
Date signed: 31 Jul 2013	Supplementary financing:	Original closing date: 31 Dec 2014
Date of entry into force : 31 Jul 2013	Restructuring:	Revised disbursement deadline: 31 Dec 2016
Date effective for 1st disbursement: 06 Jun 2013	Extensions (specify dates): 31 Dec 2014 to 31 Dec 2016 (24 months)	Revised closing date: 31 December 2016
Date of actual 1st : 09 Sept 2013		

b. Financing sources

Financing source/ instrument (MUA)	Approved amount (MUA) :	Disbursed amount (MUA) :	Percentage disbursed (%) :
Loan:			
Grant: ADF		1,000,000.00	95.36
Government:			
Other (ex. Co-financiers):			
TOTAL :		1,000,000.00	95.36

Co-financiers and other external partners:

Execution and implementation agencies: PIU (Project Implementation Unit) / Ministry of Finance

c. Responsible Bank staff

Position	At approval	At completion
Regional Director	J.M. GHARBI	Mrs. Marlene KANGA
Country Manager	Mr. Coulibaly MEDJOMO	Mr. Sylvain MALIKO
Sector Director	Mr. K. BEDOUMRA	Mr. Justin MURARA
Sector Manager	Mr. F. WASSEL	Mr. Ali EYEGHE
Task Manager	Mr. I.A. TRAORE	Mr. Stanny KOLOKOTA
Alternate Task Manager		
PCR Team Leader		Mr. Stanny KOLOKOTA NGAYMOKO, Task Manager,

		RDGC.2
PCR Team Members		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Vurce Arsene MAFOUTA LOSSOMBOT, Financial Management Specialist, TDFO/ORPF.2; • MARINI Daniel, Procurement Specialist, COCD / SNFI.3
d. Report data		
PCR Date : Oct 2017		
PCR Mission Date:	From: 13 Nov 2017	To: 20 Nov 2017
PCR-EN Date:		
Evaluator/consultant :		Peer Reviewer/Task Manager:

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.

This evaluation is based on the review of documents in the project including the following:

Memorandum to the President and the technical note entitled Demand for Technical Assistance to the Republic of the Congo for the Development of National Competencies in support of Growth Sectors of June 2013. The Project Completion Report for this project dated October 2017. The Aide Memoire of the June 2015 supervision mission which gives the reason for the project change in scope,

The Aide memoire of the Completion Mission of November 2018. In addition to these documents the project file also contained approval of contracts and memoranda relating to Closing Date extensions.

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 lack of an adequate labour force is a constraint to the government's efforts to increase growth and to reduce the country's dependence on oil, which represents 70% of GDP. Despite growth in the 2008-2011 period, the country's economy had not changed substantially. The technical assistance proposed was to help Congolese Government's efforts to support skills development by developing a project to support skills training in support of the growth sectors. The project was also to help develop an inventory of capacities in public finance.

The technical assistance project was financed with a grant of UC 1,000,000 from the Fragile States Facility.

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 Board approval documents suggest that the project objective is to contribute to the competencies and human resources of the Congo. Specifically, the project would finance technical assistance (i) to support the Government in the preparation of a program/project to develop human resources competencies mostly in the productive sectors; (ii) support the government in the preparation of an inventory of competencies in public administration.

The PCR notes that the project development objective is to (PCR Development Objective, Section B4): "(i) contribute to increasing

the provision of vocational training in the forest economy, mining and agro-business sectors to support diversification of the national economy; (ii) contribute to the emergence of training systems that better meet employers' needs, through the implementation of a public-private partnership framework and better monitoring of trainee integration; (iii) contribute to the structuring of employers' and craftsmen's organisations.

The project was modified in 2015. There is no indication in the PCR or the Aide Memoire of the completion mission that this change was submitted for Bank management approval. The technical assistance for the human resources study was awarded in January 2015. The Government informed the Bank's June 2015 mission that the consultant awarded the contract had not been able to provide information on the availability of key personnel to start the program. In addition, the study to formulate a project/program to develop human competencies in the productive sector had already been carried out with support from the World Bank and the European Union. The World Bank had already financed a technical assistance project in this area. The Government and the Bank agreed that the contract should not be carried out; a revised list of activities was prepared (summarized in section D below).

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 will be preparation of a program of skills development for productive sectors and an inventory of skills of public sector personnel. Neither the PCR nor the Technical Note for approval spells out project outcomes and outputs.

Given the project scope, beneficiaries will be the government which will improve its capacity to implement policies as a result of the analytical work carried out under the project and the personnel, mostly public sector, which will benefit from the training under the project, and in term, the productive sectors which should benefit from the training programs being developed.

d. Principal activities/Components:

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

At approval, the project financed two areas of technical assistance (technical annex of 2013). The PCR notes that there was substantial delay in project effectiveness and that planned activities were changed. The revised activities are not spelled out in the PCR.

1. Technical assistance of the definition of a program for skills development in the area to facilitate economic diversification, in particular in the wood, mining and agribusiness sectors. The technical assistance will survey the policies and strategies of the Government in these sectors and identify available education facilities. The TA will propose new structures as well as a summary of the proposed training arrangements, including course content. The TA will also propose other measures for the monitoring of technical and professional training. The study will also examine the demand for the skills training in the sectors identified.

2. Technical assistance to carry out an inventory of existing competencies in the Congolese public sector.

The project activities were revised in June 2015 and the following were agreed

The Bank and Government agreed on a new work program for the technical assistance envisaged, including the following:

- 1- Technical assistance for modeling public policy, which integrates inclusive growth and economic diversification: design, preparation of a budget and evaluation.
- 2- Technical assistance for government financial programming (debt; balance of payments; monetary data)
- 3- Technical assistance for the evaluation of the evaluation of the Growth, Employment and the Reduction of Poverty (DISERP)

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.

The project is in line with Pillars II and IV of the Government's Growth, Employment and Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper for 2012- (DSCERP). The second DSCERP pillar aims at growth and diversification to promote job creation. The fourth pillar is social development and inclusion. The project is in line with the Bank's strategy in the Republic of Congo (2012-2016 CSP).

This evaluation rates the relevance of the project as satisfactory because the subject of increased capacity in the country is a priority. It does not agree that the PCR rating of highly satisfactory is justified given the limited information available on the project and the economic environment.

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.

The project consists of technical assistance in priority areas, The project document includes the terms of reference for two two consultancies as well as implementation arrangements, a budget for each activity and procurement arrangements. The available approval documentation does not present planned outputs and outcomes. During the 2015 Supervision Mission, the first component of the project was dropped as the World Bank and the EU had already financed the planned studies, and the World Bank had financed a project in the area.

In view of the above, this evaluation rates project design as highly unsatisfactory. The PCR does not rate project design.

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.

Project results were not stated in the Board document. The PCR includes information on outputs that are summarized below. The referenced work falls within the scope of the technical assistance included in the TA proposal but there is no reference to the source of the information.

The PCR indicates that the outputs are as follows:

Output 1. Ministry of Finance, Budget and Public Portfolio, and the Ministry of Planning: Study on public policy modelling that integrates inclusive growth and economic diversification.

Output 2. Ministry of Finance, Budget and Public Portfolio. Study on the electronic archiving of documents of the Directorate general for the Budget in the Ministry.

Output 3. Ministry of Finance, Budget and Public Portfolio, and the Ministry of Planning. Training on the control of financial programming (TOFE, debt, balance of payments, monetary situation) as well as the preparation, implementation and monitoring of

programme budget execution (new preparation techniques, actors and roles, implementation, evaluation and reporting procedures, case studies and simulations on Ministries)

Output 4. Ministry of Planning. Study on the diversification of the Congolese economy by clusters

Output 5. Congolese Government: The Government has identified and planned specific activities to build the national system's capacity to correct the dysfunctions that affect it and limit public investments on the basis of the above studies

The PCR repeats the work carried out under 1-4 above.

- Technical assistance for modelling public policies that integrate inclusive growth and economic diversification. PCREN comment: not clear
- Technical assistance on financial programming control (TOFE, debt, balance of payments, monetary situation) as well as the preparation, implementation and monitoring of programme budget (new preparation techniques, actors and roles, implementation, evaluation and reporting procedures).
- Technical assistance for a study on the project to electronically archive documents of the Directorate General of Budget (development of IT specifications, equipment and training of workers).
- Technical assistance for the evaluation of the 2012-2016 DSCERP

This evaluation is unable to rate the output criterion on the basis of available information: the original outputs and outcomes are not listed in the Approval Documents. Outputs 1 and 5 above are not clear. The PCR rates the outcome as satisfactory

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.

The approval documents or the 2015 supervision mission do not include outcome targets. The PCR summarizes outcomes in general terms (see below). The stated achievements are not substantiated with clear references of the analytical/technical work carried out and the main conclusions work. For instance, what were the main governance weaknesses identified (under Outcome 1); what were the NDP components identified (under Outcome 2); which were the critical issues addressed and problems resolved (Outcome 3)

Outcome 1: The Government's capacity to manage problems affecting its public investment system is built up

- The Government's economic governance weaknesses have been identified and remediation recommendations have been made.
- The Inter-ministerial Directory of Trades and Skills (RIMEC) allowed for (i) the identification of cross-cutting inter-ministerial state jobs and the ones specific to Ministries and (ii) the definition of job skills the Government needs to implement the strategy of diversification

-Outcome 2: The NDP components were identified and the Ministries involved in its implementation. 72 persons including 28 women, (40% of participants) benefited from skills building for NDP implementation and monitoring in the public finances improvement area through different capacity building activities.

-Outcome 3: The Government now has the information needed to reform public investment management: About 58% of weaknesses identified at project entry in the investment cycle have been corrected. (The source for this statement is not given in the PCR). The Government is committed to implementing all the recommendations mentioned in the report. Capacity has created opportunities to organise analysis of key skills required to improve civil service professions, and in the short term, promote the gradual introduction into the Congolese public administration of performance assessment in career management.

This evaluation rates this criterion unsatisfactory. The available information on the outputs above do not provide evidence of the stated achievements does not provide a clear statement of what the outcomes were expected to be. The PCR rates this criterion as highly satisfactory

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).

The PCR notes in the section on Implementation Progress (Section C4): that "Overall, evidence indicates that the project's development objective has been achieved as significant outputs were noted."

-Ministries and other state structures have strengthened their public financial management skills. Evaluation by project beneficiaries has confirmed the active participation of staff of the Ministries concerned and the extension of training to other staff that did not participate

-These technical assistance activities have made it possible to identify different public sector professions and distinguish those that perform support duties from those involved in operational activities, define the regulations that apply to them and determine specific training needs for each profession. This assistance has fostered the introduction into the Congolese public administration performance assessment considerations in the career management.

-The capacity building strategy put in place by the project for the Government has facilitated the creation of business support units; updating of development planning instruments within each Ministry; development of monitoring and evaluation tools and various capacity building and reform interventions in the public finance sector. All these efforts have built the capacities of stakeholders and junior staff by making project gains effectively

The available project documents do not provide a clear statement of project objectives and outcomes. Available information suggests that project design was highly unsatisfactory. This evaluation rates project outcomes as unsatisfactory given the information available.

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.

Not defined in the project documents, technical assistance.. Women represented 40% of the total. The Aide Memoire of the Project Completion mission Aide Memoire indicates that 289 persons were trained as indicated below.

Beneficiaries of technical Assistance:

- Modeling public policies integrating growth and economic diversification: 75 trained
- Government financial programming: 78 trained
- Electronic filing of documents in the budget directorate: 71 trained.
- Evaluation of the DSCERP document: 65 persons trained.

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.

None reported

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 release of the tranche(s) is assessed through this same criterion.

Planned implementation period 1 year
Actual implementation period 3 years

Ratio of planned to actual 0.33

This evaluation rates this criterion as highly unsatisfactory in line with Bank guidelines, and does not concur with the satisfactory/unsatisfactory rating of the PCR (text and table are different)

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).

Ratio cannot be calculated, as it is not clear from PCR the extent of physical implementation, as it appears that there was a substantial cutback in the scope of the project following initial implementation delays. The project's planned duration was one year; the actual

duration was 3 years. This evaluation is unable to rate this criterion

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.

NA The rate of return is not calculated for technical assistance projects. The calculations in the PCR are unclear

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).

The PCR includes the following observations

-The grant was approved on 13 September 2013, became effective on 13 September 2013 and the first disbursement was made on 13 October 2015. It took more than two years before physical implementation activities began in 2016. The late take-off of the project, required the review the list of activities initially planned.

-Contract renegotiations affected the delivery period of project outputs. Likewise, the performance of some contractors was affected by the lengthy waiting time for the award of contracts and approval of the commencement of activities.

This evaluation notes that the project implementation structure described in the cover memorandum is in line with those of similar operations. It included a Technical Steering Committee (CTP) in charge of project control and guidance; a Project Implementation Unit (PIU); and activity monitoring committees under the responsibility of Ministries directly involved in the project. The PCR does not provide comments on procurement, financial management compliance with covenants which are inputs to the implementation rating

The PCR rates implementation progress unsatisfactory, although the rationale for this judgement is not clear in the PCR (the table in Section 9 shows implementation progress satisfactory. This evaluation concurs with an unsatisfactory rating

SUSTAINABILITY

l. 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.

NA

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.

Capacity building activities for the civil servants of different Ministries (Ministry of Finance and Budget, Ministry of Planning, Ministry of the Public Service), and the Studies and Planning Directorates of all sector Ministries), have probably helped improve their competencies.

Tools developed by the technical assistance providers for the abovementioned human resources departments should enable the Government to introduce results based management process. However, more efforts should be made to harmonise the various current practices and new practices introduced by the training. Ministries that have benefited from strong public finance sector results-based management support may be able to obtain enough information on the various reform outcomes in this sector, to regularly review progress made and take appropriate measures to strengthen the country's economic development.

Given the amount of money spent the technical assistance provided likely contributed to improve the competencies of the beneficiary ministries. However this evaluation is unable to rate sustainability on the basis of the information provided in the PCR. The rating for sustainability in is different in the text and in Section 9 of the report.

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 (eg. 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.

The PCR notes that ownership of project achievements would likely be enhanced because of the participation of all Ministries through the Directorates of Studies and Planning (DEP). As part of its implementation, the project benefited from the synergy of other AfDB-financed initiatives. One example is the Public Finance and Strategic Planning Technical Assistance and Capacity Building Project for which the current project plays a complementary role.

Given the evidence available, this evaluation is not able to rate this criterion; The PCR rates this criterion satisfactory.

o. 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.

NA

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.

The PCR notes that despite frequent task manager and sector manager changes and the cumbersome Bank rules and procedures, its support has been significant throughout the project cycle. An ongoing contact with the PIU addressed all activity review concerns although this was not the result on a real appraisal at project start-up. These ongoing contacts also facilitated the processing of procurement files and the timely issue of Bank notifications. This statement suggest the project unit performed well, although this is not explained in the report

The Bank provided additional comments on the PCR on its own performance (Section III A 1), which is at the end of the report.

“The project design did not did not fully address the country's socio-economic and institutional constraints. At the start of the project, the Bank was slow to respond to the country's needs resulting in a significant disbursement delay in the first years and even after the project's restructuring in 2014 (0% at the end of 2013 and 0% at the end of 2014). The project finally took off in the second half of 2015, and from then on, the support provided helped to accelerate activities (95.36% disbursement rate at the end of the project)”. This statement, which appears at the end of the report.

“From project launch to project completion in December 2016, the Bank carried out twelve (12) supervision missions. The missions were effective in identifying problems to be solved by the Government and Bank for proper implementation of the project. The Bank, however, quite quickly dealt with issues that were brought to its attention and sufficiently consistently followed up on issues brought to the Government's attention. The Bank's representation in Congo, together with the Ministry of Finance, held regular meetings with project managers to discuss issues common to all Bank-financed projects and specific to individual projects. The task manager's accessibility made it possible for the supervision team to quickly solve problems that occurred”.

This evaluation rates Bank performance as unsatisfactory given that the project design is rated highly unsatisfactory, the comments made in

the PCR and the limited information available on the project. The Peer Review concurs with this assessment.

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.

The PCR notes that the borrower's performance was affected by the late take-off, which forced it to substitute activities initially planned with new ones. The grant was approved on 13 September 2013, became effective on 13 September 2013 and the first disbursement was made on 13 October 2015. It took more than two years before implementation activities began in earnest in 2016. Contract renegotiations affected the delivery period of project outputs. Likewise, the performance of some contractors was affected by the lengthy waiting time for the award of contracts and approval of the commencement of activities.

The Government undertook to take care of project staff (compensation and payment of related costs). However, given the country's circumstances, the Government's efforts fell short. In practice, the Borrower did not ensure permanent and close project monitoring during implementation. Because working capital (operations) was not planned by the AfDB, support for national staff by the Government was insufficient. The PCR notes that local staff still benefited from their public service remunerations. But since this remuneration is not enough, the AfDB always supported them with an additional allowance. It was not the case for this project.

This evaluation is unable to confirm the PCR's moderately satisfactory rating. Given the comments on lack of counterpart support, this evaluation Government performance as unsatisfactory. The Peer Review concurs with this assessment.

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).

The PCR notes that some contractors recruited for the implementation of project activities did not live up to expectations, which led the project team to cancel commitments with some firms more than once.

In view of the PCR comment, this evaluation is not able to confirm the satisfactory rating for performance of other stakeholders. Given the paucity of information, the evaluation is unable to rate this criterion.

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.

This evaluation notes that there is insufficient information on the project provide an overall assessment of the project. The limited information available would lead to an unsatisfactory rating. The approval and supervision documents contained only a general description of the technical assistance to be financed; and procurement and financing arrangements; the PCR did not give a clear statement of project objectives, spell out the supervision history and project achievements with respect to objectives. It appears that an important study in the project had already been financed by the World Bank and EIB (Supervision Mission of June 2015 which would make project design highly unsatisfactory

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.

Subject not discussed in Project documents

6. EVALUATION OF KEY LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

a. b. Lessons learned and Recommendations:

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.

The main observation of this evaluation is that if technical assistance projects are to be evaluated ex post using the Bank standards, the Bank approval and follow-up documentation and the PCR need to include the basic information so this evaluation can be undertaken. For purposes of the ex-post evaluation, the amount of the financing or the level of AFDB approval is irrelevant (e.g., this financing was approved at the level of the President).

The PCR includes some generic recommendations that apply to most projects and which are summarized below.

- Improve quality of project design: There is a need to improve the quality of preparation studies and project implementation units should be established during preparation;
- Improve ownership of sector agencies. Project monitoring units should be set up in sector Ministries within the Directorates of Studies and Planning (DEP). The Project Implementation Unit (PIU) should be trained on Bank rules and procedures immediately after project approval
- Improve implementation: Flexible procedures should be used for certain types of procurement or national procedures adopted.
- Improve sector governance. Apply new regulations and instruments of the Central African Economic and Monetary Community (CEMAC) on public finance to create a uniform environment for the whole country and greater involvement of Ministries in project implementation.

7. COMMENTS ON PCR QUALITY AND TIMELINESS

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

The PCR is unclear. It does not provide information on the project history and objectives, which are important considering the limited information, included in the approval documents. Many ratings do not include the rationale for the rating. For instance, there is no evidence that 58% of initial problems identified in the study were solved (in outcome section). Also, there are calculation errors in such as timeliness. PCR rates criterion which are not rated for TA evaluations, (eg the cost benefit analysis). There are inconsistencies between the ratings in the text and the table summarising ratings in section 9

This evaluation rates the quality of the PCR a 1.5. The PCR was completed on time.

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
<i>Note: The limited information available to evaluator (approval memorandum and PCR) made it difficult to rate most criteria</i>			
RELEVANCE	3.5	2	Information available does not justify PCR ratings
Relevance of project development objective	4	3	
Relevance of project design	3	1	

EFFECTIVENESS	3	2	
Development objective (DO) Development Outcome Development Outputs	3	2 2	Insufficient information on objectives and results to confirm PCR ratings
EFFICIENCY	2.5	1	
Timeliness	2	1	Rate calculation in PCREN uses Bank guidelines.
Resource use efficiency	3	UTR	Insufficient information on how many of planned activities were implemented.
Cost-benefit analysis	3	NA	Rate of Return not calculated for TA projects
Implementation progress (IP)	2	2	Insufficient information on project management, including compliance with covenants and safeguards; discussion suggests procurement and counterpart funding issues.
SUSTAINABILITY			
Financial sustainability	3	NA	
Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities	3	UTR	Insufficient Information to rate. PCR rating in text 2
Environmental and social sustainability	3	NA	Rating in PCR text 2.
OVERALL PROJECT COMPLETION RATING	3	UTR	
Bank performance:	3	2	The rating takes into account the content and quality of the information in the project file.
Borrower performance:	3	2	Limited Government support (e.g., that local staff was not available to follow up the project was limited because AFDB had not paid salary supplements to local staff.
Performance of other shareholders:	3	NR	
Overall PCR quality:		1.5	

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	Very Good – Fully achieved with no shortcomings
3	Good – Mostly achieved despite a few shortcomings
2	Fair – Partially achieved. Shortcomings and achievements are roughly balanced
1	Poor – 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
<i>Note: The limited information available to evaluator (approval memorandum and PCR) made it difficult to rate many of the criteria). Criteria rated UTR is because there is insufficient information to rate.</i>				
RELEVANCE	Relevance of the project development objective (DO) during implementation	4	3	Insufficient information to confirm PCR rating
	Relevance of project design (from approval to completion)	3	2	Insufficient information to confirm PCR rating
OVERALL RELEVANCE SCORE				
EFFECTIVENESS*	Effectiveness in delivering outcomes			
	Outcome	3	2	See table in section 9 above and text
	Effectiveness in delivering output			
	Output	3	2	See table in section 9 above and text
	Development objective (DO)			
	Development objective rating	3	2	See table in section 9 above and text
	Beneficiaries			
	Beneficiary1	NR	UTR	Insufficient information See table in section 9 above and text
Unanticipated outcomes (positive or negative not considered in the project logical framework) and their level of impact on the project (high, moderate, low)				

Criteria	Sub-criteria	PCR work score	IDEV review	Reasons for deviation/comments
	Institutional development	3	UTR	
	Gender	NR	UTR	
	Environment & climate change	NA	NA	
	Poverty reduction	NR	UTR	
	Private sector development	NR	UTR	
	Regional integration	NR	UTR	
	Other (specify)			
EFFECTIVENESS OVERALL SCORE				
EFFICIENCY	Timeliness (based on the initial closing date)	2	1	As per Bank rules.
	Resource used efficiency	3	UTR	
	Cost-benefit analysis	3	-	Cost benefit analysis not calculated for TA projects.
	Implementation progress (from the IPR)	2	UTR	
	Other (specify)			
OVERALL EFFICIENCY SCORE				
SUSTAINABILITY	Financial sustainability			
	Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities	2	UTR	
	Ownership and sustainability 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).</p> <p>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
----------	--------------	----------------	-------------	--------------------------------

		Not rated in PCR	Not Discussed in PCR UTR	
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			
OVERALL BANK PERFORMANCE SCORE			U	Statement in PCR that local staff was not available to follow up the project was limited because AFDB had not paid salary supplements to local staff.
BORROWER PERFORMANCE	Quality of preparation and implementation		UTR/	
	Compliance with covenants, agreements and safeguards		UTR	
	Provision of timely counterpart funding		UTR	
	Responsiveness to supervision recommendations		UTR	
	Measures taken to establish basis for project sustainability		UTR	
	Timeliness of preparing requests		UTR	
OVERALL BORROWER PERFORMANCE SCORE			U	PCR notes tnat the ptojrvy fif no
PERFORMANCE OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS	Timeliness of disbursements by co-financiers		UTR	
	Functioning of collaborative agreements		UTR	
	Quality of policy dialogue with co-financiers (for PBOs only)		UTR	
	Quality of work by service providers		UTR	
	Responsiveness to client demands		UTR	
OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS			UTR	
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)

Criteria	Sub-criteria	IDEV Score	Comments
			Not discussed in project document or PCR. No monitoring indicators presented
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		
OVERALL M&E DESIGN SCORE			
M&E IMPLEMENTATION	The M&E function is adequately equipped and staffed		
OVERALL M&E IMPLEMENTATION SCORE			
M&E UTILIZATION	The borrower used the tracking information for decision		
OVERALL M&E UTILIZATION SCORE			
OVERALL M&E PERFORMANCE SCORE		U	

PCR QUALITY EVALUATION

Criteria	PCR-EVN (1-4)	Comments
QUALITY OF PCR		
1. Extent of quality and completeness of the PCR evidence and analysis to substantiate the ratings of the various sections	2	PCR does not include -A summary of project implementation history needed particularly why project content was modified after effectiveness. -Source of information for output and outcomes sections. For instance, the source for the statement that 58% of weaknesses identified at project entry were resolved is not given (Section B2) -No statement on whether there were outcome indicators available at start-up.
2. Extent of objectivity of PCR assessment score	2	The PCR does not contain sufficient information to support ratings, particularly on relevance, effectiveness and implementation progress.
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	There are some inaccuracies. For instance Timeliness calculation inaccurate The rate of return is not calculated for TA projects.
4. Extent of identification and assessment of key factors (internal and exogenous) and unintended effects (positive or negative) affecting design and implementation	UTR	None listed. Cannot tell from PCR whether there would be any.
5. Adequacy of treatment of safeguards, fiduciary issues, and alignment and harmonization	2	Information not available in PCR
6. Extent of soundness of data generating and analysis process (including rates of returns) in support of PCR assessment	1	Source of data not available. Timeliness calculation incorrect. Rates of return do not need to be calculated for TA projects
7. Overall adequacy of the accessible evidence (from PCR including annexure and other data provided)	1	This PCR would have benefitted from annexes showing information on project implementation including the last supervision report
8. Extent to which lessons learned (and recommendations) are clear and based on the PCR assessment (evidence & analysis)	1	Not discussed
9. Extent of overall clarity and completeness of the PCR	1	
Other (specify)		
PCR QUALITY SCORE	1.5	
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)		
PCR COMPLIANCE SCORE		
*** rated as Very Good (4), or Good (3), or Fair (2), or Poor (1)		

References