

PCR EVALUATION NOTE FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

1. BASIC INFORMATION			
a. Basic project data			
Project title: Rehabilitation of East Africa Selected Road Sections along the Central Corridor in Tanzania, Burundi and Rwanda			
Project code: P-ZI-DB0-153	Instrument number(s): NEPAD-IPPF GRANT No. 5150155001502		
Project type: Preparation Phase	Sector: Transport		
Country: MULTINATIONAL (Tanzania/Burundi/Rwanda)	Environmental categorization (1-3) : 3		
Processing Milestones	Key Events	Disbursement and Closing date	
Date approved: 20/06/2014	Cancelled amount: NA	Original disbursement deadline: 31/07/2016	
Date signed: 02/10/2014	Supplementary financing: NA	Original closing date: 31/07/2016	
Date of entry into force : 02/10/2014	Restructuring: NA	Revised disbursement deadline: 01/04/2019	
Date effective for 1st disbursement: 11/08/2016	Extensions (specify dates): July 31, 2016 to 1st April 2019 1st April 2019 to December 2019	Revised closing date: 31st December 2019	
Date of actual 1st disbursement: 24/03/2017			
b. Financing sources			
Financing source/ instrument (MUA)	Approved amount (USD) :	Disbursed amount (USD) :	Percentage disbursed (%) :
Loan:	USD 2,520,215	USD 2,500,572	99%
Grant:			
Government:			
Other (ex. Co-financiers):			
TOTAL :	USD 2,520,215	USD 2,500,572	99%
Co-financiers and other external partners:			
Execution and implementation agencies: East Africa Community (EAC)			
c. Responsible Bank staff			
Position	At approval	At completion	
Regional Director	Mr. Gabriel NEGATU	Ms. Nnenna NWABUFO	
Sector Director	Mr. Sylvain MALIKO	Mr. Amadou OUMAROU	
Sector Manager	Mr. Bamory TRAORE	Mr. Mike SALAWOU	
Task Manager	Dr. Sadok ZERELLI	Mr. Alex MBARAGA	
Alternate Task Manager	NA	Mr. Buberwa KEMIBARO	
PCR Team Leader		Mr. Jeffrey KOUTON / Mr. Suleiman ATHUMANI	
PCR Team Members		Mr. Emmanuel Chiejina EJIKE/ Mr. Alex MBARAGA	

d. Report data		
PCR Date : 28 August 2020		
PCR Mission Date:	From: 16 February 2020	To: 18 February 2020
PCR-EN Date: 19/04/2021		
Evaluator/consultant : TESFAYE T.	Peer Reviewer/ Task Manager : Ghzala A	

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:

Impacts: Facilitating and strengthening intra-regional trade. Stimulating the productivity and competitiveness of the economies in the area of influence of the project.

b. Objectives/Expected Outcomes:

The overall objectives of the project (Rehabilitation of East Africa Selected Road Sections along the Central Corridor in Tanzania, Burundi and Rwanda) were to facilitate trade between countries in central (DRC) and eastern Africa to enhance the economies of the region and facilitate improved movement of goods and people who will benefit through job creation and increased wealth, among other benefits.

The specific purpose of the project: Preparing technical feasibility and economic viability of improving the existing roads, and detailed engineering designs and tender documents for the most viable rehabilitation options for the following multinational roads (i) Lusahunga – Rusumo and Kayonza – Kigali Multinational Road (Tanzania/Rwanda), (ii) Nyakanazi – Kasulu – Manyovu and Rumonge - Rutunga - Bujumbura (Tanzania/Burundi)

Expected outcomes (investment and operation phases): (i) decreasing vehicle operating costs; (ii) reduce transit times; (iii) easier movement of persons, goods and services; and (iv) improving access for women to local markets, hospitals, schools.

Beneficiaries: East African Community (EAC)

c. Outputs and intended beneficiaries:

The project studies would be carried out in two distinct packages to determine the economic feasibility and technical viability of developing the corridors that connect the three countries to the port of Dar es Salaam. The expected outputs would include:

- Technical and economic feasibility study report
- Environmental and social impact assessment report
- Detailed engineering designs reports
- Bidding documents

d. Principal activities/Components:

Component/activities:

Component A: Consultancy services for Lot 1 : Tanzania/Rwanda: Lusahunga – Rusumo (91 km) /Kayonza - Kigali (70 km) – Total = 161 km

Component B: Consultancy Services for Lot 2: Tanzania/Burundi: Nyakanazi – Kasulu– Manyovu (250 km) /Rumonge - Rutunga - Bujumbura (78 km) – Total = 328 km

The activities/outputs of the consultants comprise of preparing and delivering technical and economic feasibility study report, environmental and social impact assessment report, detailed engineering designs reports, and bidding documents

Component C: Project Management

3. PROJECT PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

RELEVANCE

a. Relevance of the project development objective:

PCR rates highly satisfactory (4). PCREN concurs.

The East Africa Community (EAC) formally submitted request to NEPAD-IPPF (Infrastructure Project Preparation Facility) to finance the consultancy services for carrying out the feasibility studies and detailed designs of two regional road projects connecting the Republics of Rwanda and Burundi to the East African Regional Trunk Road Network Corridor in the United Republic of Tanzania, namely:

(i) Tanzania/Rwanda: Lusahunga – Rusumo (91 km) /Kayonza - Kigali (70 km) – Total = 161 km

(ii) Tanzania/Burundi: Nyakanazi – Kasulu– Manyovu (250 km) /Rumonge - Rutunga - Bujumbura (78 km) – Total = 328 km

Both roads were identified by PIDA-PAP as the priority African Regional Transport Integration Network (ARTIN) corridor in East Africa. These roads were also given high priority by EAC Heads of States in 2012.

This project forms part of the Bank's regional integration strategy for Eastern Africa (Eastern Africa Regional Integration Strategy Paper, 2018-2022), which aims at linking regional markets through investments in infrastructures, trade & transport facilitation and promoting private sector development. Furthermore, the project was aligned with Tanzania's Country Strategy Paper (CSP 2016-2020), Burundi's CSP (2019-2023) and Rwanda's CSP (2012-2016). The design and implementation stages benefited from lessons learnt from previous Bank interventions in the transport sector in the three countries.

The project objectives are relevant to specific countries' development and beyond. The relevance of this project also reinforced the need of all EAC partner countries to have more feasible transport competing corridor options for their export and import requirements.

b. Relevance of project design (from approval to completion):

PCR rates relevance of project design highly satisfactory (4). PCREN rates satisfactory (3)

The key elements that characterize the project's design are featured in the appraisal report's results-based logical framework (RLF), which include: (i) specification of the project's objective and its connections to the problems/issues that necessitated the project; (ii) articulation of the results-chain including key risks and mitigation

measures; (iii) identification of the main outputs and outcomes (not always distinguishable) that are partially integral in the project's M&E system. The results chain in particular maps the pathways linking the consultancy activities and outputs of the study (technical and economic feasibility reports) to anticipated outcomes related to improved road transport and development impacts (such as strengthening intra-regional trade and stimulating productivity and competitiveness of the economies in the area of influence of the project).

During the project appraisal stage, the Bank / NEPAD-IPPF and the EAC Secretariat discussed, negotiated and agreed on an organizational structure for the management of the implementation of funded preparatory activities. The East African Community Secretariat (EAC) was designated to be the Executing Agency of the Study with the assistance of TANROADS in Tanzania, Rwanda Transport Development Agency (TRDA) in Rwanda and Office des Routes (ODR) in Burundi.

The original design of the study remained sound but some adjustments were necessary during the implementation cycle.

EFFECTIVENESS

c. Effectiveness in delivering outputs:

PCR rates effectiveness in delivering outputs satisfactory (3). PCREN agrees.

The output of the proposed studies would be technical reports aimed at informing and enabling the physical implementation of road segments in the Central corridor.

Technical feasibility study report, 100%

Economic viability study report, 100%

Audit report, 0%

The feasibility studies and detailed engineering design of the two road sections were completed, 100%. The audit of the project was yet to commence (as of August 2020).

d. Effectiveness in realizing outcomes:

PCR rates effectiveness in realizing outcomes satisfactory (3). As per the definition adopted in the PCR, the PCREN concurs with the satisfactory rating.

But note that the definition adopted in the PCR is not in line with the definition/measurement of outcomes stated in section 2 (a) above. These anticipated outcomes would only materialize in investment/operation phases of the rehabilitated roads, which would include, for example, reduced transport and travel costs, increased movement of persons, goods and services, and greater access to economic and social sectors.

e. Project development outcome:

PCR rates project development outcome highly satisfactory (4). The PCREN rates satisfactory (3) in line with the PCR evaluation guidance, which suggests a rating of 3 if output and outcome performance is each rated 3.

The PCR's rating is based on assessment of the achievement of the study objective (i.e. determine technical and economic viability, assess the environmental and social impact, carry out design reviews and detailed engineering designs, and prepare tender documents for the most viable options).

Note that achieving development impacts is not the same as achieving project's objective. The former would consummate when the rehabilitated roads realize intermediate outcomes leading to, for example, strengthening intra-regional trade and stimulating the productivity and competitiveness of the economies in the area of influence of the project. Such development impacts cannot be rated at this feasibility study stage.

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.

EAC Secretariat (100%), and Regional Member Countries (Tanzania, Rwanda and Burundi), 100%

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

None reported

EFFICIENCY

h. Timeliness:

PCR rates timeliness highly unsatisfactory (1). PCREN concurs as the ratio of planned and actual implementation time is 0.35, which, as per the PCR evaluation guidance is highly unsatisfactory (1).

Among the factors that contributed to the time overrun were the procurement delays. The NEPAD-IPPF Grant Agreement was signed by the AfDB on 2 October 2014 and countersigned by EAC Secretariat on 3 November 2014. Despite signing the Grant Agreement in 2014, the consulting firms (HP GAUFF INGENIEURE GmbH & Co. and EGIS) commenced provision of services in May 2016.

i. Resource use efficiency:

PCR rates resource use efficiency satisfactory (3). PCREN concurs.

By the end of the project period, 99% of the NEPAD-IPPF funding was disbursed. The main outputs of the projects can be assessed as 85%. The audit of the project was not delivered. The ratio of the median percentage physical implementation of the project outputs and commitment rate is 0.85, which, as the PCR guidelines is rated satisfactory (3).

j. Cost-benefit analysis:

Not applicable for the study itself

k. Implementation progress:

PCR rates implementation progress satisfactory (3). PCREN concurs.

As it is underscored in the PCR, the project experienced difficulties in implementation due to four main factors: (i) delays in recruiting the consultants, (ii) insecurity reported in one of the implementing countries (Burundi) which hindered the consultants from fulfilling field missions, (iii) challenges in organization of validation meetings (logistics and permit issues faced by road agencies in attending these meetings), and (iv) disbursement delays due to the use of the two currencies USD and EURO.

SUSTAINABILITY

l. Financial sustainability:

PCREN rates financial sustainability highly satisfactory (4) because the two roads have been found bankable and suitable for investment and therefore expected to raise the necessary financing for implementation as well as operations and maintenance. PCREN agrees.

m. Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities:

PCR rates institutional and capacity sustainability satisfactory (3). PCREN concurs as the study project has reinforced EAC's capacity to prepare, design and manage regional projects.

n. Ownership and sustainability of partnerships:

PCR rates ownership and sustainability of partnerships highly satisfactory (4). PCREN rates satisfactory (3).

PCREN agrees that “the beneficiary’s members as well as the EAC secretariat were engaged in the implementation of the project study. Key ministries of government from the concerned countries and institutions within the Ministry of Transport also participated in the implementation of the project. Stakeholder information dissemination and validation workshops were held to ensure direct participation in evaluating the project deliverables.”

However, the PCREN is unsure if these engagements would meet the high standard (rating =4) that would require “a project has been very effective at involving all the relevant stakeholders and there is a strong sense of ownership amongst the beneficiaries.”

o. Environmental and social sustainability:

N/A

As this is a study, environmental and social sustainability does not apply, and will only come into play after the physical rehabilitation and modernization projects.

4. PERFORMANCE OF STAKEHOLDERS

a. Bank performance:

PCR rates Bank performance satisfactory (3). PCREN concurs

In terms of compliance, all procurement, financial management and monitoring systems used during the implementation of funded activities were in line with EAC Secretariat procedures as well as with the Bank's rules, guidelines and procedures. Thus, the Bank's rules were used as agreed.

Technical compliances have been executed by the consultant through the periodic progress reports in accordance with the Bank's requirements.

The Bank / NEPAD-IPPF carried out field supervision missions to access the progress and resolve implementation issues. The executing agency, the consultant and NEPAD-IPPF worked in full collaboration. The supervision missions were effective in resolving implementation issues that arose.

However, there were few notable areas of weakness affecting the Bank's performance: (i) Inadequate determination of the scope of the consultancy services; (ii) inadequate assessment of political and insecurity risks in the regions; and (iii) high turnover of Task Managers –risk to smooth continuity of operations. At times some requests for project documents were addressed to the executing agency by the Bank, even though some of these documents had already been sent to the Bank (sign of inadequate project documentation)

b. Borrower performance:

PCR rates Borrower performance satisfactory (3). PCREN concurs

The Borrower refers to the EAC Secretariat (the executing agency) and the three member countries (Uganda, Rwanda and Burundi). The Borrower fulfilled the project covenants. The executing agency

mostly followed the Bank's fiduciary requirements and its own rules and procedures throughout the project implementation. Quarterly progress reports were regularly submitted to the Bank.

However, there were some areas of weakness in performance: (i) inadequate determination of the scope of the consultancy services; (ii) inadequate assessment of political and insecurity risks in the regions; (iii) delays in the procurement of consultants; and (iv) insufficient mechanism for coordination among participants (executing agency, the consultant and member countries).

c. Performance of other stakeholders:

PCR rates performance of other stakeholders satisfactory (3). PCREN concurs

Consultants performance: The project was carried out by HP GAUFF INGENIEURE GmbH & Co. and EGIS. The design quality for Burundi side was not satisfactory.

5. SUMMARY OF OVERALL PROJECT PERFORMANCE

a. Overall assessment:

PCR rates overall project performance 3.5. PCREN rates satisfactory (3)

Relevance in objective and design was satisfactory. Progress towards achieving the project's objective was satisfactory. Proxy indicators of operational efficiency such as timeliness and implementation effectiveness suggest some scope for improvement. The project's performance on sustainability was satisfactory.

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

PCREN rates overall quality of M&E satisfactory (3)

The M&E focus was on monitoring the performance of consultants charged with the responsibilities for producing the project's outputs. The data/information generated was used to prepare reports on the project's activities and outputs. Information contained in these reports influenced decisions affecting project operation and result.

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.

<u>Original</u>		<u>Validation</u>
	The NEPAD-IPPF Grant Agreement was signed by the AfDB on 2 October 2014 and countersigned by EAC Secretariat on 3 November 2014. Despite signing the Grant Agreement in 2014, the EAC Secretariat executed Service Contracts of fifteen (15) calendar months duration with HP GAUFF INGENIEURE GmbH & Co. (Germany) and EGIS (France) on 1st April 2016, 18 months (1.5 years) after signing the NEPAD-IPPF Grant Agreement. The initial closing date for the Grant was 31 July 2016, but this was extended to December 2019. Both Consulting firms	Write-Off

	(HP GAUFF INGENIEURE GmbH & Co. and EGIS) commenced provision of services 1 May 2016.	
<u>Reformulation (If applicable)</u>		
<u>Reviewer Comment</u>	the lesson learned is not articulated	

<u>Original</u>	The project saw an increase in the scope of works ranging from the designing of an additional 5 bridges, realignment designs, bypass designs and feeder roads design to topographical surveys, geotechnical investigation and materials surveys together with logistics and management considerations.	<u>Validation</u> Write-Off
<u>Reformulation (If applicable)</u>		
<u>Reviewer Comment</u>	the lesson learned (if any) is not articulated	

<u>Original</u>	There is a need for EAC Secretariat to ensure that staff responsible for day-to-day administration of projects are versed in undertaking feasibility studies and engineering designs of roads and project management to feel able to review the works of others to avoid technical and management challenges that may eventually constitute a risk to project accomplishment.	<u>Validation</u> Write-Off
<u>Reformulation (If applicable)</u>		
<u>Reviewer Comment</u>	Moved to the section under the recommendation	

<u>Original</u>	The EAC Secretariat and the Bank should ensure that the scope of the consultancy services is adequately determined and defined so that the Terms of References are comprehensive and address all the activities and costs necessary and sufficient for the delivery of the consultancy services. In addition, the Bank and EAC should have better assessed political and insecurity risks in the regions and take them into account during estimation of the project duration.	<u>Validation</u> Write-Off
<u>Reformulation (If applicable)</u>		
<u>Reviewer Comment</u>	Moved to the section under the recommendation	

<u>Original</u>	It is necessary to ensure continuity of the work by always having an alternate Task Manager. This alternate TM could be a designated staff on the field. In addition, a proper handover of the operation from previous to incoming Task Manager should be done to ensure project continuity.	<u>Validation</u> Write-Off
<u>Reformulation (If applicable)</u>		
<u>Reviewer Comment</u>	Moved to the section under the recommendation	

<u>Original</u>	At times, some requests for project documents were addressed to the executing agency by the Bank, even though some of these documents had already been sent to the Bank. As a lesson learnt, a documentation record management system is necessary.	<u>Validation</u> Sign-Off
<u>Reformulation (If applicable)</u>		
<u>Reviewer Comment</u>		

<u>Original</u>	NEPAD-IPPF is currently financing the OSBP study for the Manyovu/Mugina OSBP, which lies on one of the road sections funded by this project. The OSBP is filing a gap that was not included in the design of this project. As a risk to the sustained achievement of outcomes of the project, construction of the corridor without paying attention to border issues could have threatened the prospects to achieve the full benefits of improved transport infrastructure. As a lesson learnt, there is a need to mainstream trade facilitation measures such as OSBP in the preparation of cross border corridors).	<u>Validation</u> Sign-Off
<u>Reformulation (If applicable)</u>		
<u>Reviewer Comment</u>		

<u>Original</u>	One reason of the delay in disbursement was explained by the fact that EGIS contract was denominated in Euro and USD, with expected exchange rate fluctuations.	<u>Validation</u> Write-Off
<u>Reformulation (If applicable)</u>		

<u>Reviewer Comment</u>	Not all operational difficulties are lessons learned
--------------------------------	--

<u>Original</u>	The detailed design and tender documents should be reviewed deeply by the executing agency and the EAC staff, in order to avoid any eventual issues during the projects implementation. In addition, the consultant have to be responsible of any defect noticed during the launching of the tender or the work implementation stage.	<u>Validation</u> Write-Off
<u>Reformulation (If applicable)</u>		
<u>Reviewer Comment</u>	Moved to the section under the recommendation	

<u>Original</u>	It is highly recommended to undertake French studies in compliance with French standards for the French speaking countries.	<u>Validation</u> Write-Off
<u>Reformulation (If applicable)</u>		
<u>Reviewer Comment</u>	Fits under recommendation	

<u>Original</u>	It is highly recommended to undertake separate studies for French and English speaking countries in order to avoid any eventual non-satisfactory quality design.	<u>Validation</u> Write-Off
<u>Reformulation (If applicable)</u>		
<u>Reviewer Comment</u>	Fits under recommendation	

<u>New lesson</u>	
<u>Reviewer comment</u>	

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).

<u>Original</u>	There is a need for EAC Secretariat to ensure that staff responsible for day-to-day administration of projects are versed in undertaking feasibility studies and engineering designs of roads and project management	<u>Validation</u> Sign-Off
------------------------	--	---

	to feel able to review the works of others to avoid technical and management challenges that may eventually constitute a risk to project accomplishment.	
<u>Reformulation (If applicable)</u>		
<u>Reviewer Comment</u>		

<u>Original</u>	The EAC Secretariat and the Bank should ensure that the scope of the consultancy services is adequately determined and defined so that the Terms of References are comprehensive and address all the activities and costs necessary and sufficient for the delivery of the consultancy services. In addition, the Bank and EAC should have better assessed political and insecurity risks in the regions and take them into account during estimation of the project duration.	<u>Validation</u> Sign-Off
<u>Reformulation (If applicable)</u>		
<u>Reviewer Comment</u>		

<u>Original</u>	It is necessary to ensure continuity of the work by always having an alternate Task Manager. This alternate TM could be a designated staff on the field. In addition, a proper handover of the operation from previous to incoming Task Manager should be done to ensure project continuity.	<u>Validation</u> Sign-Off
<u>Reformulation (If applicable)</u>		
<u>Reviewer Comment</u>		

<u>Original</u>	The detailed design and tender documents should be reviewed deeply by the executing agency and the EAC staff, in order to avoid any eventual issues during the projects implementation. In addition, the consultant have to be responsible of any defect noticed during the launching of the tender or the work implementation stage.	<u>Validation</u> Sign-Off
<u>Reformulation (If applicable)</u>		
<u>Reviewer Comment</u>		

<u>Original</u>	Capacity building and training, especially on Bank procedures and requirements, will be required for the EAC in terms of Procurement, Financial Management, Project Management and disbursements (Training of the EAC Staff on Bank's disbursement procedures should be conducted at the beginning of new future projects in order to avoid disbursement delays). For the execution of future projects, emphasis should be on technical Assistance not only during the preparation phase but also for the implementation of the physical works project.	<u>Validation</u> Sign-Off
<u>Reformulation (If applicable)</u>		
<u>Recipient(s)</u>	Bank and Beneficiary	
<u>Reviewer Comment</u>		

<u>Original</u>	It is recommended: (i) to support EAC to mobilize its partners to mobilize funding for the maintenance of the roads (ii) the maintenance, facilitation, fund raising for the project implementation.	<u>Validation</u> Sign-Off
<u>Reformulation (If applicable)</u>		
<u>Recipient(s)</u>	Bank and Beneficiary	
<u>Reviewer Comment</u>		

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).

PCR quality satisfactory (3): Satisfactory in coverage of evaluation dimensions, data generation and access, quality of analysis and lessons learned.

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	4	4	
Relevance of project development objective	4	4	
Relevance of project design	4	3	Original design was sound but some adjustments were required during implementation.
EFFECTIVENESS		3	
Delivery of outputs	3	3	
Realization of outcomes	3	3	Defined in the PCR as the completion of the feasibility studies and detailed engineering design of the two road sections and finalization of the audit report. As it is shown in the appendix below, the performance of these indicators averages 3 (satisfactory).
Development objective (DO)	4	3	<p>The rating of 4 of the DO is not consistent with the PCR evaluation guidance which suggests a rating of 3 if output and outcome performance is each rated 3.</p> <p>Note 1: The PCR's rating is based on assessment of the achievement of the study objective (i.e. determine technical and economic viability, assess the environmental and social impact, carry out design reviews and detailed engineering designs, and prepare tender documents for the most viable options).</p> <p>Note 2: Achieving the project's objective is not the same as achieving development impacts. Development impacts such as strengthening intra-regional trade cannot be rated at this feasibility study stage.</p>
EFFICIENCY		2	
Timeliness	1	1	
Resource use efficiency	3	3	
Cost-benefit analysis	N/R	N/R	not rated
Implementation progress (Compliance with (i) with covenants; (ii) project systems and procedures; (iii) project execution and financing)	3	3	No IPR has been available to track the 10-IP criteria
SUSTAINABILITY		3	
Financial sustainability	4	4	
Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities	3	3	
Ownership and sustainability of partnerships	4	3	The PCREN is uncertain that the project has met the high standard (rating =4) as per the PCR evaluation criteria, i.e. the project has been very effective at involving all the relevant stakeholders and there is a strong sense of ownership amongst the beneficiaries.
Environmental and social sustainability	N/R	N/R	not applicable
OVERALL PROJECT COMPLETION RATING	3.5	3	
Bank performance:	3	3	
Borrower performance:	3	3	

Performance of other stakeholders:	3	3	
Overall PCR quality:		3	Satisfactory in coverage of evaluation dimensions, data generation and access, quality of analysis and lessons learned.

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

PCR rating scale:

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	4	
	Relevance of project design (from approval to completion)	4	3	Original design was sound but some adjustments were required during implementaiton.
OVERALL RELEVANCE SCORE		4	4	
EFFECTIVENESS*	Effectiveness in delivering outcomes			
	Outcome (overall)	3	3	For the PCR, achievement in outcomes refers to completion of the planned feasibility Studies and detailed engineering design of the two road sections as per scope of the assignment
	Effectiveness in delivering output			
	Technical feasibility study report, 100%		4	
	Economic viability study report, 100%		4	
	Audit report, 0%		1	
	Output (overall)	3	3	The average rating for outputs is Satisfactory since one component, the financial audit, did not start yet after 5 years.

Criteria	Sub-criteria	PCR work score	IDEV review	Reasons for deviation/comments
	Development objective (DO)			
	Development objective rating	4	3	The PCR's rating is based on assessment that the objective of the study was achieved (i.e. determine technical and economic viability, assess the environmental and social impact, carry out design reviews and detailed engineering designs, and prepare tender documents for the most viable options).
	Beneficiaries			
	EAC Secretariat EAC Secretariat 100%		4	
	Regional Member Countries (Tanzania, Rwanda and Burundi), 100%		4	
	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	N/R	N/R	
	Gender	N/R	N/R	
	Environment & climate change	N/R	N/R	
	Poverty reduction	N/R	N/R	
	Private sector development	N/R	N/R	
	Regional integration	N/R	N/R	
	Other (specify)			
	EFFECTIVENESS OVERALL SCORE			3
EFFICIENCY	Timeliness (based on the initial closing date)	1	1	
	Resource used efficiency	3	3	
	Cost-benefit analysis	N/R	N/R	
	Implementation progress (from the IPR)	3	3	
	Other (specify)			
OVERALL EFFICIENCY SCORE		2	2	
SUSTAINABILITY	Financial sustainability	4	4	

Criteria	Sub-criteria	PCR work score	IDEV review	Reasons for deviation/comments
	Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities	3	3	
	Ownership and sustainability of partnerships	4	3	The PCREN is uncertain that the project has met the high standard (rating =4) as per the PCR evaluation criteria,
	Environmental and social sustainability	N/R	N/R	

*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		3	The Bank / NEPAD-IPPF in collaboration with the executing agency, the consultant and NEPAD-IPPF engaged in identification and resolution of problems.
	Use of previous lessons learned from previous operations during design and implementation		3	The design and implementation stages benefited from lessons learnt from previous Bank interventions in the transport sector in the three countries.
	Promotion of stakeholder participation to strengthen ownership		3	Notably among the member countries of the East Africa Community
	Enforcement of safeguard and fiduciary requirements		3	Project covenants were duly fulfilled.
	Design and implementation of Monitoring & Evaluation system		2	Mainly for monitoring activities and deliveries of consultant
	Quality of Bank supervision (mix of skills in supervisory teams, etc)		3	The Bank performed field supervision missions and resolved implementation issues. However, high turnover of Task Managers were cause for
	Timeliness of responses to requests		2	The Bank / NEPAD-IPPF has processed the recipient requests (for disbursement, non-objection, etc.) but encountered some delays
OVERALL BANK PERFORMANCE SCORE		3	3	
BORROWER PERFORMANCE	Quality of preparation and implementation		3	The Bank / NEPAD-IPPF in collaboration with the executing agency, the consultant and NEPAD-IPPF engaged in identification and resolution of problems.
	Compliance with covenants, agreements and safeguards		3	The executing agency mostly followed the Bank's fiduciary requirements and its own

				rules and procedures throughout the project implementation.
	Provision of timely counterpart funding		UTR	no data
	Responsiveness to supervision recommendations		3	Jointly with the Bank, implementation issues were resolved. Quarterly progress reports were regularly submitted to the Bank.
	Measures taken to establish basis for project sustainability		2	The project contributed to sustainability but no explicit strategies were in place or recommended
	Timeliness of preparing requests		UTR	no such specific data
OVERALL BORROWER PERFORMANCE SCORE		3	3	The rating refers to the performance of the East African Community (EAC), the executing agency.
PERFORMANCE OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS	Timeliness of disbursements by co-financiers		N/R	
	Functioning of collaborative agreements		N/R	no information
	Quality of policy dialogue with co-financiers (for PBOs only)		N/R	not applicable
	Quality of work by service providers		3	refers to the deliveries of the consultant. Overall satisfactory except the case of the Burundi's feasibility study.
	Responsiveness to client demands		UTR	no data
OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS		3	3	refers mainly to the performance of the consultants for the study
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	The M&E focus was on monitoring the performance of consultants charged with the responsibilities for producing the project's outputs.
	Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan were duly approved	3	Mainly for monitoring progress in technical and economic feasibility study, environmental and social impact assessment, and detailed engineering designs including various financial/economic rates return for different road section.
	Existence of disaggregated gender indicator	UTR	no data

Criteria	Sub-criteria	IDEV Score	Comments
	Baseline data were available or collected during the design	UTR	no data
	Other, specify		
OVERALL M&E DESIGN SCORE		3	
M&E IMPLEMENTATION	The M&E function is adequately equipped and staffed	3	The East Africa Community (EAC), which was the implementing agency, was equipped and staffed
OVERALL M&E IMPLEMENTATION SCORE		3	
M&E UTILIZATION	The borrower used the tracking information for decision	3	EAC delivered progress reports to the Bank as per the compliance requirement. Technical compliances have been executed by the consultant through the periodic progress reports in accordance with the Bank's requirements. The data/information generated influenced decisions affecting project operation and result.
OVERALL M&E UTILIZATION SCORE		3	
OVERALL M&E PERFORMANCE SCORE		3	

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	Covered all the evaluation dimensions. Informed largely by the PCR evaluation guidance
2. Extent of objectivity of PCR assessment score	3	Largely objective based on the feasibility studies, and detailed engineering data and cost estimates.
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	Scoring and associated narrative are mostly consistent with the PCR guidance.
4. Extent of identification and assessment of key factors (internal and exogenous) and unintended effects (positive or negative) affecting design and implementation	3	Some influential factors identified presumably through field observations and expert knowledge
5. Adequacy of treatment of safeguards, fiduciary issues, and alignment and harmonization	3	Covered adequately on performance in safeguards and fiduciary issues, and adjustments in scope.
6. Extent of soundness of data generating and analysis process (including rates of returns) in support of PCR assessment	3	Data required for the feasibility study and detail project design were generated
7. Overall adequacy of the accessible evidence (from PCR including annexure and other data provided)	3	Through published quarterly technical reports
8. Extent to which lessons learned (and recommendations) are clear and based on the PCR assessment (evidence & analysis)	3	Lessons learned are clear
9. Extent of overall clarity and completeness of the PCR	3	Satisfactory
Other (specify)		
PCR QUALITY SCORE	3.0	Satisfactory
PCR compliance with guidelines (PCR/OM ; IDEV)		
1. PCR Timeliness (On time = 4; Late= 1)	4	
2. Extent of participation of borrower, Co-financiers & field offices in PCR preparation***	3	Borrower/executing agency
3. Other aspect(s) (specify)		
PCR COMPLIANCE SCORE	4	
*** rated as Highly satisfactory (4), or Satisfactory (3), or Unsatisfactory (2), or Highly unsatisfactory (1)		

List of References

African Development Bank Group. 2020. Rehabilitation of East Africa Selected Road Section Along the Central Corridor in Tanzania, Burundi and Rwanda. Project Completion Report. August.

African Development Bank Group and NEPAD - Infrastructure Project Preparation Facility (NEPAD –IPPF). 2014. Feasibility Studies and Design of the Rehabilitation of Selected Road Sections of the Central Corridor in Tanzania, Rwanda and Burundi. Project Information Memorandum (PIM). June.