

PCR EVALUATION NOTE FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

1. BASIC INFORMATION

a. Basic project data

Project title: Arusha-Namanga-Athi River Road Development Project		
Project code: P-Z1-DB0-038 (Tanzania), P-Z1-DB0-040 (Kenya)	Instrument number(s): Tanzania: ADF Loan No. 2100150013894 and ADF Grant N° 2100155008616 Kenya: ADF Loan No. 2100150013893	
Project type: Infrastructure	Sector: Transport	
Country: Multinational: Tanzania/Kenya	Environmental categorization (1-3) : 1	
Processing Milestones	Key Events	Disbursement and Closing date
Date approved: 13 Dec 2006	Cancelled amount:	Original disbursement deadline: 31 Dec 2012
Date signed: 8 Feb 2007	Supplementary financing:	Original closing date: 31 Dec 2012
Date of entry into force : 30 April 2007 (ADF Loan No. 2100150013893); 11 May 2007 (ADF Loan No. 2100150013894); 08 Feb 2007 (ADF Grant No.:2100155008616)	Restructuring:	Revised disbursement deadline: 30 Nov 2014 (ADF Loan No. 2100150013893); 31 Dec 2014 (ADF Loan No. 2100150013894, ADF Grant No.:2100155008616)
Date effective for 1st disbursement: 04 Jan 2008 (ADF Loan No. 2100150013893); 28 Oct 2008 (ADF Loan No. 2100150013894); 29 Jun 2006 (ADF Grant No.:2100155008616)	Extensions (specify dates):	Revised closing date: 31 Dec 2014 (ADF Loan No. 2100150013893); 30 Jun 2015 (ADF Loan No. 2100150013894, ADF Grant No.:2100155008616)
Date of actual 1st : 25 Feb 2008 (ADF Loan No. 2100150013893); 21 Jan 2010 (ADF Loan No. 2100150013894); 20 Sept 2010 (ADF Grant No.:2100155008616)		

b. Financing sources

Financing source/ instrument (MUA)	Approved amount (MUA) :	Disbursed amount (MUA) :	Percentage disbursed (%) :
Loan: ADF Loan (UA 49,241,000.00)	46,588,019.94	46,727,257.08	94.90
ADF Loan (UA 537,000.00)	337,538.50	298,819.97	55.65

Grant: ADF (UA 3,501,000.00)	3,394,799.41	3,347,270.71	95.61
Government: GoT (UA 3,089,953.00)	3,089,954.00	2,920,819.00	95
Government: GoK (UA 5,621,000.00)	5,511,000.00	5,511,000.00	98
Other (ex. Co-financiers): JBIC Loan (UA 40,259,039.00)	39,650,626.31	39,060,394.79	97.02
TOTAL :	98,571,937.16	97,865,561.55	95.71
Co-financiers and other external partners:			
Execution and implementation agencies:			
c. Responsible Bank staff			
Position	At approval		At completion
Regional Director			G. Negatu
Country Manager			Tonia Kandiero
Sector Director	G. MBESHERUBUSA		Amadou Oumarou
Sector Manager	J. RWAMABUGA		Abayomi Babalola
Task Manager	M. WA-KYENDO		Patrick Tamba Musa
Alternate Task Manager			George Makajuma
PCR Team Leader			Patrick T. Musa, Transport Engineer OITC.2TZFO
PCR Team Members			George Makajuma, Infrastructure Specialist, EARC; August Mwesiga Byabato, Transport Economist/ Consultant; Erasto Machume, Transport Engineer/ Consultant OITC.2TZFO
d. Report data			
PCR Date : 10 Mar 2014			
PCR Mission Date:	From: 03 Feb 2014	To: 14 Feb 2014	
PCR-EN Date:			
Evaluator/consultant:	Peer Reviewer/Task Manager: Ram Janakiram		

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

The project for development of Arusha-Namanga-Athi River is consistent with the East African Community (EAC's) goal of developing modern regional road networks in order to accelerate regional integration and the socio-economic development of the peoples in the concerned region. Under EAC, six road corridors were identified as priority areas for action. Among these was the Arusha-Namanga-Athi River road. The Government of

Tanzania (GOT) and the Government of Kenya (GOK), within the EAC development framework, aimed at improving regional transport infrastructure in order to deepen economic co-operation and foster regional integration. It is consistent with Pillar I: Supporting Regional Infrastructure Development, of the Bank Group Regional Integration Policy And Strategy 2014–2023, and Pillar I: Promotion for Regional Infrastructure Development, of the Eastern Africa - Regional Integration Strategy Paper (Risp) 2011-2015 which specifically mentions Namanga one-stop border post as one of the achievement targets.

The Bank’s intervention in this road project is in line with the development priorities of both the Government of Tanzania (GoT) and the Government of Kenya (GoK). It is also in compliance with the Bank Group’s strategy of promoting economic co-operation, regional integration and multinational infrastructure projects. Furthermore, the project is aligned to Tanzania’s MKUKUTA (poverty strategy) and the Millennium Development Goals, which focus on poverty alleviation of its people. The project is aligned with Kenya Vision 2030 whose main objective was to help transform Kenya into a newly industrialized middle-income country providing a high quality of life to all its citizens by 2030 in a clean and secure environment

The road is considered to be of strategic importance to the region and forms part of the priority Corridor No.5 of the EAC Regional Roads Network, which spans from Tunduma in southern Tanzania to Moyale in northern Kenya, and onward to Addis Ababa. The designation of six priority corridors is a result of collaborative effort between the EAC, the Partner States of Uganda, Tanzania and Kenya and donors active in the region’s transport sector. The development of this road project was expected to facilitate movement of traffic between Zambia, Tanzania, Kenya, Uganda and Sudan. The significance of the road as a regional road network was in line with the development priorities of the GOT and the GOK and the Bank’s strategy to support multinational programs with a strong focus on regional integration among African states. EAC’s last two five-year regional development strategies (2001/05, 2006/10) highlighted the importance of all three countries collaborating in the development of the transport and communications sectors

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.

Conditions for the implementation of the East African Road Network Project included the formation of Roads Boards/Agencies, participation of the private sector, harmonization of regional policies and axle load control in the road sub-sectors. Tanzania and Kenya already had road fund boards. At the time of appraisal Tanzania had a semi autonomous road agency, while Kenya was to establish road authorities by end of 2007.

The principal beneficiaries were expected to be the tourism industry, cross border traders and socio-economic aspects of regional integration.

Problems addressed by the project were:

- Weak traffic management and road safety: Road Safety Councils, established in Kenya and Tanzania are mostly inactive. In order to alleviate the problems in traffic management and road safety some measures have been taken, such as standardization of driver training and regular updating of driving skills; as well as provision of facilities for non-motorized transport such as pedestrian crossings, footpaths, sidewalks and cycle lanes. The design of the project road has taken into account these needs and has incorporated standard engineering safety provisions such as pedestrian crossings, cycle lanes, traffic signs, speed limit signs and climbing lanes.
- Overloading by heavy goods vehicles: this is being addressed through the upgrading and establishment of additional weighbridge facilities, the checking of sealed containers at port of entry and fuel tankers at the port of loading and the banning of vehicles with illegal axle configurations.
- Lack of participation of local/regional contractors: The project has included a scoping study in the capacity building component to survey and report the problems regional contractors have experienced and to suggest a way forward.

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 objectives in the loan agreements with Kenya and Tanzania were to support regional integration, cross border trade, tourism, socio-economic development in the zone of influence, and to contribute to the reduction of poverty.

The project's narrower core objective shown in the results framework of the appraisal report was to improve road transport infrastructure between Kenya and Tanzania through priority road corridors in the sub-region. Specifically: (a) To improve transport service between Tanzania and Kenya, particularly between Arusha and Nairobi and between Malindi and Dar es Salaam; (b) To improve capacity of the EAC Secretariat, and (c) To improve contracting capacity of regional contractors.

Component	Expected outcomes
1.Rehabilitation /Reconstruction of (i)Arusha–Namanga (104 km) section in Tanzania (LotT); and Supervision	1. Improved transport service between Arusha, Namanga, Athi River and Nairobi as measured by Reduced VOCs: Reduction of composite

A one-stop border post was added later.

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 evaluator concurs with the PCR rating of 4, highly satisfactory. The EAC identified six main corridors of strategic importance within the community (a total length of some 8,300 km) that urgently needed rehabilitation and upgrading. Four of these corridors spanned the countries of Kenya and Tanzania; the lack of financial resources clearly hampered the development of the regional network. To that effect, the EAC Secretariat in collaboration with the member countries initiated donor-co-ordinated assistance in order to mobilize funds for the development of the corridors. The Bank's project fits within this broad donor assistance framework.

The project for development of Arusha-Namanga-Athi River was aligned with the East African Community (EAC's) goal of developing modern regional road networks in order to accelerate regional integration and the socio-economic development of the peoples in the concerned region. Under the EAC, six road corridors were identified as priority areas for action. Among these was the Arusha-Namanga-Athi River road. The Government of Tanzania (GOT) and the Government of Kenya (GOK), within the EAC development framework, aimed to improve regional transport infrastructure in order to deepen economic co-operation and foster regional integration. It was consistent with Pillar I: Supporting Regional Infrastructure Development, of the Bank Group Regional Integration Policy and Strategy, 2014–2023, and Pillar I: Promotion for Regional Infrastructure Development, of the Eastern Africa - Regional Integration Strategy Paper, 2011-2015, which specifically mentions a Namanga one-stop border post as one of the achievement targets.

The Bank's intervention in this road project was in line with the development priorities of both the Government of Tanzania (GoT) and the Government of Kenya (GoK). It was also in compliance with the Bank Group's strategy for promoting economic co-operation, regional integration and multinational infrastructure projects. Furthermore, the project was consistent with Tanzania's MKUKUTA (Poverty Reduction Strategy) and Millennium Development Goals that focus on poverty alleviation for its people. On the Kenya side, the project was aligned with Kenya Vision 2030, which "seeks to help transform Kenya into a newly industrializing middle-income country providing a high quality of life to all its citizens by 2030 in a clean and secure 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 evaluator concurs with the PCR rating of 3, satisfactory. The Tanzania National Roads Agency (TANROADS), the Executing Agency for lot T, (the road section in Tanzania), was well established and had a track record in implementing similar road projects. Similarly for Lot K (the section in Kenya), the Ministry of Roads and Public Works and (later) the Kenya National Road Agency (KeNHA), had implemented similar road projects. The project concept was based on the larger vision of establishing a major arterial trunk road network to facilitate trade and integration of the east African region. The design consultant used the participatory approach during the study and took into account stakeholder suggestions.

Alternatives considered in the design included various types of pavement options to carry the type of loading projected during the life of the road. The Athi River end of the project carries heavy truck loads and as the road was in average to good condition, the consideration of alternatives was between asphalt overlays and reconstruction/rehabilitation. The latter was chosen as the more appropriate. Some bridges, while in a good structural state, were found to have a low hydraulic capacity and most of them had to be replaced. The whole road length was comprised of asphalt concrete with a bituminous surface-dressing overlay to arrest cracking, which is a widespread problem in East Africa.

The project also took into account traffic safety needs and incorporated standard engineering safety provisions such as pedestrian crossing, cycle lanes, traffic signs, speed limit signs and climbing lanes etc.; and “one-stop joint border control” to address the excessive delays experienced in cargo clearance at border points.

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 evaluator rates the effectiveness in delivering outputs as 3, satisfactory.

- A total of 240 km between Arusha and Athi River was rehabilitated to the required standard of 7.0m carriageway with asphalt concrete surfacing and 2.0m double bituminous surface treatment shoulders save for a section of 10 km between Arusha and Namanga that, at the time of the PCR site visit, was yet to be accepted by the Employer due to surface irregularities. This 10 km section was to be resurfaced and/or the pavement reconstructed.
 - The feasibility study and detailed engineering design of the Arusha-Holili-Voi road was completed and works tenders were already underway. The Tanga-Bagamoyo road design was 90 per cent completed. Weighted average completion was 94 per cent.
 - A One-Stop Border Post was completed encompassing both sides of the border.
 - Two activities (technical assistance for capacity building of the EAC secretariat and the study of regional contractor capacity) were not implemented because “they were shelved out of the current project” according to the PCR. No reasons were given for this decision.
-

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 effectiveness in delivering outcomes as 4, highly satisfactory; the evaluator rates it as 3, satisfactory.

Lot T Arusha-Namanga section

- **Increased volume of motorized traffic:** The baseline value in 2006 was 1,325 vehicles per day (vpd.); the target at completion was 1,795 vpd at project completion. The most recent value was 4,278 vpd in 2014, an increase of 238 per cent. The outcome was easily achieved (the target may, however, have been set too low).
- **Increase in cross border trading:** This was not measured at the time of the PCR mission, but mentioned in the appraisal report.
- **Increased tourism activities:** This was not measured, but mentioned in the appraisal report.
- **Reduced vehicle-operating costs (VOCs):** The baseline value in 2006 was US\$0.56 per vehicle km; the target was US\$0.45 and the most recent value was US\$0.73 in 2013. The outcome was not achieved, but it was thought that the input parameters used in the HDM4 program may have been incorrect due to the unavailability of input data.
- **Reduced road roughness:** The baseline value in 2006 was 5.65 on the international roughness index (IRI); the target was IRI 2.08 and the most recent value was 2.06 in 2013. The outcome was achieved.
- **Increased length of road in good condition in the Arusha region:** The baseline value was 163 km (46 per cent) in 2006. The target was 267 km and the actual was 285 km (76 per cent) in 2013. This outcome was achieved. Information from the TANROADS website indicates that this percentage has continued to grow after the project closed.

Lot K Namanga-Athi River section

- **Increased volume of motorized traffic:** The baseline value in 2006 was 1,418 vpd; the target at completion was 1,795 vpd at project completion. The most recent value was 3,339 vpd in 2012, an increase of 186 per cent. The outcome was achieved.
 - **Increase in cross border trading:** This was not measured, but mentioned in the appraisal report. An article on the border post in April 2018 indicated that there had been a 30 per cent increase in collection revenue in comparison to the situation prior to the road being upgraded.¹
 - **Increased tourism activities:** This was not measured, but mentioned in the appraisal report.
 - **Reduced vehicle-operating costs:** The baseline value in 2006 was US\$0.78 per vehicle km; the target was US\$0.45 and the most recent value was US\$0.33 in 2013. The outcome was
-

¹ The East African, Business, April 11, 2018 www.theeastafrican.co.ke

exceeded.

- **Reduced road roughness:** The baseline value in 2006 was 5.65 on the international roughness index (IRI); the target was IRI 2.08 and the most recent value was 2.06 in 2013. The outcome was achieved.
- **Increased length of road in good condition in Kajiado district:** The baseline value was 110 km (36 per cent) in 2006. The target was 246 km, and the actual was also 246 km (81 per cent) in 2013. This outcome was achieved.

Supporting methodology and evidence for the outcomes could have been stronger.

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 the development outcome as 3, satisfactory in compliance with the 2012 guidelines while the PCR gives 4, highly satisfactory. Ratings derived for outcomes and outputs were combined to assess the progress that the project had made towards realizing its development objective. Three outcomes for both lots were fully achieved while the reduced VOCs outcomes were partially achieved. The values for VOC reduction were likely erroneous and so the reviewer believes the real values were lower. Cross border trade and tourism activities were not measured, presumably because of lack of reliable data, while the two technical assistance activities were not undertaken under this project for reasons not explained.

The traffic levels recorded after completion (2014) were much higher than anticipated. An issue therefore was whether this was a temporary phenomenon or a permanent trend. The World Food Program's publicly available data on Namanga crossing (November 2017) shows that truck traffic was 2,486.² Since such traffic is on average 22-23 percent of total traffic it is concluded that the trend has continued. In addition, some developments that may at least partially be attributable to the improved road are new cement factories opened in Athi River town; a new export-processing zone established in Kitengela and new horticultural farms opened between Kiengela and Isinya (Lot K).

The two studies, for reasons not given in the PRC, were dropped, but 97 per cent of the grant funding was expended on design and audit costs, plus some unspecified capacity building activities.

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.

Tourism operators (169) within the Arusha, Ngorogoro, Tarangire, Tsavo and Serengeti parks benefitted (as did the tourist traveling on improved roads). National and regional transport operators (174 in Tanzania and 432 in Kenya also benefitted). The general population residing in the project area were further beneficiaries, but the number of female beneficiaries could not be estimated.

The PCR does not provide any additional details of the different type of project beneficiaries and

²[2dca.logcluster.org/display/public/DLCA/2.3.10+Tanzania+Border+Crossing+of+Namanga](https://dca.logcluster.org/display/public/DLCA/2.3.10+Tanzania+Border+Crossing+of+Namanga)

supporting evidence for their validation. Other beneficiaries mentioned in the appraisal report included commercial farmers, commodity trade dealers, hotel operators, and officers in charge of regional integration and customs, local people living within the roads sphere of influence.

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.

The PCR mentions the establishment of new cement factories in Athi River town, new Export Processing Zone in Kitengela and new Horticultural farms between Kitengela and Isinya (Lot K). More details on how they have benefitted from this project would have been helpful.

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.

The evaluator concurs with the PCR rating of 3, satisfactory.

Lot T:

Implementation of the Arusha-Namanga road section did not fully adhere to the project implementation schedule as planned at appraisal. The project was approved on 8th February 2007, the 1st disbursement was effective on 11th March 2008, while the project was substantially completed on 28 February 2013. Planned completion as per project implementation schedule was June 2010. Significant extensions of time were granted to the contract due to additional works for construction of the one-stop border post at Namanga and construction of additional drainage structures due to overtopping of a section of the road by floods. The Contractor submitted a total of 24 time extension claims, but only eight were properly substantiated. A total of 29 months time extension was granted.

Lot K:

Implementation of the Namanga-Athi River road section did not fully adhere to the project implementation schedule as planned at appraisal. The project was approved on 8th February 2007, 1st disbursement was effective on 11th March 2008, while the project was substantially completed on 22nd February 2012. Planned completion as per the project implementation schedule was June 2010. A total of 17 months time extension was awarded.

The reasons for the delays were not elaborated upon in the PCR.

i. Resource use efficiency:

Provide an 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 evaluator concurs with the PCR rating of 3, satisfactory. The percentage achieved for the two outputs was assessed as 96 per cent and 94 per cent giving a median of 95 per cent. The ratio of the median percentage physical implementation of the project outputs and commitment rate was therefore between 1 and 0.75 implying that the project largely delivered the outputs expected within the available budget.

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 rating was 4, highly satisfactory, but the evaluator gives 3, because the assumptions and the methodology were not provided in detail. Economic re-evaluation was undertaken using Highway Development and Management (HDM IV) model version 2.08 at a 12 per cent discount rate with an analysis period of 20 years of road service. Two maintenance strategies were considered: (i) *“Without project”* do minimum case: Maintenance practice comprising routine maintenance, patching 100 per cent of potholes, resealing at 25 per cent cracking, and reconstructing at 8 IRI. (ii) *“With project:* Maintenance practice comprising of routine maintenance, patching 100 per cent of potholes, resealing when the cracked area reaches 15 per cent, and overlaying with 50 mm asphaltic concrete when roughness reaches 4.5 IRI m/km, with the overlay resetting IRI to 2.0. For economic re-evaluation purposes, each lot was treated as a separate project because of the different VOC data sets used by Tanzania and Kenya. The weighted average project road section parameters and traffic values were used within each lot. Accident costs were not taken into account, as accident profiles and frequency were not available. For both lots, HDM4 object files used at appraisal stage could not be obtained. The EIRR at appraisal was 15.0 per cent and at completion was 18.2 per cent. Given the higher than expected traffic the economic life of the project could be reduced.

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 evaluator concurs with the PCR rating of 3.5. The implementation progress (IP) rating was derived from the Bank’s Project Supervision Rating Reports for both Lots. The IP progress rating took into account IP assessment under the following categories viz. a) Compliance with covenants (b) Procurement performance (c) Financial performance (d) Performance on Activities and Works and (e) Impact on Development. The final IP rating is the arithmetic average of all individual ratings. Based on these ratings the evaluator concurs with the PCR

Lot T final IP rating was 3.79 while Lot K was rated as 3.31. The simple arithmetic average of IP ratings for both Lots 1 and 2 (IP= 3.55) was taken to be the overall rating for the entire project. No single item in both Lots was rated as Unsatisfactory or Highly Unsatisfactory.

SUSTAINABILITY

I. 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 evaluator agrees with the PCR rating of 3, satisfactory, but believes that more evidence could have been presented on road maintenance funding.

Lot T:

The Government of Tanzania through the Road Fund Board (RFB) allocates road maintenance funds to TANROADS for maintenance of trunk and regional roads. RFB and TANROADS have placed the highest priority on routine maintenance of all bitumen roads. It implies that, regardless of the total funding available, the project road is assured to receive sufficient routine maintenance. On average, TANROADS allocates about USD 1,600 per km per year for maintenance of paved trunk roads. The earliest the project road is likely to need periodic maintenance will be around year 2020. By then GoT will need to mobilize sufficient funding for undertaking the necessary periodic maintenance. GoT continues to strengthen the RFB resource base in order to fully close the existing road maintenance-funding gap. In financial year 2013/14 there were delays in the release of road maintenance funds.

Lot K:

The Government of Kenya through the Kenya Roads Board (KRB) allocates road maintenance funds to KeNHA for maintenance of national highways of which the Namanga-Athi River is one. KRB and KeNHA also gave the highest priority to routine maintenance of all bitumen roads. In financial year 2013/14 there were delays in the release of Government funds to all public sectors including for road maintenance funds.

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 evaluator rates this section as 2, unsatisfactory as opposed to the PCR rating of 3 because there was little supporting detail provided by the PCR on the capacity strengthening initiatives that actually took place.

Lot T:

The Executing Agency for the project was TANROADS under the Directorate of Projects. At appraisal it was confirmed that TANROADS was well established and equipped and had been successful in implementing similar road projects. TANROADS has remained robust in terms of its organization and the management of its functions. The project further contributed to strengthening institutional capacities in the TANROADS Projects Directorate.

Lot K:

The Executing Agency for the project is KeNHA, which is well established and equipped and has been successful in implementing similar road projects. KeNHA has also remained robust in terms of its organization and the management of its functions. The project further contributed to strengthening institutional capacities within KeNHA.

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 does not provide an adequate assessment – especially in the areas of the project's ability to put in place effective partnerships with relevant authorities. More details would have been useful. The evaluator nevertheless concurs with the rating of 3, satisfactory.

Lot T:

All key partners were involved to varying degrees in the implementation of the project. They include TANROADS Headquarters and Regional Offices, Regional Administrations and District/Urban Councils. Involvement of local contractors at sub-contract level to the main contractors were either very limited, not revealed, or non-existent. Involvement of local consultants was only visible in Audit services. The project offered an opportunity for training to MoW/ TANROADS staff and the transfer of expertise in road construction to local personnel working with consultants and contractors. The experience gained by local staff should be useful in future road projects. More than 90 per cent of works supervision personnel were local staff. On asset sustainability, vandalism of road signs and road furniture along the completed project road was identified as a problem that needed to be addressed. JBIC was also a partner in that they funded most of the Tanzanian section of road in a co-financing arrangement with AfDB.

Lot K:

A paragraph similar to the above was word for word the same for Lot K except for the names of the authorities. On asset sustainability, vandalism of road signs and road furniture along the completed project road does not appear to be a significant issue.

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 gives a rating of 3.5 whereas the evaluator gives 3, satisfactory.

Lot T:

The project was classified as Category 1. A full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA), including an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) was prepared by GOT and used as a tool by TANROADS and the supervision consultant to monitor the Contractor's

compliance. Environmental issues were generally well addressed. Most borrow pits have been reinstated, embankment side slopes grassed, and erosion control instituted. On social matters, the project carried out some HIV/AIDS activities/interventions but these were not properly reported. A few environmental and social shortcomings noted during the mission visit included: Constructing proper drainage outfalls on newly constructed drainage structures, as some houses at Longido Township were flooded by water from culverts directed to their houses; reinstatement of borrow sites and quarries; and conflict concerning the borrow pit site re-opening at Km 28. On a positive note, it was observed that cross-slabs had been provided to communities at strategic locations along the road. On compliance with future environmental safeguards, TANROADS has to ensure that for all its major projects the following reports are provided: (i) ESMP Completion/Decommissioning Audit reports; (ii) Completion reports on HIV/AIDS activities and lessons learnt; (iii) RAP Completion Report.

Lot K:

The project was classified as Category 1. A full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA), including an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) were prepared by GOK and used as a tool by KeNHA and the supervision consultant to monitor the Contractor's compliance. Environmental issues were generally well addressed. Borrow pits have been reinstated, embankment side slopes grassed, and erosion control instituted. On social matters, the project carried out a comprehensive HIV/AIDS programme that involved HIV awareness among the workers and the surrounding community. Issues of long term impact and were addressed including Voluntary Medical Circumcision, the increasing vulnerability of married couples to HIV infection and multiple concurrent partnerships, the need to focus more on under-served and most-at-risk populations such as: sex workers, cattle traders, and persons living with HIV, etc. The HIV/AIDS programme further approached the HIV awareness from a communal level since project workers continually interact with the community in one way or another. The impact of the HIV programme was believed to have had a long-term impact on the community that will last well beyond project completion.

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.

There was no self-evaluation, but the Borrower's assessment of the Bank's performance was provided and the PCR based a rating of 4, highly satisfactory on this assessment! The evaluator rates Bank performance as 3, satisfactory.

Lot T:

Borrower's assessment of Bank's performance: The Bank appraised the project and sent supervision missions (with appropriately mixed skills personnel) to the project at six monthly intervals. The purpose of the Bank's missions were to monitor, give timely technical guidance, promote stakeholders participation during site and wrap-up meetings and report on the project progress. The advice given by various Bank Missions was useful to GoT during the

implementation of the project. Commendable actions taken by the Bank include: (i) the acceptance to extend the loan disbursement date to allow funding and implementation to completion of additional works. (ii) Approval of Addenda for construction of the one stop border post and the associated supervision contract.

It is noted that the Borrower fulfilled all conditions precedent for the first disbursement on 17 October 2007 and the Bank approved this on 22 January 2008. The delay contributed to the overall start-up delay.

Lot K:

Borrower's assessment of Bank's performance: The Bank appraised the project and regularly sent supervision missions to the project. The purpose of the Bank's mission was to monitor and report on the project progress. The advice given by various Bank Missions was useful to the Government during the implementation of the project.

b. Borrower performance:

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

The evaluator concurs with the PCR rating of 3.

Lot T:

Compliance with Project Covenants was Highly Satisfactory. All project covenants were fulfilled by the GoT. However, the Borrower's compliance with fiduciary requirements was Unsatisfactory as there were significant delays in the payment of the GoT portion of several interim payment certificates (IPCs) leading to accumulated interest on the delayed payments. The Roads Agency performed satisfactorily in the submission of the Audit Reports, but Employer's project completion report was delivered late. The Borrower was responsive to Bank supervision findings and recommendations. The Borrower's compliance with Environmental Safeguards was Satisfactory. The ESIA and Environmental Management & Monitoring Plan were prepared by the GoT and were used as tools by TANROADS and the supervision consultant to monitor the Contractor's compliance. The Government generally agreed to the Bank's supervision mission findings and recommendations.

Lot K:

Compliance to Project Covenants was Highly Satisfactory. GoK fulfilled all project covenants. However, the Borrower's compliance with fiduciary requirements was Unsatisfactory as there were significant delays in the payment of the Government portion of several IPCs leading to interest on the delayed payments. The Roads Agency performed satisfactorily in the submission of Audit Reports but the Employer's project completion report was not delivered. The Borrower was responsive to Bank supervision findings and recommendations. The Borrower's compliance with Environmental Safeguards was Satisfactory. The ESIA and Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan were prepared by GoK and were used as tools by KeNHA and the supervision consultant to monitor the Contractor's compliance.. KeNHA managed the implementation well although at one time project funds were exhausted due to additional works.

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 evaluator concurs with the PCR rating of 3, satisfactory.

Lot T:

Contractors: The quality of the work performed by the Contractor and the firm's relationship with the Executing Agency and the Consultants was good. However, the Contractors failed to furnish Performance Guarantees on time, which delayed the actual commencement of works for about three months.

Supervision Consultants: Overall, the Consultants' supervision services were commendable. Quality assurance plans, inspection of workmanship, checking of measured quantities and testing for the conformity with specifications were done to the satisfaction of the Employer. Issues requiring attention of the Employer were advised in a timely manner.

Project Auditors: Three audit reports covering the project's financial and technical aspects were prepared and submitted to the Bank during the project implementation. Three audit reports covering the project's financial and technical aspects were prepared by CAG and submitted to the Bank for the periods 2009/10, 2010/11 and 2011/12. The requirement was for the Auditors to provide annual project reports and a final audit report at completion of the project. A final audit report on completion of the project has yet to be prepared.

EAC Secretariat: (Strictly speaking not a stakeholder, but a project beneficiary). The performance of the EAC Secretariat in managing design contracts despite their limited technical staff capacity was satisfactory. The delayed completion of some design activities was due to external factors, but their intervention was appropriate.

Lot K:

Contractors: The quality of work performed by the Contractor and the firm's relationship with the Executing Agency and the Consultants was generally satisfactory.

Supervision Consultants: Overall, the Consultants' supervision services were commendable. Quality assurance plans, inspection of workmanship, checking of measured quantities and testing for the conformity with specifications were done to the satisfaction of the Employer. Issues requiring attention of the Employer were advised in a timely manner.

Project Auditors: Audit reports covering the project's financial and technical aspects were prepared and submitted to the Bank during the project implementation. A final audit report at completion of the project was yet to be prepared.

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.

Overall, the evaluator rates the project a 3, satisfactory. The project development objective of this regional project was highly relevant, but the design could have been improved if the tourism and trading activity indicators had been pursued. The project was effective in that most outcomes and outputs were achieved albeit with a delay of 17 months because of the addition of the One-stop border post (of which very little was reported in the PCR). There was an acceptable EIRR and implementation progress was mostly satisfactory. There remain doubts about the financial sustainability of the project, although the Governments are making moves in the right direction. Despite some shortcomings in respect of Lot T, the environmental and social aspects were handled adequately. Some aspects such as beneficiaries, M&E, cost benefit analysis and financial sustainability lacked detail.

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

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

The M&E was weak and rated 2, unsatisfactory. Indicators to measure impacts of the project on tourism and cross border trade were not provided. The project matrix in the Appraisal Report did not provide the methodology to collect, process, analyze and use relevant data to monitor the outcomes and for decision making by project staff, There were inadequacies in data collection and reporting and little evidence of utilization of M&E in the PCR.

6. EVALUATION OF KEY LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

a. Lessons learned:

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

1. A full design review before tendering minimises unnecessary costs and project implementation delays. *(This is true, but a common error).*
2. Some boreholes developed by the contractors were transferred to communities along the road for their use even though the pump technically belonged to the contractor. Future project design can take into account such matters to assist affected communities. *(Agreed).*
3. Start up delays lead to a longer implementation period that may result in price fluctuations and extensions of time for completion. *(This is a perennial lesson, which is repeated too often).*
4. HDM4 object files used at appraisal stage should be made available for use during re-evaluation in order to minimise discrepancies in comparing HDM4 results. *(Agreed).*

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.

1. As a result of the Borrowers' implementation of appropriate cost recovery policies, maintenance revenues per annum have increased substantially. It is recommended that the Borrowers continue to broaden Road Fund revenue sources, and tighten the ring fencing of the Roads Fund so that road maintenance funds remain exclusively used for the intended purpose in order to preserve the expensive investments in road development. (*This is useful, but could have been based on a deeper analysis*).
2. Incidences of vandalism of road signs and furniture have been noted along part of the completed road. TANROADS has sensitized communities living in the vicinity to take care of road furniture. Whistle blowers are being encouraged to promptly report vandals/thieves to TAROADS offices and a cash reward is offered if a culprit is successfully apprehended and stolen items recovered. It is recommended that TANROADS upscale its sensitization campaigns and deterrence to vandalism in order to enhance road safety and reduce accident costs. In addition vandalised, stolen or damaged road signs and furniture should be promptly replaced. (*It have been useful to understand why this was apparently not a problem in Lot K*).
3. Due to difficulties in availability of data for the PCR it would be good practice to provide for a separate sub-component for data collection during project implementation. (*Or for this aspect to be upgraded in implementing agency training*).

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 produced on time and was of reasonably good quality. The evaluator rates it as 3, satisfactory. Analysis of effectiveness was good as was the sustainability section. There was some duplication of comments for the two separate lots and very little about why the technical assistance studies were dropped. For some reason the Bank performance section was not completed (though highlighted in yellow), but the self-rating was "very good." A couple of the lessons were not very useful and could have applied to any project.

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
RELEVANCE	3.5	3.5	
Relevance of project development objective	4.0	4.0	
Relevance of project design	3.0	3.0	
EFFECTIVENESS	4.0	3.5	
Development objective (DO)	4.0	3.0	Some uncompleted work evident at closure; supporting evidence and data needed
EFFICIENCY	3.0	3.0	
Timeliness	3.0	3.0	

Resource use efficiency	3.0	3.0	
Cost-benefit analysis	4.0	3.0	HDM4 object files used at appraisal unavailable; supporting data and assumptions needed.
Implementation progress (IP)	3.5	3.5	
SUSTAINABILITY	3.1	2.9	
Financial sustainability	3.0	3.0	
Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities	3.0	2.0	Little information on capacity strengthening measures
Ownership and sustainability of partnerships	3.0	3.0	
Environmental and social sustainability	3.5	3.0	Some issues with Lot K
OVERALL PROJECT COMPLETION RATING			
Bank performance:	4.0	3.0	This was based only on the Borrower's comments.
Borrower performance:	3.0	3.0	Issues with fiduciary requirements and delays in counterpart funding
Performance of other shareholders:	3.0	3.0	
Overall PCR quality:		3.0	

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	4.0	4.0	
	Relevance of project design (from approval to completion)	3.0	3.0	The results framework should have measured changes in tourism activity and cross border trading
OVERALL RELEVANCE SCORE		3.5	3.5	
EFFECTIVENESS*	Effectiveness in delivering outcomes			
	Outcome1: Increased traffic		4.0	Exceeds so substantially it raises doubt about the robustness of the traffic estimate at appraisal
	Outcome2: Reduced VOCs		3.5	Exceeded for Lot K, but not for Lot L due to inaccurate input data in the HDM4 model
	Outcome 3: cross border trading and tourism activities		1.0	Not measured
	Outcome 4: Reduced road roughness		4.0	Achieved
	Outcome 5: Increased road length in good condition		4.0	Achieved
	Effectiveness in delivering output			
	Output1: Upgrading 240km of roads		3.0	Completed save for 10km still to be accepted by Employer due to surface irregularities
	Output2: Feasibility study and detailed design for two roads		3.0	94 percent complete at closure

Criteria	Sub-criteria	PCR work score	IDEV review	Reasons for deviation/comments	
	Output 3: One-stop border post		4.0	Completed, but no details given	
	Output 4: Capacity building TA		1.0	Shelved for reasons unexplained	
	Output 5: civil works contracting capacity study		1.0	Shelved for reasons unexplained	
	Development objective (DO)				
	Development objective rating	4.0	3.0	Some uncompleted work at closure; more detail needed	
	Beneficiaries				
	Beneficiary1: Tourism and regional transport operators		3.5	Some data provided	
	Beneficiary2: Local population		3.0	Fairly vague population information, but no doubt that many people benefitted	
	Unanticipated outcomes (positive or negative not considered in the project logical framework) and their level of impact on the project (high, moderate, low)				
	Institutional development		3.0	Some training given to road agencies, though not very specific	
	Gender		2.0	No specific information provided	
	Environment & climate change		3.0		
	Poverty reduction		2.0	Not significantly discussed	
	Private sector development		3.0	Involvement of local consultants in audit and supervisory services	
	Regional integration		4.0	One-stop border post a major step forward	
Other (specify)					
EFFECTIVENESS OVERALL SCORE		4.0	3.0		
EFFICIENCY	Timeliness (based on the initial closing date)	3.0	3.0		
	Resource used efficiency	3.0	3.0		
	Cost-benefit analysis	4.0	3.0	HDM4 object files used at appraisal unavailable; assumptions and methodology not fully explained.	
	Implementation progress (from the IPR)	3.5	3.5		
	Other (specify)				
OVERALL EFFICIENCY SCORE		3.0	3.0		
SUSTAINABILITY	Financial sustainability	3.0	3.0	Some delays in release of road maintenance funds	

Criteria	Sub-criteria	PCR work score	IDEV review	Reasons for deviation/comments
	Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities	3.0	2.0	Details about how capacities were strengthened not given
	Ownership and sustainability of partnerships	3.0	3.0	
	Environmental and social sustainability	3.5	3.0	Lot K better than Lot L where there were some shortcomings
<p>*The rating of the effectiveness component is obtained from the development objective (DO) rating in the latest IPR of the project (see Guidance Note on the IPR). The ratings for outputs and outcomes are determined based on the project's progress towards realizing its targets, and the overall development objective of the project (DO) is obtained by combining the ratings obtained for outputs and outcomes following the method defined in the IPR Guidance Note. The following method is applied: Highly satisfactory (4), Satisfactory (3), Unsatisfactory (2) and Highly unsatisfactory (1).</p>				

Criteria	Sub-criteria	PCR Work score	IDEV review	Reasons for deviation/comments
BANK PERFORMANCE	Proactive identification and resolution of problems at different stage of the project cycle		3.0	
	Use of previous lessons learned from previous operations during design and implementation		3.0	
	Promotion of stakeholder participation to strengthen ownership		3.0	
	Enforcement of safeguard and fiduciary requirements		3.0	Some minor issues outstanding
	Design and implementation of Monitoring & Evaluation system		2.0	
	Quality of Bank supervision (mix of skills in supervisory teams, etc)		3.0	
	Timeliness of responses to requests		3.0	
OVERALL BANK PERFORMANCE SCORE		4.0	3.0	
BORROWER PERFORMANCE	Quality of preparation and implementation		3.0	
	Compliance with covenants, agreements and safeguards		2.0	Compliance problems with fiduciary issues
	Provision of timely counterpart funding		2.0	Some issues caused delays
	Responsiveness to supervision recommendations		3.0	
	Measures taken to establish basis for project sustainability		3.0	
	Timeliness of preparing requests		3.0	
OVERALL BORROWER PERFORMANCE SCORE		3.0	3.0	
PERFORMANCE	Timeliness of disbursements by		NA	

OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS	co-financiers			
	Functioning of collaborative agreements		NA	
	Quality of policy dialogue with co-financiers (for PBOs only)		NA	
	Quality of work by service providers		3.0	
	Responsiveness to client demands		3.0	
OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS		3.0	3.0	
The overall rating is given: Very Good, Good, Fair and Poor.				
(i) Very Good (HS) : 4				
(ii) Good (H) : 3				
(iii) Fair (US) : 2				
(iv) Poor (HUS): 1				

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

Criteria	Sub-criteria	IDEV Score	Comments
M&E DESIGN	M&E system is in place, clear, appropriate and realistic	2.0	Some indicator data not collectable
	Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan were duly approved	3.5	
	Existence of disaggregated gender indicator	1.0	No attempt made
	Baseline data were available or collected during the design	3.0	
	Other, specify		
OVERALL M&E DESIGN SCORE		2.4	
M&E IMPLEMENTATION	The M&E function is adequately equipped and staffed	2.0	Not much evidence
OVERALL M&E IMPLEMENTATION SCORE		2.0	
M&E UTILIZATION	The borrower used the tracking information for decision	2.0	Not much evidence
OVERALL M&E UTILIZATION SCORE		2.0	
OVERALL M&E PERFORMANCE SCORE		2.0	

References

1. Project Completion Report for the Multinational Tanzania/Kenya Arush-Namanga-Athi River Road Development Project, 2014
2. Staff Guidance on Project Completion Reporting and Rating, 2012
3. Project Appraisal Report: Multinational Tanzania/Kenya Arush-Namanga-Athi River Road Development Project, 2006

4. Note on the Preparation of Project Completion Report Evaluation Notes, 2009
5. Tanzania Roads Fund Board Final Draft Strategic Plan, 2016/17 to 2020/21, 2015
6. Tanzania Roads Fund website: www.roadfund.go.tz

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	2.0	No information as to why the TA outputs were dropped
2. Extent of objectivity of PCR assessment score	2.0	Bank performance too high – this section was not completed in the PCR
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)	3.5	
4. Extent of identification and assessment of key factors (internal and exogenous) and unintended effects (positive or negative) affecting design and implementation	3.0	
5. Adequacy of treatment of safeguards, fiduciary issues, and alignment and harmonization	3.5	
6. Extent of soundness of data generating and analysis process (including rates of returns) in support of PCR assessment	2.5	
7. Overall adequacy of the accessible evidence (from PCR including annexure and other data provided)	2.5	Detail superficial in places
8. Extent to which lessons learned (and recommendations) are clear and based on the PCR assessment (evidence & analysis)	3.0	
9. Extent of overall clarity and completeness of the PCR	3.0	Missing Bank performance section
Other (specify)		
PCR QUALITY SCORE	3.0	
PCR compliance with guidelines (PCR/OM ; IDEV)		
1. PCR Timeliness (On time = 4; Late= 1)	4.0	
2. Extent of participation of borrower, Co-financiers & field offices in PCR preparation	2.0	Unclear iro field offices. Employer's PRC not delivered for Lot K and late for Lot L.
3. Other aspect(s) (specify)		
PCR COMPLIANCE SCORE	3.0	
*** rated as Very Good (4), or Good (3), or Fair (2), or Poor (1)		