

PCR EVALUATION NOTE FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

1. BASIC INFORMATION			
a. Basic project data			
Project title: National Transport Sector Master Plan Study			
Project code: P-ZW-DB0-005	Instrument number(s): ADF Grant Loan No. 2100155026466		
Project type: Study	Sector: Transport		
Country: Zimbabwe	Environmental categorization (1-3): N/A		
Processing Milestones	Key Events	Disbursement and Closing date	
Date approved: 18 Dec 2013	Cancelled amount: UA 27,440 {TBC - use of portion of unutilized Grant resources for an activity under the project was approved in July 2018}	Original disbursement deadline: 31 Dec 2016	
Date signed: 22 Jan 2014	Supplementary financing: N/A	Original closing date: 30 Sep 2016	
Date of entry into force: 22 Jan 2014	Restructuring: N/A	Revised disbursement deadline: 31 Dec 2017; 30 Nov 2018	
Date effective for 1st disbursement: 20 May 2014	Extensions (specify dates):	Revised closing date:	
Date of actual 1st disbursement: 18 Nov 2015			
b. Financing sources			
Financing source/ instrument (MUA)	Approved amount (MUA):	Disbursed amount (MUA):	Percentage disbursed (%):
Loan:			
ADF Grant:	0.88	0.85255959	96.88
Government:	0.09	0.07706452	85.63
Other (ex. Co-financiers):			
TOTAL :	0.97	0.92962411	95.84
Co-financiers and other external partners: N/A			
Execution and implementation agencies: Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure Development			
c. Responsible Bank staff			
Position	At approval	At completion	
Regional Director	Ebrima Faal	Josephine Nguere	
Sector Director	Amadou Oumarou	Amadou Oumarou	
Sector Manager	Mamady Souare (OIC)	Noel Kulemeka (Regional Manager – Manager RDGS.3 Jean Kizito Kabanguka (OIC – PICU.1)	
Task Manager	Lawrence Kiggundu	Richard Malinga	
Alternate Task Manager			
PCR Team Leader		Richard Malinga	
PCR Team Members		Bereket Belayhun Woldemeskel	
d. Report data			
PCR Date: 31 Jul 2018			

PCR Mission Date:	From: 22 May 2018	To: 25 May 2018
PCR-EN Date:		
Evaluator/consultant: Peter FREEMAN	Peer Reviewer: Judith OFORI	

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 technical assistance was a means of assisting the newly launched Zimbabwe National Transport Policy to help meet the objectives of the Zimbabwe Medium Term Plan (2011-2015) and the Zimbabwe Agenda for Socio-Economic Transformation (2013-2018). The master plan would provide a framework for sustainable development of the transport infrastructure and services and serve as a leveraging tool for resources for investment in the transport sector. The study was jointly financed by the ADF through a grant of UA0.88 million (90%), and counterpart financing in terms of study support and coordination from the Government of Zimbabwe (GOZ) amounting to UA0.09 million (10%).

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 objective is to provide the Government of Zimbabwe with a comprehensive National Transport Sector Master Plan with a strategic framework and investment plan for sustainable development of the transport infrastructure and services to support growth and wealth creation taking into account green and inclusive growth.

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.

The outputs were consulting services for preparation of a Master Plan audit services, and study support and coordination. The direct beneficiary of the study was the Ministry of Transport and Infrastructural Development, (MOTID).

d. Principal activities/Components:

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

The components were identical to the outputs, i.e. consulting services for preparation of a Master Plan audit services, and study support and coordination.

There was no project restructuring, but provision was made for the printing and dissemination of the National Transport Master Plan within the grant amount.

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 3.

The National Transport Master Plan Study was considered to be a critical element that would provide clear and coherent guidance in the development of inter-modal transport linkages in the country in the growth of the transport sector, and its role in the overall economic growth.

The project objective was well aligned with the Zimbabwe Medium Term Plan (MTP 2011-2015) and the Zimbabwe Agenda for Socio-Economic Transformation (Zim Asset 2013-2018), as well as the National Transport Policy. These Government Strategies all recognized the poor state of transport infrastructure in the country as an impediment to growth, and the need to accelerate its rehabilitation. These strategies were consistent with the Bank's Country Brief for Zimbabwe (2013-2015). There was no CSP for Zimbabwe. However, the Country Brief Update (2014-2016) identified infrastructure as one of the potential areas of intervention by the Bank and the Bank Group had endorsed and committed to a New Deal for the Engagement with Fragile States, which was relevant in this case.

The transport sector master plan for Zimbabwe was designed to provide a framework that ensured systematic and coordinated interventions to address the challenges in the transport sector in the short, medium and longer term. In addition, the master Plan would serve as reference document of bankable projects upon which Government could solicit funds for planned investments. The reviewer concurs with the PCR that the transport sector is important but notes that the Country Brief Update prioritizes energy and water projects ahead of transport projects.

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 3; PCREN rating 3.

The purpose was to prepare a strategy and investment plan to meet the goals for the transport sector. The Terms of Reference for the study were satisfactory to achieve the intended result, and the structuring of the project coordination was appropriate, albeit later projects would need GoZ to consider strengthening the coordination capacity.

The project design was appropriate and effective in that, because of ongoing foreign currency shortages, it was easier for continuity of project if the consultant was being paid directly by AfDB after approval of each deliverable by the project implementation unit (PIU).

There was no project restructuring. However, provision was made from savings in the grant amount for the printing and dissemination of additional copies of the National Transport Master Plan. Under the consultancy services contract, the deliverables included the printing of 30 copies of the plan. It was later realized that for effective dissemination, an additional 110 copies would be required. This should have been addressed earlier. Unfortunately, the Recipient only made the request after the expiry of the disbursement deadline and following the notification of the cancellation of the unutilized grant amount. This change necessitated an extension of the disbursement deadline and, as this was irregular, the approval had to be given by the Vice President of AfDB. The reviewer concurs with the PCR rating of 3.

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 3; PCREN rating 3.

The consulting service component included the National Transport Master Plan Study and the Financial Audit service. The assignment commenced June 2015, with an 18-month duration and was to have been completed in December 2016. The project was implemented, with the Final Report of the National Transport Master Plan submitted in July 2017. The final report followed a Stakeholder's Validation Workshop held in March 2017 to review the Draft Final Report. The Master Plan provided a reference document to guide the country's investments in the sector in the short, medium and long term.

The Study Support and Coordination Component entailed the Government input for the management and coordination of the Study activities. Four Ministry staffers were trained in data collection, planning, drafting, traffic modeling and financial modeling for roads, rail and aviation projects.

The reviewer notes that there was no mention of the quality of the audit services but they were delivered. The Transport Master Plan document had not yet been submitted to Cabinet for adoption as government policy at the time that the PCR was prepared. For these reasons the reviewer concurs with a rating of 3.

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 3; PCREN rating 3.

Improved capacity in effective transport sector planning: There was capacity building and training of MoTID staff through the project. In addition, key decision makers were exposed to the planning methodology. Four Ministry staffers were intensively trained in data collection, planning, drafting, traffic modeling and financial modeling for roads, rail and aviation projects. The training was continuous throughout project to implementation, with staffers assigned to work on a day-to-day basis with the study consultant. The training involved participating in collecting data through organized meetings, desk research and drafting specific sections of the report with guidance from consultancy experts. Moreover, some skills were transferred to other of the Ministry's Department of Roads staff (in addition to the four counterpart staff attached to the consultants). These skills included multi-criteria analysis tool, traffic modeling and financial modeling for road projects.

National Transport Sector Master Plan: Strictly speaking as phrased this is a repeat of the output. However, the report took into account that the country was recovering from economic isolation by the international community; that Government had adopted a results-based management system that focused on clear results, outcomes and outputs; and the Bank Group's commitment to the New Deal of Engagement with Transitional States. The Transport Master Plan document had not yet been submitted to Cabinet for adoption as government policy at the time that the PCR was prepared.

The reviewer concurs that the staff training was progress but notes that the completion of the Transport Master Plan was a first step. More important will be its formal adoption by the Government and its use as a strategic planning mechanism.

e. Project development outcome:

The ratings derived for outcomes and outputs are combined to assess 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 3; PCREN rating 3.

The Zimbabwe Transport Master Plan was produced in July 2017 with priority projects identified complete with a budget estimate for all the four transport sub-sectors (i.e. aviation, rail, inland waterways and roads). This will also help the Government to secure financing for priority projects. A rating of 3 for both outputs and outcomes means a Satisfactory project development outcome. The reviewer concurs with this position.

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.

Specifically, urban councils, the National Railways of Zimbabwe (NRZ), Zimbabwe National Road Administration (ZINARA), Air Zimbabwe, the Civil Aviation Authority of Zimbabwe and indirectly the population in general. Some 53% of the population in the country are women.

g. Unanticipated additional outcomes (positive or negative, not taken into consideration in the project logical framework):

This includes gender, climate change, as well as social and socio-economic- related issues. Provide an assessment of the extent to which intended or unanticipated additional and important outcomes have been taken into consideration by the PCR. The assessment should also look at the manner the PCR accounted for these outcomes.

None

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 3; PCREN rating 3.

The consultant services for the development for the Zimbabwe National Transport Master Plan study project exceeded the planned duration by six months, as a consequence of delays in procurement and delays in delivery of some of the deliverables. The ratio of planned and actual implementation was 0.833, which in accordance with the guidelines results in a rating of 3 (Satisfactory). The reviewer concurs with this score.

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 4; PCREN rating 4.

The project physical implementation based on outputs delivered determined was 100%, whilst the total resources used was UA 929,624 equivalent (Bank and Recipient resources). The level of commitment therefore was therefore 95.84% (UA 929,624/ UA 970,000). In accordance with the guidelines this is considered Highly Satisfactory and the reviewer agrees with this rating.

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 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.

Not applicable.

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 3; PCREN rating 3.

The average IP rating was 2.75. The criterion that was rated unsatisfactory was monitoring and evaluation. This was because the preparation and submission of Quarterly Progress Reports was delayed. Other criteria were in the Satisfactory range. Accordingly the reviewer agrees that the overall rating for implementation progress should be 3.

SUSTAINABILITY

l. Financial sustainability:

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

PCR rating 3; PCREN rating 2.

The main vehicle for Bank support to Zimbabwe over the five years preceding the project has been the ZimFund, Fragile States Facility, African Water Facility and the Private Sector Window. In recognition of the constrained funding situation an arrangement was made to pay the consultant directly by the AfDB. There was no direct assessment of the extent to which funding mechanisms and modalities had been put in place to ensure the continued flow of benefits after project completion. The Government needs to put in place resources to effectively maintain the relevance and dynamism of the Master Plan. The resources should cover the management of the review and update process, as well as the maintenance of any licenses for proprietary software. The reviewer is concerned that these resources may not be forthcoming.

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 has contributed to strengthening institutional capacities that will facilitate the continued flow of benefits associated with the project. Through the project the MoTID has developed some capacity in aspects related to travel demand analysis/ forecasting as well as multi-criteria analysis. Such skills are critical for the MoTID to progressively interrogate the National Transport Master Plan investment priorities and to respond to emerging and changing circumstances. However, some of those trained have already left the employ of the Ministry. There is a need for a team to monitor and periodically engage stakeholders. This gap has not been filled at project closing and the reviewer notes this with concern.

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 3; PCREN rating 2.

The PCR says that from the discussions with some stakeholders, it is evident that this aspect needs to be enhanced and that solid partnerships with all the transport sub-sector agencies and stakeholders need to be cultivated. Discussions with ZINARA demonstrated clear ownership, but for some other organizations, it was evident there was a gap. This largely stems from the fact that since the stakeholder's review of the Draft Final Report there has been no further formal feedback. Again, the reviewer believes this is an area of concern.

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.

Not applicable.

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 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 3; PCREN rating 3.

The Bank made payments on time after submission of approvals for each milestone. It proactively identified and resolved several problems at different stages of the project cycle, for example the identification the foreign exchange risks. It also responded positively to the request for committing unutilized grant resources for dissemination even though, as noted above, this is something that should have been foreseen at an earlier stage. Supervision Missions were conducted at least once a year, typically timed with the deliverables and the stakeholder engagement.

However, the follow up on the monitoring and evaluation system could have been more rigorous to avoid the delays in the submission of the Quarterly Progress Reports and, in the reviewer's opinion the Recipient could have been encouraged more strongly to follow up on the thin capacity and resources to maintain the Master Plan and ensure the investment was sustainable.

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 3; PCREN rating 2.

The Recipient's performance in respect of compliance with covenants and agreements was satisfactory. However, the executing agency performance in ensuring quality preparation and implementation did fall short on a number of occasions. It was evident that there was no diligent follow up on some aspects at the beginning that gave rise to procurement delays, and similarly the Recipient acting contrary to Bank advice on the procurement of the auditors. The MoTID was however able to successfully mitigate the actions that arose from the mistake (opening of a financial proposal that had not qualified). The MoTID always endeavored to provide timely feedback.

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 3; PCREN rating 3.

The consultant did not always meet the submission deadline for the deliverables. The feedback to the Consultant on the other hand, was also delayed, with the knock-on effect on the Consultant's delivery. No information is provided in the PCR about the performance of other stakeholders. The reviewer notes that the consultant's performance was satisfactory but late.

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.

PCR rating 3.25 (3); PCREN rating 2.75 mostly satisfactory (3).

The relevance of the objectives was satisfactory although the PCR did not note that transport was not the highest priority strategically for Zimbabwe. Relevance of design was mostly satisfactory but underestimated the dissemination needs. Cabinet has also yet to approve the Master Plan, which is a concern. The project was reasonably efficient in that most deliverables were accomplished, albeit six months late. Sustainability was disappointing in that the PCR failed to look at the project in the context of Zimbabwe as a fragile state with very limited resources. The stakeholders had been kept in the dark after an initial successful stakeholder meeting. Even if the Cabinet had not yet approved the document, the stakeholders should have been informed of this.

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 what 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.

PCREN rating 3.

Given the limited nature of the technical assistance project the M&E was fairly low key. The delivery of the Master Plan was duplicated as an output and an outcome. Information was fairly sparse about utilization and quarterly reports were delayed. Overall it was mostly adequate.

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

The lessons as written were too specific and not generalized as required by the guidelines.

Suggested lessons are as follows:

A critical part of a technical assistance project to a fragile state with limited resources is to ensure there is adequate capacity to update and implement the deliverables. This may require additional funding but will ensure the result is sustainable. **Sign off.**

In the event that a request is made to utilize some of the unspent funding on a project, this should be done prior to the disbursement deadline. **Sign off.**

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; if you see fit, you may follow this with a comment on why the lesson merits revision in bold text;
-

-
- **Write off:** If you disagree entirely with a lesson, simply write "Write off" in red font after the text of the lesson; please follow this with a comment on why the lesson has been written off in bold text.

Whereas under the consultancy services contract, the deliverables included the printing of a number of copies (30) of the primary output the National Transport Master Plan. It was later noted that for effective dissemination, additional copies (110) would be required. These are now to be procured through a separate procurement arrangement. It necessitated extension of the Disbursement Deadline and introduction of a new procurement arrangement. This could have been addressed, well before the expiry. **Write off.**

The Transport Master Plan study was undertaken in a period of about twenty-seven months, as opposed to the eighteen months. For future projects the PIU needs to ensure time allowed for the assignments is critically reviewed against the expected deliverables, and that consultants adhere to their project timeline. The review and approval also needs to be reduced by having dedicated personnel monitoring the implementation **Write off.**

The Master Plan should not be regarded as a static document, but rather a dynamic document that shall guide investment planning in the Transport Sector. It is possible that some aspects proposed may diminish in relevance and as such the need to have a team to monitor and periodically engage stakeholders. The establishment of such a Task Force to be managed by the Ministry is recommended. There shall be need to identify persons from each of the transport sub-sectors to be part of this. **Write 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.

The first two recommendations are achievable as revised. The third is deleted as unclear.

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; **if you see fit, you may follow this with a comment on why the recommendation merits revision in bold text;**
- **Write off:** If you disagree entirely with a recommendation, simply write "Write off" in red font after the text of the recommendation; **please follow this with a comment on why the recommendation has been written off in bold text.**

Beneficiary: Ministry of Transport and Infrastructural Development needs to follow up with Cabinet concerning its endorsement of the Transport Master Plan as policy document. **Sign off**

Beneficiary: The Government needs to establish a Task Force consisting of experienced experts from the various transport sub-sectors to periodically update review and discuss with stakeholders the implementation of the Transport Master Plan recommendations. **Sign off**

Beneficiary: The Government needs to institute structures to enable the derivation of maximum benefits from the Master Plan, which shall form a reference for investments in the transport sector. **Write 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).

PCREN rating 3.

The PCR quality was for the most part satisfactory but the sustainability aspects (given that Zimbabwe is fragile state) were unrealistically scored. The lessons and recommendations were poorly written and unclear. The author did not realize that lessons should be generalized and was too specific about details in the project, which only pertained in specific circumstances.

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
RELEVANCE	3.5 (4)	3	
Relevance of project development objective	4	3	Transport not a top priority in Zimbabwe
Relevance of project design	3	3	Underestimated dissemination requirements
EFFECTIVENESS	3	3	
Delivery of outputs	3	3	Audit services not discussed
Realization of outcomes	3	3	Cabinet has yet to approve the Plan
Development objective (DO)	3	3	Cabinet has yet to approve the plan
EFFICIENCY	3.3 (3)	3.3 (3)	
Timeliness	3	3	Delay of six months
Resource use efficiency	4	4	
Cost-benefit analysis	N/A	N/A	
Implementation progress (Compliance with (i) with covenants; (ii) project systems and procedures; (iii) project execution and financing)	3	3	Quarterly progress reports delayed
SUSTAINABILITY	3	2	
Financial sustainability	3	2	Fragile state with major constraints
Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities	3	2	No arrangements to ensure capacity to maintain the Master Plan
Ownership and sustainability of partnerships	3	2	Stakeholders not kept informed after initial meeting
Environmental and social sustainability	N/A	N/A	
OVERALL PROJECT COMPLETION RATING	3.25 (3)	2.75 (3)	Satisfactory
Bank performance:	3	3	
Borrower performance:	3	2	Not always diligent about follow up
Performance of other stakeholders:	3	3	
Overall PCR quality:		3	

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	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	3	Transport not the highest priority
	Relevance of project design (from approval to completion)	3	3	Underestimated dissemination requirements
OVERALL RELEVANCE SCORE		3.5 (4)	3	
EFFECTIVENESS*	Effectiveness in delivering outcomes			
	Outcome 1: Improved capacity in effective transport sector planning The assessment is through a proxy, with inference from the capacity building and training of the MoTID staff through the project		3	Skills transfer reasonably effective (though some have moved on to other jobs)
	Outcome 2: National Transport Sector Master Plan) The Master Plan was prepared (This is more of the output)		3	Plan has not yet been accepted by GoZ
	Overall Realization of Outcomes	3	3	
	Effectiveness in delivering outputs			
	Output 1: National Transport Master Plan The Final Report was		3	Final report delivered but Plan not yet accepted by GoZ

Criteria	Sub-criteria	PCR work score	IDEV review	Reasons for deviation/comments	
	delivered in July 2017				
	Output 2:Trained Staff The four Ministry staff were trained in data collection, planning, drafting, traffic modelling and financial modelling for roads, rail and aviation projects		3	Training took place but some staff have moved on	
	Overall Delivery of Outputs	3	3		
	Development objective (DO)				
	Development objective rating	3	3	Master Plan delivered but not yet adopted	
	Beneficiaries				
	Beneficiary1 Govt. orgs.		3	Needs to be more stakeholder interaction	
	Beneficiary2 population in general		3	Ultimate indirect beneficiaries	
	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	Some training evident	
	Gender		2	53% of population female	
	Environment & climate change				
	Poverty reduction				
	Private sector development				
	Regional integration				
Other (specify)					
EFFECTIVENESS OVERALL SCORE		3	3		
EFFICIENCY	Timeliness (based on the initial closing date)	3	3	Delay of six months	
	Resource use efficiency	4	4		
	Cost-benefit analysis	N/A	N/A		
	Implementation progress (from the IPR)	3	3	Quarterly reports delayed	
	Other (specify)				

Criteria	Sub-criteria	PCR work score	IDEV review	Reasons for deviation/comments
OVERALL EFFICIENCY SCORE		3.3 (3)	3.3 (3)	
SUSTAINABILITY	Financial sustainability	3	2	Fragile state with major constraints
	Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities	3	2	No arrangements to ensure capacity to maintain Master Plan
	Ownership sustainability and of partnerships	3	2	Stakeholders not kept informed after initial meeting
	Environmental and social sustainability	N/A	N/A	
OVERALL SUSTAINABILITY SCORE		3	2	
OVERALL PROJECT COMPLETION RATING		3.25 (3)	2.75 (3)	

*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).

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		2	Issues regarding longer term capacity to sustain Master Plan not addressed
	Use of previous lessons learned from previous operations during design and implementation		3	
	Promotion of stakeholder participation to strengthen ownership		3	
	Enforcement of safeguard and fiduciary requirements		N/A	
	Design and implementation of Monitoring & Evaluation system		3	
	Quality of Bank supervision (mix of skills in supervisory teams, etc)		3	
	Timeliness of responses to requests		3	
OVERALL BANK PERFORMANCE SCORE		3	2.8 (3)	
BORROWER PERFORMANCE	Quality of preparation and implementation		2	Fell short on several occasions
	Compliance with covenants, agreements and safeguards		3	
	Provision of timely counterpart		3	

	funding			
	Responsiveness to supervision recommendations		2	Did not appoint recommended auditor
	Measures taken to establish basis for project sustainability		2	Need for capacity building and specialist task force
	Timeliness of preparing requests		2	
OVERALL BORROWER PERFORMANCE SCORE		3	2.3 (2)	
PERFORMANCE OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS	Timeliness of disbursements by co-financiers		3	
	Functioning of collaborative agreements			
	Quality of policy dialogue with co-financiers (for PBOs only)			
	Quality of work by service providers		2	Deliverables considerably late
	Responsiveness to client demands		3	
OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS		3	3	
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, IMPLEMENTATION AND UTILIZATION OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION (M&E)

Criteria	Sub-criteria	IDEV Score	Comments
M&E DESIGN	M&E system is in place, clear, appropriate and realistic	3	Appropriate but used similar descriptions for both outputs and outcomes
	Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan were duly approved	3	
	Existence of disaggregated gender indicator	N/A	
	Baseline data were available or collected during the design	3	
	Other, specify		
OVERALL M&E DESIGN SCORE		3	
M&E IMPLEMENTATION	The M&E function is adequately equipped and staffed	3	
OVERALL M&E IMPLEMENTATION SCORE		3	
M&E UTILIZATION	The borrower used the tracking information for decision	3	
OVERALL M&E UTILIZATION SCORE		3	

Criteria	Sub-criteria	IDEV Score	Comments
OVERALL M&E PERFORMANCE SCORE		3	Adequate for TA project

PCR QUALITY EVALUATION

Criteria	PCR-EVN (1-4)	Comments
QUALITY OF PCR		
1. Extent of quality and completeness of the PCR evidence and analysis to substantiate the ratings of the various sections	3	
2. Extent of objectivity of PCR assessment score	2	Underestimated the sustainability aspects
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	
4. Extent of identification and assessment of key factors (internal and exogenous) and unintended effects (positive or negative) affecting design and implementation	3	
5. Adequacy of treatment of safeguards, fiduciary issues, and alignment and harmonization	3	
6. Extent of soundness of data generating and analysis process (including rates of returns) in support of PCR assessment	3	
7. Overall adequacy of the accessible evidence (from PCR including annexure and other data provided)	3	
8. Extent to which lessons learned (and recommendations) are clear and based on the PCR assessment (evidence & analysis)	2	Unclear and not well written. Lessons too specific and not generalized.
9. Extent of overall clarity and completeness of the PCR	3	
Other (specify)		
PCR QUALITY SCORE	2.7 (3)	
PCR compliance with guidelines (PCR/OM ; IDEV)		
1. PCR Timeliness (On time = 4; Late= 1)	2	Only one month overdue
2. Extent of participation of borrower, Co-financiers & field offices in PCR preparation***	1	Little evidence
3. Other aspect(s) (specify)		
PCR COMPLIANCE SCORE	1.5 (2)	
*** 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)