

## PCR EVALUATION NOTE FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

<b>1. BASIC INFORMATION</b>			
<b>a. Basic project data</b>			
Project title: NACALA ROAD CORRIDOR STUDIES - Design and Legal Framework for Zambia/Malawi and Malawi/Mozambique One Stop Border Posts (OSBP)			
Project code: P-ZI-DB0-080	Instrument number(s): NEPAD-IPPF GRANT No. 5150155000051		
Project type: Preparation Study	Sector: Transport		
Country: Malawi, Mozambique & Zambia	Environmental categorization (1-3): 3		
<b>Processing Milestones</b>	<b>Key Events</b>	<b>Disbursement and Closing date</b>	
Date approved: 25 November, 2009	Cancelled amount: <b>USD 367,120.37</b>	Original disbursement deadline: 31 <sup>st</sup> June, 2012	
Date signed: 13 September, 2011	Supplementary financing: N/A	Original closing date: 31 <sup>st</sup> June, 2012	
Date of entry into force: 13 <sup>th</sup> September, 2011	Restructuring: N/A	Revised disbursement deadline: 27 February, 2013, 1 July 2014, 9 March 2015, 1 June 2015	
Date effective for 1st disbursement: 13 <sup>th</sup> September, 2011	Extensions (specify dates):	Revised closing date: [as above]	
Date of actual 1st disbursement: 27 <sup>th</sup> July, 2015			
<b>b. Financing sources</b>			
<b>Financing source/ instrument (USD)</b>	<b>Approved amount (USD):</b>	<b>Disbursed amount (USD):</b>	<b>Percentage disbursed (%):</b>
Loan:			
Grant: NEPAD-IPPF Grant	361,299.00	122,569.31	34
Government:			
Other (ex. Co-financiers): <b>DFID Mozambique Regional Gateway Programme (MRGP)</b>	193,679.50		
<b>TOTAL :</b>	<b>554,908.50</b>		
Co-financiers and other external partners: <b>DFID Mozambique Regional Gateway Programme (MRGP)</b>			
Execution and implementation agencies: <b>SADC Secretariat</b>			
<b>c. Responsible Bank staff</b>			
<b>Position</b>	<b>At approval</b>	<b>At completion</b>	
Regional Director	Ojukwu Chiji	Josephine Ngunire	
Sector Director	Alex Rugamba	A. Oumarou	
Sector Manager	Bamory Traore	M. Salawou	
Task Manager	Mtchera Chirwa	Mtchera Chirwa	
Alternate Task Manager			
PCR Team Leader		Guy Manouan (consultant)	
PCR Team Members		Guy Manouan (consultant); Codo Pamphile; Epifani Carvalho; Janet Okero	
<b>d. Report data</b>			

PCR Date : 30 November 2018		
PCR Mission Date:	From: 17 September 2018	To: 22 September 2018
PCR-EN Date:		
Evaluator/consultant: Peter FREEMAN		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.

The investment project involved the rehabilitation of a 75 km road between Liwonde and Mangochi in Malawi along the Nacala Road Corridor as well as establishment of One-Stop-Border-Posts (OSBPs) between Malawi and Mozambique and between Malawi and Zambia.

Preparatory activities for the Nacala Road Corridor Studies - were funded under a New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) grant from the Infrastructure Project Preparation Fund (IPPF). This grant of US\$ 361,229 together with US\$ 193,679 from the Department for International Development (DFID) Mozambique Regional Gateway Program was intended to cover the cost of design of the OSBPs and an appropriate legal framework.

### 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 objectives of the overall project were to facilitate trade between countries in southern and eastern Africa so that the economies of the region became more competitive in international trade and people would benefit through job creation and increased wealth, among other benefits.

The streamlining of the border posts was a pillar to support this concept and the outcomes were improved economic viability of the corridor and enabling of the legal framework to improve the OSBP operations.

### c. Outputs and intended beneficiaries:

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

1. Feasibility, preliminary design and final design reports and bidding documents for the OSBPs;
2. Draft legislative documentation for extra-territorial operation of the OSBPs.

The main beneficiaries were government agencies such as revenue authorities, customs, border police and business and other people using the facilities.

### d. Principal activities/Components:

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

---

The preparatory activities funded under the NEPAD-IPPF grant were mainly studies whose reports made recommendations to contribute to producing the anticipated development impacts. These activities were captured in two components:

Component A - To determine the best technical, economic, environmental and socio-economic options for One-stop border posts (OSBP) between Mozambique and Malawi and between Malawi and Zambia;

Component B - To prepare a legal framework for extra territorial operation of one-stop border posts.

---

### 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.

PCR rating 4; PCREN rating 4.

The objectives of the project were to facilitate trade between countries in southern and eastern Africa so that the economies of the region became more competitive in international trade and people would benefit through job creation and increased wealth, among other benefits.

These objectives were highly relevant as the preparation of a framework for extra territorial operation of one-stop border posts between Mozambique and Malawi and Malawi and Zambia of developing and implementing regional transport infrastructures would facilitate higher trade activities along the corridor, improve efficiencies in cross border trade and support economic growth.

##### **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.

PCR rating 4; PCREN rating 2.

The studies were to be financed by a grant provided by the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) Secretariat in their role as the regional economic community promoting regional integration and as the responsible body for coordination of the development of the OSBPs with the three countries concerned. This was considered a better proposition than having each individual country managing its own arrangements. During the project appraisal stage, the Bank/NEPAD-IPPF and the SADC Secretariat agreed on an organizational structure, whereby oversight of the studies would be undertaken by a Joint Steering Committee (JSC) comprising representatives from the Ministries responsible for transport in Mozambique, Malawi and Zambia and the Chief Executive Officers of the Roads Agencies of the three countries under the chairmanship of the Director of Infrastructure at the SADC Secretariat. The Director of Infrastructure would thus be responsible for the day-to-day management and monitoring of the activities being undertaken by a competitively recruited consultancy services firm.

This design and implementation structure benefited from lessons learnt from previous multi country Bank interventions in the Southern Africa region.

---

---

The design was clearly flawed since the SADC Secretariat did not allocated sufficient budget and a dedicated person within its Infrastructure Directorate was not identified to ensure effective delivery of the work. Moreover, the contribution to the project from the member countries concerned was to be their participation in validation meetings and workshops as well as the review and clearance of reports. However, this proved to be problematic as all three countries failed to meet in a timely manner. As a result, implementation progress was seriously affected leading to significant delays in the delivery schedule.

## **EFFECTIVENESS**

### **c. Effectiveness in delivering outputs:**

Evaluation of the extent to which the project achieved its stated outputs (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).

PCR rating 2; PCREN rating 2.

There were two tasks:

To determine the best technical, economic, environmental and socio-economic options for One-stop border posts (OSBP) between Mozambique and Malawi and between Malawi and Zambia; and,

To prepare a legal framework for the extra territorial operation of OSBPs.

In both cases, some of the required reports were completed and handed over to the Borrower. However, due to significant delays by the consultants to complete the assignment, the grant was cancelled and their contracts were terminated for non-performance. So not all the outputs were delivered as required. Only one of two OSBPs went ahead.

### **d. Effectiveness in realizing outcomes:**

Evaluation of the extent to which the project achieved (or is expected to achieve) 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.

PCR rating 2; PCREN rating 2.

1. *Feasibility, preliminary design and final design reports and bidding documents for the OSBPs:* Implementation of the Malawi/Zambia OSBP along the Nacala Corridor was pursued under ADF financing. The Malawi/Mozambique OSBP was shelved for a future time.
2. *Draft legislative documentation for extra-territorial operation of the OSBPs:* The outcome of the studies from the grant provided sufficient knowledge and information to enable the Member Countries to make a positive decision to proceed with implementation of the Malawi-Zambia OSBP, but the Malawi-Mozambique OSBP remains pending.

### **e. Project development outcome:**

The ratings derived for outcomes and outputs 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).

PCR rating 2; PCREN rating 2.

The PDO was valid and successful implementation of the components under this project would have strengthened the achievement intended by the corridor. However, as the studies were not fully completed and there were serious delays resulting in the termination of the consultant's contract, this resulted in an unsatisfactory rating.

### **f. Beneficiaries:**

---

---

Using evidence, the evaluator should provide an assessment of the relevance of the total number of beneficiaries by categories and disaggregated by sex.

The main beneficiaries were government agencies such as revenue authorities, customs, border police and business and other people using the facilities. There was no gender disaggregation.

**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.

## **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.

PCR rating 1; PCREN rating 1.

Highly unsatisfactory. The project did not start on time, took almost two years to be signed; the procurement of consultants was delayed and delivery of outputs was continuously delayed resulting in multiple requests for extension, which the Bank provided considering the importance of the studies. However, the project still had to be cancelled and the consultancy contract was terminated for non-performance. Planned project duration was 6 months; it took 54 months before cancellation of contract. The ratio of planned and actual implementation was only 1.1.

**i. Resource use efficiency:**

Provide an assessment of physical implementation (based on outputs delivered) against resources used (based on cumulative commitments/disbursements) 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).

PCR rating 1; PCREN rating 1.

Total financing provided amounted to US\$ 554,908.50 from both NEPAD-IPPF and DFID. However, at the time of cancellation, only 34% of the funds had been utilized, while delivery of the outputs was estimated at only 75% of what was expected, despite the multiple time extensions. The ratio of the median percentage physical implementation and commitment rate was 2.21.

**j. Cost-benefit analysis:**

Review the validity of the Economic rate of return (ERR) (if any) in the PCR, and highlighting any data and methodological limitations. The review should indicate if an ERR was not estimated and any reason provided in the PCR. 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 other ERRs. For PBOs for which this calculation model does not apply, an assessment could be done about the contribution of policy reforms to economic growth. In the absence of sufficient evidence, an appropriate rating should be assigned.

N/A

**k. Implementation progress:**

The assessment of the Implementation Progress (IP) on the PCR is derived from the updated IPR and takes into account all applicable IP criteria assessed under the three categories: i) Compliance with covenants (project covenants, environmental and social safeguards and audit

---

---

compliance), ii) Compliance with project systems and procedures (procurement, financial management and monitoring and evaluation), and iii) Compliance with project execution and financing (disbursement, budget commitments, counterpart funding and co-financing).

PCR rating 1; PCREN rating 1.

The implementation progress rating for the project by the Bank was consistently poor and the project was regularly flagged for poor performance both in terms of disbursement rates and the number of extensions to the closing date.

## **SUSTAINABILITY**

### **l. Financial sustainability:**

Provide an assessment of the extent to which funding mechanisms and modalities (e.g. 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.

PCR rating 3; PCREN rating 3.

The feasibility studies assessed all parameters such as economic and financial viability of the OSBPs and concluded that once constructed, they could be financially sustainable. Given the importance of the corridor and the high priority given to road maintenance, this appears likely.

### **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 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.

PCR rating 3; PCREN rating 2.

The project did not contribute much to the strengthening of institutional capacity. The PCR does not comment on the institutional capacity of the OSBPs, although this may have been addressed in the reports. The lack of monitoring of progress of the project suggests that it did not build the capacity of SADC as an implementing agency either, although a lesson may have been learned from its poor performance in this role to the effect that a project manager should have been appointed. It is important that the joint committees created for the project continue at least for a while after project completion and that the knowledge learned be passed on for the benefit of other OSBPs.

### **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.

PCR rating 4; PCREN rating 2.

Initially most key ministries of government and institutions within the Ministries of Transport were actively engaged and involved during the implementation of the project. However, the interest waned as the project proceeded and ultimately it failed because the participants did not meet frequently enough. Stakeholder information dissemination and consultations were, however, held by the study consultant and feedback was received.

### **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.

N/A

---

---

## 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.

PCR rating 2; PCREN rating 2.

Multinational operations are complex in nature, especially as was the case in the project where SADC Secretariat was the executing agency on behalf of three countries, but it lacked adequate financial and human resources to do a thorough job.

Despite the Bank's numerous communications of concern with the progress of implementation of the studies, the end result was unsatisfactory and a stronger stand by the Bank would have helped. Such concerns were addressed in PD05/2015 on the cancellation of the operations, to the effect that in future there must be a stricter approach to monitoring and client responsiveness to projects. The Bank should in future be aware of the importance of a dedicated project manager.

### **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.

PCR rating 2; PCREN rating 1.

The performance of SADC Secretariat on this project was rather highly unsatisfactory in ensuring overall project management and coordination with its member countries. Sufficient resources were not made available for the management of this project, and a tougher stance towards the consultants for poor performance should have been adopted way before their termination was activated. Overall, the responsiveness and submission of quarterly progress reports was also often untimely leading to frequent time slippages and ultimately to the cancellation of the grant.

### **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).

PCR rating 1; PCREN rating 1.

Despite their many years of experience in engineering consulting work in Africa, the consultants' approach to the assignment and performance left a lot to be desired. None of the required outputs were delivered on time and even when they were submitted, they were often lacking in quality resulting in the clients having to request frequent improvements. Site visits for data collection and stakeholder consultations were not undertaken on time, often citing lack of responsiveness from the member countries, which were not always justifiable. This led to the conclusion that the firm were not adequately experienced in this particular type of work, and that although they had proposed personnel with acceptable qualifications and experience, they were not always available and committed to the assignment leading to excessive slippages in the delivery schedule.

---

## 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 PPER is complete.

The relevance of the development objective was high but the main flaw in the project concept was that there was no project manager. Attempting to manage the project with a committee that met infrequently just did not work. The consultant failed to

---

---

perform and should have been fired at an earlier stage. As a result the efficiency was highly unsatisfactory. Sustainability was not a big issue for this kind of project. Overall the project was unsatisfactory with some aspects highly unsatisfactory.

### **b. Design, implementation and utilization of the M&E:**

Provide an assessment of planned and actual 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.

NA

---

## **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 each of the key components of the evaluation (Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Sustainability). ~~List the main PCR and/or reformulated pertinent lessons learned for each of the above four components. 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. Additionally, please submit any additional lessons not listed below that would be relevant to the project.

Below are the lessons gleaned from this project. For each lesson, please do one of the following:

- **Sign off:** If you agree with a lesson, simply write "Sign off" in green font after the text of the lesson; do not provide any other comments here;
- **Revise lesson:** If you think the wording of a lesson should be altered, make whatever changes you see fit to the text of the lesson in track changes mode and write "Sign off" in green font after the text of the lesson; do not provide any supporting commentary here;
- **Write off:** If you disagree entirely with a lesson, simply write "Write off" in red font after the text of the lesson; do not provide any other comments or revise the text of the lesson or recommendation here.

Despite that the implementation arrangements as designed with SADC Secretariat to coordinate the studies and consensus building with the 3 Member countries; the actual implementation proved problematic as SADC Secretariat had not allocated sufficient budget and a dedicated person within its Infrastructure Directorate to ensure an effective delivery of this role. Additionally, as the contribution to the project from the Member Countries was to be own resources for participation in validation meetings and workshops as well as for review and clearance of reports, it proved to be problematic for all the 3 countries to meet timely and as required often times due to unavailability of funds and key people required at specific times. As a result, implementation progress was significantly affected leading to significant delays in the delivery schedule. **Write off.**

Implementation of a complex multi country project cannot be assigned to a committee. There must be a dedicated budget and specific individuals should be charged with the responsibility of managing progress on the project. **Sign off**

Member countries need to set aside sufficient time and resources to review and validate project outputs and progress during project execution. **Sign off.**

There is a need to carefully vet consultancy competencies relevant to the assignment at hand to ensure their capability and continuous availability of key personnel to progress according to the delivery schedule. **Sign off.**

### **b. Recommendations:**

Provide a brief description of any agreement/ disagreement with all or part of the recommendations from the PCR. ~~List the main PCR and/or reformulated recommendations (required actions by the Borrower and/or the Bank).~~ Additionally, please submit any additional recommendations not listed below that would be relevant to the project.

Below are the recommendations gleaned from this project. For each recommendation, please do one of the following:

- **Sign off:** If you agree with a recommendation, simply write "Sign off" in green font after the text of the recommendation; do not provide any other comments here;
-

- **Revise recommendation:** If you think the wording of a recommendation should be altered, make whatever changes you see fit to the text of the recommendation in **track changes mode** and write "Sign off" in green font after the text of the recommendation; do not provide any supporting commentary here;
- **Write off:** If you disagree entirely with a recommendation, simply write "Write off" in red font after the text of the recommendation; do not provide any other comments or revise the text of the recommendation or recommendation here.

Beneficiary: As implementation of one-stop border posts (OSBP) at national borders requires the operational coordination of multiple stakeholders (customs, revenue officials, health, national security, agriculture etc.), it is important to sustain the joint working committees normally set up during execution, beyond the completion of the project, and to replicate lessons from one specific OSBP to others Sign off..

## 7. COMMENTS ON PCR QUALITY AND TIMELINESS

The overall PCR quality rating is based on the criteria presented in the annexe and other: The quality of the PCR is rated as highly satisfactory (HS) (4), satisfactory (S) (3), unsatisfactory (US) (2), and highly unsatisfactory (HUS) (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: HS (4), S (3), US (2), HUS (1).

The PCR was rather carelessly prepared and not checked for the many typographical errors. It was also over three years late. There was, however, adequate evidence and it was internally consistent. There was a reluctance to criticise Bank or Recipient for what was a poorly managed and aborted project. The lessons were sound.

## 8. SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION

This is a summary of both the PCR and IDEV ratings with justification for deviations. Appropriate section of the PCR Evaluation should be indicated in the last column in order to avoid detailed comments. If the evaluator is unable to validate a PCR rating on one of the four evaluation criteria, s/he must provide an appropriate explanation for this.

Criteria	PCR	PCREN	Reason for disagreement/ Comments
<b>RELEVANCE</b>	4	3	
Relevance of project development objective	4	4	Highly relevant
Relevance of project design	4	2	Failed to identify major issues
<b>EFFECTIVENESS</b>	2	2	
Delivery of outputs	2	2	Work not completed
Realization of outcomes	2	2	Work not completed
Development objective (DO)	2	2	Work not completed
<b>EFFICIENCY</b>	1	1	
Timeliness	1	1	Really poor
Resource use efficiency	1	1	Only 34% funds utilized
Cost-benefit analysis	NA	NA	
<b>Implementation progress</b> (Compliance with (i) with covenants; (ii) project systems and procedures; (iii) project execution and financing)	1	1	Consistently poor
<b>SUSTAINABILITY</b>	3.3 (3)	2.3 (2)	
Financial sustainability	3	3	Reasonable prospects
Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities	3	2	Not much capacity building
Ownership and sustainability of partnerships	4	2	Poor
Environmental and social sustainability	NA	NA	
<b>OVERALL PROJECT COMPLETION RATING</b>	2.5	2	

Bank performance:	2	2	Did not identify issues up front or resolve problems when they occurred
Borrower performance:	2	1	Allowed project to drag on with little progress.
Performance of other stakeholders:	1	1	Consultant not up to the job.
Overall PCR quality:		3	Marginally satisfactory

---

**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

## Annex

### PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT EVALUATION NOTE Validation of PCR performance ratings

All ratings given this section and in the Summary Table in Section 8 must correspond to one of the following ratings:

Score	Description (see PCR preparation guidelines for details)
4	Highly Satisfactory (HS)
3	Satisfactory (S)
2.75	Mostly Satisfactory
2.25	Mostly Unsatisfactory
2	Unsatisfactory (US)
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HUS)
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 relevant
	Relevance of project design (from approval to completion)	4	2	Failed to identify major issues
<b>OVERALL RELEVANCE SCORE</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	
EFFECTIVENESS*	<b>Effectiveness in delivering outcomes</b>			
	Outcome 1: Feasibility and economic viability on OSBPs between Mozambique and Malawi and between Malawi and Zambia Implementation of the Malawi/Zambia OSBP along the Nacala Corridor is progressing under ADF financing. The Malawi/Mozambique OSBP was shelved to a future time.		2	Work not completed
	Outcome 2: Enlightened decision making concerning a legal framework for extra territorial operation one-stop border posts The		2	Work not completed

Criteria	Sub-criteria	PCR work score	IDEV review	Reasons for deviation/comments
	outcome of the studies from thie Grant have provided knowledge and information that has enabled the Member Countries to make a positive decision to proceed with implmentaton of OSBPs along the Nacala Corridor.			
	<b>Overall Realization of Outcomes</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>Effectiveness in delivering output</b>				
	Output 1: Feasibility, Preliminary design and Final design reports and bidding documents for the OSBPs Some of the required reports were completed and handed over to the Borrower. However, due to significant delays by the consultants to complete the assignment, the Grant was cancelled and their contract was terminated for no-performance. So not all the outputs were delivered as required.		2	Only partially completed.
	Output 2: Draft Legislative Documentation for extra-territorial operation of the one-stop border posts Some of the required reports were completed and handed over to the Borrower. However, due to significant delays by the consultants to complete the assignment, the Grant was cancelled and their contract was terminated for no-performance. So not all the outputs were delivered as required.		2	Only partially completed.
	<b>Overall Delivery of Outputs</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>Development objective (DO)</b>				

Criteria	Sub-criteria	PCR work score	IDEV review	Reasons for deviation/comments
	Development objective rating	2	2	Only partially completed.
	<b>Beneficiaries</b>			
	Beneficiary1: government agencies			Only one border post operational
	Beneficiary2			
	<b>Unanticipated outcomes (positive or negative not considered in the project logical framework) and their level of impact on the project (high, moderate, low)</b>			
	Institutional development		1	Minimal
	Gender			
	Environment & climate change			
	Poverty reduction			
	Private sector development			
	Regional integration		2	Only one OSBP completed
	Other (specify)			
<b>EFFECTIVENESS OVERALL SCORE</b>		2	2	
EFFICIENCY	Timeliness (based on the initial closing date)	1	1	Really poor
	Resource used efficiency	1	1	Only 34% funds utilized
	Cost-benefit analysis	NA	NA	
	Implementation progress (from the IPR)	1	1	Poor
	Other (specify)			
<b>OVERALL EFFICIENCY SCORE</b>		1	1	
SUSTAINABILITY	Financial sustainability	3	3	Reasonable prospects
	Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities	3	2	Not much capacity building
	Ownership sustainability and of partnerships	4	2	Poor
	Environmental and social sustainability	NA	NA	Environmental category III

Criteria	Sub-criteria	PCR work score	IDEV review	Reasons for deviation/comments
<b>OVERALL SUSTAINABILITY SCORE</b>		<b>3.3 (3)</b>	<b>2.3 (2)</b>	
<b>OVERALL PROJECT COMPLETION RATING</b>		<b>2.5 (3)</b>	<b>2</b>	
<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		1	Did not identify potential problems
	Use of previous lessons learned from previous operations during design and implementation		1	No evidence
	Promotion of stakeholder participation to strengthen ownership		3	
	Enforcement of safeguard and fiduciary requirements		NA	
	Design and implementation of Monitoring & Evaluation system		NA	
	Quality of Bank supervision (mix of skills in supervisory teams, etc)		1	Little evidence
	Timeliness of responses to requests		2	
<b>OVERALL BANK PERFORMANCE SCORE</b>				
BORROWER PERFORMANCE	Quality of preparation and implementation		2	
	Compliance with covenants, agreements and safeguards		NA	
	Provision of timely counterpart funding		NA	
	Responsiveness to supervision recommendations		1	Project dragged on with minimal progress until cancelled
	Measures taken to establish basis for project sustainability		1	
	Timeliness of preparing requests		1	
<b>OVERALL BORROWER PERFORMANCE SCORE</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>1.25 (1)</b>	
PERFORMANCE OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS	Timeliness of disbursements by co-financiers		NA	
	Functioning of collaborative agreements		1	

	Quality of policy dialogue with co-financiers (for PBOs only)			
	Quality of work by service providers		1	
	Responsiveness to client demands			
<b>OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS</b>			1	
The overall rating is given: HS, S, US and HUS.				
(i) Highly satisfactory (HS) : 4				
(ii) Satisfactory (S) : 3				
(iii) Unsatisfactory (US) : 2				
(iv) Highly Unsatisfactory (HUS): 1				

**DESIGN, IMPLEMENTAION AND UTILIZATION OF MONITRING AND EVALUATION (M&E) Not applicable**

Criteria	Sub-criteria	IDEV Score	Comments
M&E DESIGN	M&E system is in place, clear, appropriate and realistic		
	Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan were duly approved		
	Existence of disaggregated gender indicator		
	Baseline data were available or collected during the design		
	Other, specify		
<b>OVERALL M&amp;E DESIGN SCORE</b>			
M&E IMPLEMENTATION	The M&E function is adequately equipped and staffed		
<b>OVERALL M&amp;E IMPLEMENTATION SCORE</b>			
M&E UTILIZATION	The borrower used the tracking information for decision		
<b>OVERALL M&amp;E UTILIZATION SCORE</b>			
<b>OVERALL M&amp;E PERFORMANCE SCORE</b>			

## PCR QUALITY EVALUATION

Criteria	PCR-EVN (1-4)	Comments
<b>QUALITY OF PCR</b>		
1. Extent of quality and completeness of the PCR evidence and analysis to substantiate the ratings of the various sections	3	Reasonable evidence provided
2. Extent of objectivity of PCR assessment score	2	PCR author reluctant to criticise Bank or Recipient
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	Internally consistent
4. Extent of identification and assessment of key factors (internal and exogenous) and unintended effects (positive or negative) affecting design and implementation	2	Design relevancy was too lenient
5. Adequacy of treatment of safeguards, fiduciary issues, and alignment and harmonization	NA	
6. Extent of soundness of data generating and analysis process (including rates of returns) in support of PCR assessment	NA	
7. Overall adequacy of the accessible evidence (from PCR including annexure and other data provided)	3	Not rich in data but OK
8. Extent to which lessons learned (and recommendations) are clear and based on the PCR assessment (evidence & analysis)	3	Fairly good lessons
9. Extent of overall clarity and completeness of the PCR	2	Quality could have been better. Not checked for typographical errors (there were many) – gave the impression that this was an imposed task of little value.
Other (specify)		
<b>PCR QUALITY SCORE</b>	2.6 (3)	
<b>PCR compliance with guidelines (PCR/OM ; IDEV)</b>		
1. PCR Timeliness (On time = 4; Late= 1)	1	Over 3 years late
2. Extent of participation of borrower, Co-financiers & field offices in PCR preparation***	1	No evidence
3. Other aspect(s) (specify)		
<b>PCR COMPLIANCE SCORE</b>		
*** rated as Highly satisfactory (4), or Satisfactory (3), or Unsatisfactory (2), or Highly unsatisfactory (1)		

**List of References (please only list nonstandard documents, i.e. those not found on the EVRD website)**