

PCR EVALUATION NOTE FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

1. BASIC INFORMATION			
a. Basic project data			
Project title: Tunisia Road Project V			
Project code: P-TN-DB0-009	Instrument number(s): AFDB loan		
Project type:	Sector: Transport		
Country: Tunisia	Environmental categorization (1-3) :		
Processing Milestones	Key Events	Disbursement and Closing date	
Date approved: 11/06/2008	Cancelled amount:0	Original disbursement deadline: 55 months	
Date signed: 22/10/2008	Supplementary financing: NA	Original closing date: 31/12/2013	
Date of entry into force: 11/05/2009	Restructuring: NA	Revised disbursement deadline: 91	
Date effective for 1st disbursement: 11/05/2009	Extensions (specify dates): 30/06/2015; 31/12/2015	Revised closing date: 31/12/2016	
Date of actual 1st: 23/07/2009			
b. Financing sources			
Financing source/ instrument (MUA)	Approved amount (MUA): (Note: Approval figures in appraisal lower than disbursed amount)	Disbursed amount (MUA) :	Percentage disbursed (%):
Loan:		174.330.000.00	100.00
Grant:			
Government:		107.161.858.00	90.91
Other (ex. Co-financiers):			
TOTAL :		281.491.858.00	88.42
Co-financiers and other external partners:			
Execution and implementation agencies: Ministry of Equipment, Housing and Regional Development, General Directorate of Highways (DGPC)			
c. Responsible Bank staff			
Position	At approval		At completion
Regional Director	Jacob Kolster		Jacob Kolster
Sector Director	Gilbert Mbeshherubusa		Amadou Oumarou
Sector Manager	Juste Rwamabuga		Abayomi Babalola
Task Manager	MD Gangare		Papa Mamadou Fall
Alternate Task Manager			
PCR Team Leader			Papa Mamadou Fall

PCR Team Members		Andrianorsion R Rakotobe
d. Report data		
PCR Date : 27/11/2016		
PCR Mission Date:	From: 18/10/2016	To: 03/11/2016
PCR-EN Date:		
Evaluator/consultant: Herminia Martinez	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.

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.

At the time of appraisal, the road network required modernization. Despite its considerable paved length, the network did not provide an adequate level of service; the roads, which are better adapted to traffic needs (currently total less than 50% of the paved network (6000 km). The country's transport policy aimed at putting in place an efficient transport system providing high quality, least cost services. The project was in line with the 2007-2011 development plan and with the Bank's policy for Tunisia.

The political changes that began in 2011 took place during project implementation, which resulted in substantial changes in personnel in the Government and had an impact on the implementation of most government programs.

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 project objective is to improve level of service of the classified road network so as to increase intra and inter regional and improve the accessibility of the country's principal development poles.

The project will have an important economic impact, and will reduce vehicle-operating costs and time travelled and while at the same time improving safety

The project outcomes are to build up the capacity of rehabilitated roads in terms of condition of carriage way structures and their size and to make the main roads made secure in 11 Governorates with appropriate crossing structures.

The project was not amended during implementation.

c. Outputs and intended beneficiaries:

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

The project outputs are:

- The rehabilitation of 36.5 km of road bypasses in the main towns of Tunisia, and the Greater Tunis Area;
- Road rehabilitation (374.1km); road reinforcement (640.4 km); and construction works on highway structures (14). (Appraisal Report page v).

Project outcomes include the reduction in the capacity constraints in the Tunisian road network, a reduction in vehicle operating

costs and a reduction in time travelled. As the road network is brought to an acceptable standard, road maintenance should prove more efficient.

Project beneficiaries are the population of 19 of the 24 Governorates of Tunisia

d. Principal activities/Components:

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

The project consists of the following components:

A. Road Works

A.1 Development road works (by-passes of the towns of Beja, Jendouba, Sidi Bouzid, M'Saken- Est at Sousse and El Hamma at Gabes) modernization of the following sections: GP6D at Beja, GP2 between Enfida and Kairouan and GP3-Fahs to Zaghouan;

A.2 Rehabilitation works on 374.1 km of classified roads;

A.3 Reinforcement works on 640.4 km of roads; and

A.4 Construction works on 14 highway structures

B. Works supervision Services

B. 1 Works supervision and coordination of project activities;

B2. Consultants' assistance assignments for the inspection and monitoring of the development road works and highway structure works.

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 PCR rates this criteria as highly satisfactory; this evaluation concurs

Improvement of the road network is a priority for Tunisia's economic growth. The project was part of the government's development plan for 2007-2011 and in line with the Bank strategy for Tunisia. Although not explicitly stated in the PCR, and improvement of the road network continues to be priority

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 PCR rates this criterion satisfactory; this evaluation judges it unsatisfactory for the reasons listed below: ,

-The appraisal does not show clear links between project activities, and expected outputs/outcomes. Only some indicators are quantified Missing for instance is the base year reference for the reduction in transit time and reduction in vehicle operating costs. At appraisal, the logical framework in the project should have been more detailed and include base year and target figures. Base

year data could have been gathered early in the project.

-The PCR notes that the road choices were changed during implementation, and indicates that the implementation arrangements (choice of roads) were cumbersome. It recommends the use a “program based” approach for the selection of roads. It also notes that weak feasibility studies during preparation resulted in delays and cost overruns. _

_The PAR notes that follow up of project indicators will be done by agencies usually tasked with project execution implementation but does not establish a monitoring system. The Monitoring and Evaluation system was also not developed during supervision, which is reflected in the lack of data in the PCR.

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 PCR rates this criterion as highly satisfactory; this evaluation rates it as satisfactory. At the time of the PCR, one of the output indicators in the PCR was surpassed; two were achieved or almost achieved, and one was 83% achieved and the planned works were expected to be completed in 2017 with government financing. Work on road bypasses was underway.

	Planned	Actual	
Road bypasses	36.5 km for 5 towns	20.5 for 3 towns	56%. (bypasses on 4 other towns underway).
Road modernization (4 lane)	89 km	74	83%. (works on 29km underway)
Rehabilitated Roads	374.5 km	371.8 km	99.4%
Reinforced Roads	640.5 km	1065	166%
Construction Works	14	14	

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 PCR rates this criterion as satisfactory; this evaluation concurs although it notes the lack of information on outcomes.

Four indicators are discussed in the PCR as follows:

-One, dealing with capacity enhancement of roads was partly met, although the PCR notes that the indicator could not have been achieved as a result of work on this project alone (capacity constraints decreased from 40% in 2008 to 25% at the end of the project).

-Vehicle-operating costs on a sample of roads fell to 0.6% to 13.5% against a planned 10% to 45% at the beginning of the project (PCR does not indicate origin of the estimate).

-The road maintenance budget increased substantially during the period from TN 58.2 to TND 211, which suggests increased maintenance although the PCR notes that this is not a direct reflection of the quality of maintenance.

-There was no data on time reduction.

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 rates this criterion as satisfactory. This evaluation concurs. At the time of the PCR output indicators appear to have been met or works are underway. Outcomes were not clearly defined at appraisal or during implementation. However the PCR shows figures that indicate a reduction in vehicle operating costs and in the network capacity constraints and an improvement in road maintenance.

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.

This evaluation rates this criterion satisfactory.

The PCR notes that the population in the North West, Center and South West benefitted particularly. Some 50% of beneficiaries were women.

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 noted in PCR. Increased road access to growth poles outside the main centers, generally benefits the poor by increasing access to markets, health and education services.

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) are assessed through this same criterion.

The PCR rates this criterion unsatisfactory; this evaluation concurs..

The ratio between the planned and actual period of implementation calculated from the date of effectiveness of the first disbursement to completion was 0.55% or unsatisfactory (<.75 and >0.50). The project was to have taken 49 months to complete and took 85 months to complete. Delays resulted form changes in work scope after contracts had been awarded. Changes in demands of owners of lands to be expropriated following the 2011 political events. The Closing date of the project was extended twice.

Details on the project completion time are given below.

Date of effectiveness of first disbursement: 11/05/09

Original closing date: 12/31/13

Actual closing date: 12/31/16

Planned implementation: 49 months

Actual implementation: 85 months

Ratio of planned to actual implementation:

0.55%

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).

The PCR rates this criterion as highly satisfactory. This evaluation is unable to score it as there is insufficient information on the scope and cost of the project (Output 1, Section B- of the PCR)

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.

The PCR rates this criterion as highly satisfactory. This evaluation rates the criterion satisfactory although it notes problems with the rate of return calculation in the PCR. The PCR methodology for calculating the ex-post rate of return is based on a sample of roads. This methodology leads to rates of return ranging from 13.6% to 45.8% but it is not clear if this is a representative sample. The methodology used in the PCR differs from that used in the Appraisal Report which uses a weighted average of costs and benefits, which is appropriate.

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 rates this criterion as satisfactory with the average of notations for the indicators used a 2.89. This evaluation assesses the criterion on the very low end of satisfactory given the observations, especially regarding financial issues, noted in the PCR.

- Bank disbursements were made against supplementary commitments, which had not been approved by the Bank.
- The financial management was evaluated as inadequate because of problems raised by the Auditor and the Bank and which the executing agency did not always take into account.
- There are differences between commitments and disbursements under the loan, which were still being reviewed at the time of the PCR.
- The process of selection of roads resulted in changes in the project composition and the PCR suggests that the process was not adapted to the project (Section II A Para. 3)

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.

The PCR rates this criterion satisfactory; this evaluation concurs.

Road maintenance is financed out of the budget and the Government has committed and allocated sufficient funds for it. Recent experience suggests that the Government will meet its commitments. Experienced local contractors do maintenance.

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.

The PCR rates this criterion satisfactory; this evaluation concurs.

The project did not include training but the PCR notes that the supervision of this project in coordination with the external consultants contributed to training in project execution. The PCR does not address issues that may have affected the project agencies following the 2011 revolution where there were substantial changes in government staffing and structures

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 rates this component satisfactory; this evaluation rates it unsatisfactory.

The Appraisal Report notes that the project received the backing of the inhabitants of the concerned Governorates but does not discuss a consultative process during project implementation. The PCR does not show evidence of active participation of the local population and administrations. The PCR notes that payment for expropriated land was delayed because new legislation had to be approved after the 2011 political events when landowners in the region increased their payment demands.

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.

The PCR rates this criterion as unsatisfactory; this evaluation concurs.

A Social and Environmental Plan was prepared prior to appraisal and is summarized in the Appraisal Report. The social and environmental measures outlined in the plan were integrated in the work plan of contractors but there was no follow up of their implementation because there was no personnel assigned to this task.

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 rates bank performance as satisfactory, and this evaluation concurs but notes the following.

- There were problems with the project design. At appraisal, the logical framework in the project should have been more detailed and include base year and target figures. Base year data could have been gathered early in the project
- The Monitoring and Evaluation system (and logical framework) was not developed at appraisal or during supervision, which is reflected in the lack of data in the PCR. The appraisal report indicated that monitoring and evaluation would be carried out by the executing agency.
- The PCR notes that the roads built differed from those planned and that a program approach would have led to better results reflecting design problems.
- The project was supervised regularly although there were frequent changes in the Bank supervision team; the location of the Bank in Tunis helped supervision. The impact of the 2011 political events other than as it relates to expropriation is or the Bank actions to deal with resulting changes are not discussed in the PCR.

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 rates Borrower performance as satisfactory; this evaluation concurs although there are concerns about financial management issues raised in the PCR

Counterpart funds were provided in time. Maintenance funds were also allocated in a timely manner. The Government financed contracts that could not be financed by the Bank. To the extent feasible, given staff constraints, the regional bureaus of the Ministry followed up on the project. The PCR does not discuss the impact on the Ministry of the 2011 political changes, which led to changes of senior personnel in many agencies.

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 rates contractors performance as good but uneven among providers; this evaluation concurs. Information on contractor performance is limited in the PCR.

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.

The project is rated moderately satisfactory (2.85). The project met a priority need. The design had limitations in the definition of the outputs and outcomes of the project. The project did not have monitoring arrangements that provided information to make accurate ex-post judgement on project outcomes. The approach to implementation relied on regular Bank procedures, which the PCR correctly considered inappropriate. Neither the monitoring and evaluation arrangements nor implementation arrangements were modified during project implementation. The efficiency of the project is difficult to evaluate because there was a change in the project composition during implementation and because the project was not completed at the time of the PCR and it is not clear what total costs are.

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.

There Appraisal Report indicated that monitoring and evaluation would be carried out by the executing agency. The PCR noted that there was no M&E follow up. The PCR notes that a data bank was being prepared at the time of PCR preparation but there appears not to have been adequate follow up.

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.

This evaluation generally agrees with the recommendations in the PCR.

Large projects dealing with a large number of roads are affected by the approach to implementation arrangements. In the case of

this project roads built differ from those planned.

The monitoring and evaluation arrangements and the lack of project data has made difficult the assessment of project impact

Right of way arrangements can cause major delays in project implementation. Changes in Government led to increased demands from those holding the right of way, and legislation had to be approved to ensure the use of lands for the project roads

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.

In a project of this type, which includes a large number of roads, the implementation arrangements should provide a clear approach for selecting/modifying the list of roads to be included in the project. The PCR suggests a program-based approach

Project benchmarks to monitor outcomes should be available by appraisal an in any event early during project implementation

The right of way for the project should be acquired before award of contracts.

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-financier, and the bank's external office(s) are rated as follows: Very Good (4), Good (3), Fair (2), Poor (1).

The PCR was completed the month of project closing and is rated satisfactory. Data on project outcomes was not developed at appraisal or implementation and the PCR based its assessment on qualitative analysis. The efficiency analysis is unclear, as explained above. Some of the ratings appear optimistic (see table in section 8).

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	PCR EN	Reason for disagreement/ Comments
RELEVANCE	4	3.0	
Relevance of project development objective	4	4	Highly satisfactory. Meets urgent needs and in line with Government and Bank policy
Relevance of project design	3	2	Unsatisfactory. Weaknesses spelled out in PCR and Section 3b above: weak logical framework; inadequate implementation arrangements; choice of lending instrument (programmatic vs. investment)
EFFECTIVENESS	3	3	
Development objective (DO)	3	3	Satisfactory. Most outputs completed or largely completed and indication outcomes positive
EFFICIENCY	3	2.66	
Timeliness	2	2	Unsatisfactory. Timeliness ratio 0.55
Resource use efficiency	4	UTS	Insufficient data to score. There are components of the project that have not been completed or paid for. It is not clear if costs are final. (Section B-Output 1 of the PCR).
Cost-benefit analysis	4	3	The analysis is based on a sample of roads and it is not clear if this is representative.
Implementation progress (IP)	3	3	Low end of satisfactory

SUSTAINABILITY	3	2.75	
Financial sustainability	3	3	Satisfactory
Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities	3	3	Satisfactory
Partnerships	3	2	Unsatisfactory
Environmental and social sustainability	2	2	Unsatisfactory
OVERALL PROJECT COMPLETION RATING	3.25	2.85	
Bank performance:	3	3	Satisfactory
Borrower performance:	3	3	Satisfactory
Performance of other shareholders:	3	3	Satisfactory
Overall PCR quality:		3	Satisfactory. Report short on outcome data, which reflects weak monitoring evaluation. Ratings generous.

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
RELEVANCE	Relevance of the project development objective (DO) during implementation	4	4	Highly satisfactory. Meets urgent needs and in line with Government and Bank policy
	Relevance of project design (from approval to completion)	3	2	Unsatisfactory. Serious weaknesses of design spelled out in report and PCR. (Section 3b: weak logical framework; inadequate implementation arrangements)
OVERALL RELEVANCE SCORE		3.5	3	
EFFECTIVENESS*	Effectiveness in delivering outcomes			
	Outcome	4	3	Satisfactory. The information in the PCR does not justify the 4 rating. Problem arising from lack of monitoring system. The vehicle operating cost figure is a sample of roads and other indicators are indirect measures of outcomes (Section 3d above)
	Effectiveness in delivering output			
	Output	3	3	Satisfactory. All outputs met or partially met.
	Development objective (DO)			
	Development objective rating	3	3	Satisfactory. Outputs mostly met
	Beneficiaries			
	Beneficiaries	NR	3	Satisfactory. PCR suggests all targets were met.
	Unanticipated outcomes (positive or negative not considered in the project logical framework) and their level of impact on the project (high, moderate, low). None discussed in PCR.			

Criteria	Sub-criteria	PCR work score	IDEV review	Reasons for deviation/comments
	Institutional development			
	Gender		3	Not rated in PCR, which notes 50% of beneficiaries, were women.
	Environment & climate change		2	Project did not follow environmental and climate change plan..
	Poverty reduction		UTS	Project likely had a positive impact in reducing poverty
	Private sector development		UTS	Road projects tend to have positive effects on small enterprise development in affected areas
	Regional integration		NA	
	Other (specify)			
EFFECTIVENESS OVERALL SCORE				
EFFICIENCY	Timeliness (based on the initial closing date)	2	2	Satisfactory, See table in section 8 above
	Resource used efficiency	4	UTS	NR See table in Section 8 above
	Cost-benefit analysis	4	3	Satisfactory, See table in Section 8 above
	Implementation progress (from the IPR)	2.89	3	Moderately Satisfactory.
	Other (specify)			
OVERALL EFFICIENCY SCORE				
SUSTAINABILITY	Financial sustainability	3	3	Satisfactory
	Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities	3	3	Satisfactory
	Ownership and sustainability of partnerships	3	2	Unsatisfactory. No evidence of sustainability as discussed above
	Environmental and social sustainability	2	2	Unsatisfactory
<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
----------	--------------	----------------	-------------	--------------------------------

BANK PERFORMANCE	Proactive identification and resolution of problems at different stage of the project cycle	NR	UTS	
	Use of previous lessons learned from previous operations during design and implementation	NR	UTS	
	Promotion of stakeholder participation to strengthen ownership	NR	UTS	
	Enforcement of safeguard and fiduciary requirements	NR	UTS	
	Design and implementation of Monitoring & Evaluation system	NR	2	
	Quality of Bank supervision (mix of skills in supervisory teams, etc)	NR	UTS	PCR notes Bank supervised regularly
	Timeliness of responses to requests	NR	UTS	PCR notes that executing agencies noted delays in Bank responses.
OVERALL BANK PERFORMANCE SCORE				
BORROWER PERFORMANCE	Quality of preparation and implementation	NR	UTS	PCR suggests there were problems with design (project should have followed programmatic approach) but does not provide discussion of problems
	Compliance with covenants, agreements and safeguards	NR	UTS	PCR suggests compliance but there were problems with audit recommendation compliance
	Provision of timely counterpart funding	NR	UTS	PCR suggests adequate provision
	Responsiveness to supervision recommendations	NR	UTR	Insufficient information
	Measures taken to establish basis for project sustainability	NR	UTS	PCR suggests adequate budgetary allocations for maintenance, but not clear in supervising ministry has adequate supervision arrangements
	Timeliness of preparing requests	NR	UTS	
OVERALL BORROWER PERFORMANCE SCORE				
PERFORMANCE OF OTHER	Timeliness of disbursements by co-financiers	NR	UTS	PCR suggests timely provision
	Functioning of collaborative agreements	NR	UTR	
	Quality of policy dialogue with co-financiers (for PBOs only)	NR	UTR	
	Quality of work by service providers	NR	UTR	PCR suggests generally good but varies according to provider
	Responsiveness to client demands	NR	UTR	
OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS				
The overall rating is given: Very Good, Good, Fair and Poor.				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Very Good (HS) : 4 (ii) Good (H) : 3 (iii) Fair (US) : 2 (iv) Poor (HUS): 1 				

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

Criteria	Sub-criteria	IDEV Score	Comments
OT	M&E system is in place, clear, appropriate and realistic	UTS	Relied on existing structures
	Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan were duly approved	UTS	
	Existence of disaggregated gender indicator	UTS	Not available
	Baseline data were available or collected during the design	UTS	Not available
	Other, specify		
OVERALL M&E DESIGN SCORE			
M&E IMPLEMENTATION	The M&E function is adequately equipped and staffed	UTS	
OVERALL M&E IMPLEMENTATION SCORE			
M&E UTILIZATION	The borrower used the tracking information for decision	UTS	
OVERALL M&E UTILIZATION SCORE			
OVERALL M&E PERFORMANCE SCORE			

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	3	PCR contains limited details/data on project, which may reflect data availability.
2. Extent of objectivity of PCR assessment score	3	Tended to be optimistic (see section 8)
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)	3	See table in 8 above
4. Extent of identification and assessment of key factors (internal and exogenous) and unintended effects (positive or negative) affecting design and implementation	3	Impact of 2011 events on project agencies could have been discussed more
5. Adequacy of treatment of safeguards, fiduciary issues, and alignment and harmonization	3	
6. Extent of soundness of data generating and analysis process (including rates of returns) in support of PCR assessment	3	There may be insufficient basic data
7. Overall adequacy of the accessible evidence (from PCR including annexure and other data provided)	3	
8. Extent to which lessons learned (and recommendations) are clear and based on the PCR assessment (evidence & analysis)	3	
9. Extent of overall clarity and completeness of the PCR	3	
Other (specify)		
PCR QUALITY SCORE		
PCR compliance with guidelines (PCR/OM ; IDEV)		
1. PCR Timeliness (On time = 4; Late= 1)	4	
2. Extent of participation of borrower, Co-financiers & field offices in PCR preparation	UTS	Information not available
3. Other aspect(s) (specify)		
PCR COMPLIANCE SCORE		
	4	
*** rated as Very Good (4), or Good (3), or Fair (2), or Poor (1)		

References