

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK GROUP



**REVIEW OF 2000-2004 COUNTRY PORTFOLIO
REVIEW REPORTS**

**OPERATIONS EVALUATION DEPARTMENT
(OPEV)**

08 June 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations and Acronyms	i
Executive Summary	ii
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Methodology and Scope of the Review	1
2. Bank Group Policy on CPRs	2
2.1 The Bank Group CPR Policy	2
2.2 Format for CPR Reports	3
2.3 CPR Review Procedures	3
2.4 Comparison of World Bank CPPR and Bank Group Policies and Procedures	4
3. Assessment of the CPR Process	5
3.1 Pre-mission Review Process	5
3.2 Composition and duration of CPR Missions	5
3.3 Post-mission Review Process	6
4. Analysis of the Quality of CPR Content	7
4.1 The Content of CPRs	7
4.2 Assessment of the Overall Quality of CPRs	7
4.3 Review of Active Projects	8
4.4 Assessment of Borrower and Bank Performance	10
4.5 Coordination with Other Donors	11
4.6 Lessons learned, Measures, Solutions and Plans of Action	12
4.7 Summary of Assessments	13
5. Generic Portfolio Issues	14
5.1 Portfolio Issues emerging from the CPRs Reviewed	14
5.2 Generic Portfolio Management Issues	14
5.3 Status of Recommendations of Past Studies on Bank Processes	16
6. Key Conclusions and Recommendations	18
6.1 Policy, Format and Guidelines	18
6.2 Processes and Systems	19
6.3 Content of the CPRs	19
6.4 Generic Portfolio Issues	20
Annexes	Number of pages
I. List of Country Portfolio Review Reports	1
II. Questions and Staff Responses	3
III. Assessment of the Quality of CPR Reports	4
IV. Portfolio Review Matrix – Summary of Generic Problems	2
V. Active Portfolio and Performance Ratings	1
VI. Comparison of World Bank and Bank Group Policy and Procedures	1
VII. CPR Report Processing Time	1

This report was prepared by a team comprising Messrs. M. Manai, Chief Evaluation Officer, A. Coker, Principal Evaluation Officer, W. Byaruhanga (Consultant) under the supervision of Getinet W. Giorgis, Director of OPEV. Ratings were made and peer review provided by Mr. E. N'diaye, Chief Evaluation Officer, Mrs. G. Yirga-Hall, Messrs. P-A Rochon, F. Turay, and H. Razafindramanana, Principal Evaluation Officers, all of OPEV. All enquiries on the report should be addressed to Mr. A. Coker, extension 3425.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ADB	African Development Bank
ADF	African Development Fund
APPR	Annual Portfolio Performance Review
CODE	Committee of Operations and Development Effectiveness
CPPR	Country Portfolio Performance Review (World Bank)
CPR	Country Portfolio Review (African Development Bank)
CSP	Country Strategy Paper
DO	Development Objectives
IDWG	Interdepartmental Working Group
IP	Implementation Progress
IWG	Internal Working Group
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
OPEV	Operations Evaluation Department
POPR	Policy and Performance Review Department
PPRU	Procurement Unit
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
PSDU	Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Unit

Executive Summary

1. The Country Portfolio Review (CPR) is one of the main instruments used by the Bank Group for tracking the implementation performance, relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, potential impact and overall assistance to member countries.
2. It is a dynamic, interactive instrument from which action plans are expected to, periodically, be developed to address key systemic problems in portfolio management. The CPR thus serves as an important supervision tool in assessing Bank and borrower performance in the implementation of projects and programs, in enhancing portfolio quality, and in drawing useful lessons for the subsequent development of country and sector assistance strategies.
3. This review is the first of its kind and has four principal purposes. *First*, it assesses the policy, format and guidelines of CPRs undertaken during 2000–2004. *Second*, it assesses the process of preparation, consultation with client countries and interdepartmental cooperation within the Bank in the preparation and review process of CPRs. *Third*, it assesses the content of the set of CPRs and gauges the adequacy and depth of coverage of portfolio issues, their relevance and their usefulness as a portfolio performance management tool. *Fourth*, it identifies lessons and makes recommendations on the policy, process and content of future CPRs to make them more useful as instruments for reporting on achievements and formulating future Bank assistance strategies in the regional member countries.
4. The methodology used is a combination of desk reviews and interviews of key personnel. Desk reviews entailed a detailed examination of 24 CPRs undertaken for 18 countries during 2000–2004, as well as project and program documents and other relevant material sourced from the Bank. The review also compares the contents of Bank CPRs and processes with those of the World Bank. Semi-structured questionnaires and discussions were used for the interviews with Bank staff in various departments.
5. The format and guidelines for CPRs were formally established by a Bank Group policy approved in 1995, with further format reviews in 1999 and 2004. The guidelines specified that CPRs be undertaken for all countries every 24–36 months. Bank staff were expected to consult with countries about project or program-specific or systemic portfolio management issues. They were required to agree on a plan of action to enhance the realization of the expected outcomes. The guidelines also specified that CPR missions be led by senior officers.
6. The conclusion of this review is that the CPR has been a useful tool for promoting dialogue between the Bank Group and borrowers. It provided a more complete picture of the Bank's assistance programs than project level supervisions, took stock of current issues affecting project implementation and proposed measures to address the issues.
7. Although the CPR reports reviewed vary in length and depth of analysis, a number of common shortcomings were evident. These include: the quality of the analysis; its limited scope; the undue focus on projects; lack of evidence of a borrower-owned action plan for portfolio improvement; and poor coverage of the achievement of development objectives. These shortcomings have been attributed to the lack of systematic advance preparation and effective teamwork, and the level of borrower involvement and ownership.

8. Content wise, the reports focused on project-specific issues. Not as much attention was paid to portfolio management issues, development outcomes, sustainability of the portfolio, and borrower monitoring and evaluation capacities. The review also identified the absence of time-bound plans of action in a number of reports. Very often they did not point the way forward for using lessons learned in future Country Strategy Papers (CSPs).
9. As regards the process of preparing CPRs, shortcomings and non-compliance with approved guidelines were found in respect to: frequency; the consultation process with clients; the low profile of CPR missions and their skill mix; interdepartmental cooperation in the preparation and review stages; duration of missions; and the time taken to complete reports.
10. The set of CPRs reviewed have been useful in identifying a number of common generic issues. On the part of the borrowing countries there were delays in effectiveness, evident in the delays in project implementation and project start-up; weak technical and managerial capacities of executing agencies; frequent changes in Project Management Unit (PMU), evident in the shortages of qualified staff; and non-compliance with audit and progress reports. On the part of the Bank, several issues that were raised in previous studies recur in the CPRs under review. These are related to: the need for quality support and supervision, monitoring and performance ratings; team effectiveness, as is evident in sector/country department coordination; and poor portfolio monitoring and risk reporting.
11. The review makes several recommendations to improve policy guidelines and their format, content and process, and to provide solutions to generic problems for CPRs, as listed below.

- **Policy guidelines and format:**

- a. Update the current policy, guidelines and format to incorporate changes in emphasis and approach.
- b. Train staff in performance rating and the contents of new guidelines.

- **Content:**

- a. Focus less on project-specific issues addressed by supervision missions, and more on systemic and generic issues related to key portfolio management issues.
- b. Pay more attention to the assessment of links between physical implementation, CSPs and expected development outcomes.
- c. Reduce background discussion and instead introduce discussion on progress made since the last CPR.
- d. Harmonize the rating scales and methodology for supervision reports, project completion reports and performance evaluation reports.

- **Processing of CPRs:**

- a. Increase the frequency of CPRs; at the very least respect current guidelines.
- b. Give country directors a greater say in the composition and duration of missions.
- c. Each fiscal year, after consultation with borrowers, country directors should select countries for CPRs based on portfolio size and/or portfolio problems.
- d. Prepare a discussion note or Issues Paper and forward it to borrowing countries for their approval well in advance of the CPR mission.
- e. Raise the profile of CPRs, both in the ADB and the government.
- f. Create a mechanism to follow up and monitor action plans that have been agreed on, and are owned by client countries.

• Common and systemic problems:

- a. Mainstream M&E capacity building in its interventions in regional member countries.
- b. Strengthen accountabilities and incentives, especially for sector managers, to enhance the candor and quality of supervision and the results focus of project performance ratings.
- c. Reduce delays in effectiveness; meet key conditionalities before Board presentation as far as possible; assist in preparing bidding documents; and clarify to countries the conditions or client commitments that are preconditions to loan effectiveness.
- d. Improve the quality of supervision through a better skill mix and greater intensity of missions and greater use of peer reviews.
- e. Equip Bank country offices in regional member countries with an adequate complement of experienced staff to assist in improving portfolio performance.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

1.1.1 The policy and guidelines for Country Portfolio Reviews (CPRs) was established by the Bank Group policy approved in 1995. The policy sets out the objectives of the CPR process, established the format of CPR reports and the procedure for CPR reviews. However, since then, the policy has been improved by two changes in format and procedure through format review processes conducted in 1999 and 2004.

1.1.2 The principal objectives and scope of CPRs, as cited in the policy document (Ref. ADF/BD/WP/95/01/Rev. 1), were to:

- Improve the quality of the Bank's country portfolios;
- Assist member countries in meeting their current obligations;
- Adapt projects to changing economic circumstances; and
- Provide guidance for future country programming.

These principles were enunciated in broad terms without providing specific guidance or interpretation as to what was meant, for example, by statements such as: "assisting member countries to meet their current obligations" or "adapting projects to changing economic circumstances".

1.1.3 This CPR review assesses the process and content of CPRs undertaken during 2000–2004. Recommendations are made to strengthen portfolio performance and increase the development impact of projects. The review is to set the agenda for future CPR development.

1.2 Methodology and Scope of the Review

1.2.1 The review was based mainly on desk reviews of CPRs prepared from 2000–2004, including reports on World Bank processes, staff interviews, questionnaires and subsequent analysis. The cut-off period of 2000 reflected the preparation of CPR reports since the format reviews of 1999.

1.2.2 The work involved desk reviews of background documentation, interviews with relevant Bank staff, and an evaluation report presenting the results. The review team analyzed 24 CPRs undertaken since 2000, interviewed Bank staff in the operations complex using a pre-designed questionnaire, and reviewed a range of other relevant reports, including reports on the Country Portfolio Performance Reviews (CPPRs) of the World Bank.

1.2.3 The desk review was conducted in two phases – a preliminary phase during which the questionnaire design was finalized, and a second phase that followed the staff interviews. During these interviews, a set of questions was posed to Bank staff in the operations complexes (see Annex II). The review team also obtained documents on CPPR processes of other institutions, notably the World Bank. The CPR reports were analyzed against an evaluation grid, focusing on the quality of assessments (see Annex III).

2. BANK GROUP POLICY ON CPRs

2.1 The Bank Group CPR Policy

- 2.1.1 The main CPR policy document and guiding principles for CPR preparation date back to 1995. The document responded to the need to strengthen the supervision function in the Bank, as recommended by the 1994 Knox report.¹ The policy evolved to satisfy the need for improvements in portfolio performance and, in particular, for restructuring the portfolio and/or reducing the prevalence of problematic projects.
- 2.1.2 In general, CPRs were seen as an important component of the Bank's portfolio management system, which aims at:
- Learning from implementation experience to improve the implementation of the existing portfolio and the quality of projects entering the portfolio;
 - Reinforcing borrower commitment to, and ownership of Bank Group-financed projects;
 - Ensuring the continued relevance of projects for sector strategies; and
 - Offering information on countries' performance in implementing Bank Group projects as part of the assessment of African Development Fund (ADF) resources.
- 2.1.3 Although the 1995 policy envisaged that countries with declining portfolio performance would be reviewed more frequently, reviews are generally undertaken at intervals of 2–3 years for each country. While CPRs have been conducted regularly in a number of cases, for most countries they are not consistently undertaken, as specified in the guidelines.
- 2.1.4 CPRs typically have two components: (a) a review of the general context in which projects are implemented; and (b) project assessment to identify corrective actions. The reviews should also link project implementation to the country strategy by determining how project performance affects the intended development impact. A major intent of a review is to provide feedback and allow lessons learned to be incorporated into the implementation of ongoing projects and the design of future projects.
- 2.1.5 The portfolio review process was expected to result in either an information note to the Boards for reviews where no actions required their approval, or a memorandum to the Boards in cases where restructuring was proposed. The CPR recommendations may result in actions such as: (a) loan cancellations based on established guidelines; (b) modification of expenditure categories; (c) and the use of loan savings in accordance with policy guidelines for savings. These recommendations need to be approved by the Boards.

¹ See Knox, D. 1994. "The quest for quality", Report of the Task Force on Project Quality for the African Development Bank, April 1994, pp 3–12.

2.2 Format for CPR Reports

2.2.1 The CPR policy requires that the reports follow a specific structure, which includes a number of annexes:

- Introduction;
- Recent economic developments;
- Review of ongoing projects;
- Assessment of management/implementation capacity;
- Assessment of lending strategy and experience;
- Coordination with other donors;
- Loan repayments and arrears; and
- Conclusions and recommendations.

2.2.2 The present CPRs have been prepared in accordance with the format, specified in the 1995 document.² The format has, however, undergone some changes and currently excludes “Recent economic developments” and “Assessment of lending strategy and experience”. “Review of ongoing projects” – now the second chapter – also covers other sub-headings such as: problem and potential problem projects; evaluation of the quality and frequency of supervision missions; overall evaluation of portfolio performance; and disbursements. It also covers crosscutting issues including poverty reduction, environment, gender and participation. A new chapter on “Proactive management of the portfolio” – also called “Initiatives to enhance portfolio quality” – includes sub-headings on potential problems and solutions, action plans to improve portfolio performance, and lessons drawn for future Country Strategy Papers (CSPs) and CPRs.

2.2.3 These changes appear to have been dictated by the need to cover crucial issues affecting portfolio performance, but also to avoid duplication of information contained in other Bank documents, such as the CSPs.³

2.3 CPR Review Procedures

2.3.1 The CPR policy document sets out the procedure for the preparation and review of a CPR report. This includes: the formation of a multi-disciplinary team; the development of an Issues Paper processed through internal committees; a field mission led at least by a division manager; and the elaboration of a CPR report, which is processed and submitted to the Boards.

2.3.2 The 1995 CPR review procedure was modified in April 1999 when the Bank established a document review procedure for all documents prepared by the operations complex. It was emphasized that the quality and effectiveness of Bank Group operations hinged on the efficiency of the review process. The existing review process, therefore, had to be strengthened and rationalized to ensure the consistency, quality and technical soundness of documents prepared by operations departments. It would add value and delineate accountability, allowing for assessment during every step of the process.

² The 1995 policy document is the core document being used as a format for CPRs. The current format, however, incorporates the changes made in the 1999 policy review.

³ See Bank Group Policy on Portfolio Review and Restructuring (ADF/BD/WP/95/01/Rev. 3) of June 1995; Operations Manual, Chapter 2, Operations Review Process, OM 210-1 of September 2004; and Operations Manual, Chapter 2, Bank Group Operational Procedures, OM 210-2 of June 1999.

- 2.3.3 As a result, the review of the Issues Paper and CPR report was made to follow the same process as specified for the CSPs. The pre-mission meetings of the Internal Working Group (IWG) and the Interdepartmental Working Group (IDWG) were made optional; they would be convened only in cases involving critical issues. After the mission, meetings of IWG and IDWG to review the CPR report would be mandatory.
- 2.3.4 The CPR review process emphasizes that the caliber of task managers and mission leaders is critical to the quality of documents. It requires directors, heads of units and division managers to offer adequate support to task managers, and to entrust leadership of missions and the resultant activities to competent staff. However, the director or head who authorizes a document's final release would ultimately be responsible for it.
- 2.3.5 After the Board has approved a CPR report, the country director advises the borrower of the conclusions and recommendations of the portfolio review exercise, particularly the measures for improving portfolio performance.

2.4 Comparison of World Bank CPPR and Bank Group CPR Policies and Procedures

- 2.4.1 The World Bank undertakes CPPRs⁴ to strengthen portfolio performance and enhance the development impact of projects. The reviews examine portfolio performance, agree on an action plan for addressing generic implementation issues and attempt to resolve major project-specific issues.
- 2.4.2 World Bank CPPRs constitute a process of consultation during which the Bank and the borrower review the performance of the loan portfolio. Where necessary, a program of measures is drawn up to strengthen portfolio performance and add to the development impact of projects.
- 2.4.3 General similarities in Bank Group and World Bank policy objectives exist, but there are differences in the format, content and process of CPR and CPPR reports (see Annex VI).
- 2.4.4 The main differences between the two reviews are: (a) the level of advance preparation; (b) the level of borrower participation and ownership; and (c) the process of the review. For the World Bank, a key element is the Discussion Paper for a CPPR meeting. The preparation of this document is a collaborative effort between the Bank and the borrower. The CPPR deals with project status, as well as the sectoral and strategic issues that need to be resolved. In contrast, Bank Group CPRs concentrate on implementation aspects and shed light on wider sectoral and strategic issues. Moreover, countries for which World Bank CPPRs will be undertaken are selected on the basis of annual consultations with borrowers. At the Bank Group, there is no formal provision for annual consultations.

⁴ The term "CPR" refers to the process at the Bank Group that is similar to the World Bank process referred to as "CPPR".

3. ASSESSMENT OF THE CPR PROCESS

3.1 Pre-mission Review Process

- 3.1.1 CPR scheduling seems to depend on the proactivity of the departments concerned. No systematic selection criteria appeared to be used to determine the selection and frequency of CPRs by either portfolio size or portfolio performance.
- 3.1.2 The guidelines require the preparation of an Issues Paper before a CPR mission is held. It must be reviewed by an IWG and IDWG, but this procedure is not strictly adhered to. In practice, the country director clears the Issues Paper at the same time as the mission's terms of reference. Moreover, pre-mission meetings, which were required before 1999, are now optional. The objectives of the CPR mission and the issues involved therefore are not always properly identified and discussed beforehand.

3.2 Composition and duration of CPR Missions

- 3.2.1 Although the guidelines specify that a CPR mission be led by a director, the CPR missions were led by the country economist, and on two occasions by a vice-president. The failure of directors and divisional managers to assume leadership of CPR missions is a probable measure of the rather casual manner in which the CPR exercise is being handled in the Bank at present.
- 3.2.2 The composition of CPR missions is normally dependent on the size of the portfolio. There is, however, a notable shortage of staff time for CPR missions. They are commonly combined with supervision or appraisal missions, which renders them cumbersome. At present, the country director initiates the CPR, but has difficulty in putting together a team for the mission. Directors should first consult each other and agree on the availability of staff before scheduling a CPR mission.
- 3.2.3 Three of the 24 CPR reports under review specifically indicate that missions were led by senior economists. The remaining reports do not name the leaders of the missions and several omit the names of team members. From interviews undertaken, it appears that most CPR missions have been led by Country Economists.
- 3.2.4 A CPR mission with a multi-disciplinary team normally lasts two weeks, but in practice, not all mission members stay for the full period as they are usually required to attend to other tasks. Some team members participate for up to one week and then attend to other assignments. They then interact via email and finalize reports such as aide-memoirs and back-to-office reports in this manner. There is, however, a problem when the team is not always together. When team members leave before the end of the field mission, it becomes difficult for the mission leader to defend all points included in the aide-memoir at the wrap-up meeting.
- 3.2.5 There is general agreement that the CPR is an important stocktaking exercise and that, as such, it is equally important that project staff visit all project components in the field to ascertain the current state of implementation. CPR and supervision missions, however, do not visit all the sites of project components – they rely on information obtained in meetings with project managers.

3.3 Post-mission Review Process

- 3.3.1 For the set of CPRs reviewed, the reports were not produced until six months to one year after the return of the CPR mission. On average, it took 9–10 months to produce the CPR report and 13–14 months to have it sent to the Board for consideration (see Annex VII).
- 3.3.2 The post-mission process focused on the follow-up of recommendations made to improve the quality of the portfolio. Interviewees suggested that the recommendations in CPRs are difficult to implement, as departments still face staff shortages. Further, there does not appear to be any formal mechanism for follow-up of CPR recommendations and few follow-up meetings held in borrower countries.
- 3.3.3 There was no strong link between the CPR and CSP processes in terms of the input of the CPR into the CSP. CPRs were not prepared for all countries, and the delay in their preparation have reduced their usefulness. Thus, CPRs did not add to the CSPs in depth.
- 3.3.4 Although implementation problems were in many cases properly identified and follow-up actions proposed and agreed with executing agencies and the government, there was no implementation follow-up mechanism in place by Country Departments. Some impact, and a degree of improvement in projects, management and institutions were evident when the CPR process reviewed the action plans of previous CPRs to see how the recommendations had been implemented.
- 3.3.5 The responsibility for a CPR document rested on the country economist, who normally compiled the report with the help of the country team members. He or she prepared and sent follow letters to the countries about agreed recommendations and follow-up actions. This responsibility is, however, not clearly stated in the CPR policy document or procedures.

4. ANALYSIS OF THE QUALITY OF CPR CONTENT

4.1 The Content of CPRs

4.1.1 CPR content is structured into five chapters. They identify constraints, problems that affect portfolio performance, and lessons and recommendations for improving the quality of the portfolio:

- Chapter 1: Review of ongoing projects
- Chapter 2: Assessment of management/implementation capacity
- Chapter 3: Coordination with other donors
- Chapter 4: Loan repayments and arrears
- Chapter 5: Initiatives for improving the quality of the portfolio

The set of 24 CPRs largely complies with the current CPR format. They were more or less modeled on these main headings, making it possible to analyze their overall quality.

4.2 Assessment of the Overall Quality of CPR Content

4.2.1 Based on the five chapter headings and their content, the review team developed a set of four categories and ten criteria for assessing content quality (see Annex III). The four categories are: (a) review of active projects; (b) assessment of borrower and bank performance; (c) coordination with other donors; and (d) lessons learned, measures, solutions and plans of action to improve the country portfolio.

Table 4.1: Score of the Quality of CPR Reports

Score	Number of CPRs	Countries
> 3.5 Highly satisfactory	–	–
> 2.5 and < 3.5 Satisfactory	13	Chad, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea (2), Ethiopia, Gabon, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania (2), Morocco (1 and 2), Mozambique, Namibia, São Tomé and Príncipe (2), Togo
> 1.5 and < 2.5 Unsatisfactory	9	Benin (1 and 2), Cameroon (1 and 2), Equatorial Guinea (1), Malawi, Mauritania (1), Rwanda, Senegal
< 1.5 Highly unsatisfactory	2	Algeria, São Tomé and Príncipe (1)

4.2.2 Based on the scores in Annex III⁵ and summarized in Table 4.1, 13 reports were found to be satisfactory, nine unsatisfactory and two highly unsatisfactory.

⁵ The scores used to discuss the assessments have been grouped to reflect the use of averages in the scoring system.

4.3 Review of Active Projects

This category had three criteria.

Criterion 1: How appropriately and objectively did the CPR report apply the rating methodology for each project (implementation performance and development objectives)?

4.3.1 The rating methodology used in CPRs covers the following:

- Compliance with loan conditions (as a precondition to loan effectiveness, general and other conditions);
- Procurement performance (consultancy services, goods, works);
- Financial performance (the availability of foreign exchange, local currency, disbursement flows, cost management and recovery, and performance of co-financiers);
- Activities and works (adherence to implementation schedule, performance of consultants, technical assistants, contractors and project management); and
- Achievement of development objectives (DOs) – the likelihood of: achieving project objectives, maintaining benefits beyond the implementation stage, increasing institutional capacity, and change in the expected rate of return.

4.3.2 Since 1996, the rating methodology has been developed for project supervision and application in CPRs. It puts more emphasis on implementation progress (IP) composed of the first four aspects mentioned above. The four-point rating scale ranges from highly unsatisfactory (0) to highly satisfactory (3) compliance. The overall assessment of each project's performance is based on the average score of all five criteria. It is, however, not clear from some criteria how the rating scale should be applied, thus permitting judgmental assessment and subjectivity. Furthermore, the rating methodology for active projects is not harmonized with the method used to assess the performance of completed projects. The latter method clearly distinguishes between the likelihood of achieving DOs and the IP.⁶

4.3.3 These ratings were assessed according to how appropriately and objectively CPRs applied the methodology to each project. Generally, criteria are strictly applied, notably the IP criteria, using facts, field observations and discussions with the borrowers and executing agencies. Yet, there seems to be a lack of understanding of the methodology for rating the DOs. Each of the components of the DO rating should be assessed, particularly the sustainability of benefits beyond the implementation stage and the change in the expected economic rate of return. In most projects, however, this criterion is overoptimistically and not comprehensively applied.

4.3.4 The reviewed CPRs did not assess risks or the changing conditions under which projects are implemented, for example, serious delays in fulfilling the conditionality or during the bidding and the implementation of project components. No report made a thorough assessment of risk factors and conditions, and of the likelihood of achieving DOs and sustaining the active portfolio's benefits. The differential between IP and DOs is still high in some CPRs (notably those of Cameroon, Malawi, Mauritania and Mozambique). The differential between the IP rating and the

⁶ The evaluation rating system consists of five categories making up the overall outcome of projects: (a) relevance and quality at entry; (b) achievement of objectives ("efficacy"); (c) efficiency; (d) institutional development impact; and (e) sustainability. Bank performance and borrower performance (also known as implementation performance) are rated separately.

likelihood of achieving DOs at the time of the CPR varied from 4% to 76%, which is an indication of the subjectivity of the assessment.

- 4.3.5 Another measure of the subjectivity and reliability of the rating in CPRs is the “disconnect”, defined in the Annual Portfolio Performance Review (APPR) as the difference between the percentage of projects at risk and the percentage of unsatisfactory performance ratings of completed projects. According to the APPR of 2002–2003,⁷ this is between 22% and 25%, which is high compared with the net disconnect of 16% in the World Bank’s portfolio in sub-Saharan Africa⁸ in 2003.
- 4.3.6 The APPR of 2002–2003 and earlier process reviews⁹ of the Operations Evaluation Department (OPEV) reported a continuing systemic bias in the ratings data. Task managers tend to be overly optimistic when assessing the likelihood of achieving development outcomes of operations under their supervision. At the same time, they are pessimistic about the immediate prospects of implementation progress.
- 4.3.7 Staff are often reluctant to reveal unsatisfactory portfolio performance, which could lead to recommendations for strong action, such as restructuring or loan cancellation. Staff feel that the development of objectively verifiable indicators for rating project performance in the portfolio is not sufficiently elaborated to ensure an objective assessment. Recent CPRs sometimes incorporate notes to justify the ratings. It is, therefore, necessary that the CPR format be enhanced to provide detailed and candid assessments of the rating criteria. Project staff should be guided as to the methodology and extent of coverage in the narrative assessments. Incentives and accountability for more reliable and timely ratings for risk and progress monitoring are needed.
- 4.3.8 The rating methodology used for each project presents two problems. First, the rating of IP and DOs needs to be harmonized with the methodology used by the evaluation department, which clearly distinguishes IP from the likelihood of achieving the DOs. This will provide for a single straightforward conclusion from the results. Second, more emphasis needs to be put on the analysis of rating personnel’s skills and the likelihood of achieving DOs, institutional development and sustainability.

Criterion 2: How deeply did the CPR identify constraints on, and causes of strengths and weaknesses for each project?

- 4.3.9 An in-depth analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of each project should help form a solid base for identifying the lessons learned. The CPR reports discussed to varying degrees constraints on, and causes of strengths and weaknesses encountered during project implementation. Some reports specified the root causes of difficulties with the start-up of projects, fulfillment of loan conditions and project management. Other reports, however, did not identify the root causes of problems confronting the country, nor did they go into sector specifics. These CPRs merely repeated the same recurrent implementation problems cited in the supervision reports. Some identified constraints are still symptoms only, and do not specify the underlying causes of implementation weaknesses and management problems.

⁷ 2002–2003 Annual Portfolio Performance Review ADB/BD/WP/2004/148/Rev. 1/Approved – ADF/BD/WP/2004/180/Rev. 1. Approved May 10, 2005.

⁸ World Bank Annual Report on Performance Portfolio (fiscal year 2003) – March 30, 2004.

⁹ OPEV: Process Review of 1997 APPR: ADB/BD/WP/99/108 – ADF/BD/WP/99/91 of September 2, 1999.

Criterion 3: How objectively did the CPR report assess evidence of, and commitment to projects?

- 4.3.10 An objective analysis of borrower commitment to projects is an essential factor in portfolio sustainability. The CPRs indicate a degree of objectivity in the discussions on the evidence of, and commitment to projects. Borrower commitment was affected by such crucial issues as inadequate capacity of the executing agencies to manage the project implementation schedule, poor staff qualifications, and mobility in the implementation units.
- 4.3.11 Some CPRs reported satisfactorily on borrowers' commitment to improve project implementation and remove the constraints on bank projects. They stated borrowers' difficulties in complying with Bank rules, procedures and the requirement to submit regular progress and audit reports. At present, preparatory meetings are not organized at country level to discuss CPR issues, and it is not clear whether follow-up meetings on action plans are scheduled. CPR meetings and follow-up action plans are important and could be made a regular feature. The CPR should rather be a joint document prepared by both the Bank and the borrower. This document could be discussed at a CPR meeting to obtain the commitment of the borrower or executing agencies to the recommendations and action plans.

4.4 Assessment of Borrower and Bank Performance

This category also had three criteria.

Criterion 4: How well was the performance of borrowers and executing agencies assessed?

- 4.4.1 The level of reporting on borrowers' effectiveness in monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and supervision was assessed for each report. As crucial stages in the project cycle, M&E and supervision – when correctly and vigorously undertaken – will ensure healthy portfolio performance. They also help to track performance in project implementation, identify systemic and specific problems, and make recommendations for their resolution.
- 4.4.2 Most CPRs satisfactorily assessed the performance of borrowers and their executing agencies, reporting on shortcomings and weaknesses that hampered implementation of the projects. The shortage of qualified technical, financial and economic staff, however, in particular the assistance needed to develop medium and long-term visions for resolving staff shortages, was not addressed adequately. There was no discussion on what needed to be done to improve the performance of countries and what preparations should be made for future interventions by the Bank.
- 4.4.3 In a broader context, CPR reports should include a section on ways to build borrower capacity to implement and manage the Bank Group portfolio. This should be based on track records of portfolio performance and lessons drawn from previous CPRs and portfolio improvement plans. Most CPRs do not analyze or propose measures for improving the effectiveness of executing agencies and for implementing recommendations contained in audit reports that the Audit Department of the Bank conducts from time to time.

- 4.4.4 In most CPR reports, the institutional and sustainability aspects of projects are not fully developed. The financial viability of projects (continuous financial flows and the ability to provide counterpart funds and support recurrent costs) is weakly analyzed. The reports do assess the quality of Bank/borrower partnerships to ensure that recurrent or operational cost requirements are met through regular budgetary allocations.
- 4.4.5 There is no assessment of the project M&E capacities of borrowers. No specific recommendations are made to improve M&E capacity and to solve the identified weaknesses of the executing agencies in managing projects.

Criterion 5: How well is Bank Group performance assessed?

- 4.4.6 Not all the CPR reports deal with the specific matter of the Bank's performance in conducting its fiduciary responsibilities and in solving implementation problems during regular supervision missions. Performance is assessed in general terms, stating the frequency of supervision missions undertaken to improve the quality of projects in the portfolio. The overall rating given is as satisfactory. It was found that most projects are adequately supervised, with each project attaining the required supervision frequency of 1.5 times per year. The Bank's proactivity and periodic assistance to executing agencies are not analyzed, however and there was no information provided on the number of staff days spent to supervise activities.
- 4.4.7 Some assessments of the quality of services were not objective, especially regarding tasks for which the Bank Group has primary responsibility. Some CPRs failed to show whether or not the Bank Group provided appropriate advice throughout all phases of the project cycle, was flexible in adapting to changing circumstances and performed satisfactorily in overseeing project activities.

Criterion 6: How well did the CPR report assess institutional development?

- 4.4.8 CPRs are expected to assess the extent to which the project has contributed to improving institutional capacities and policy framework. For instance, was the borrower able to make more effective use of its human, financial and natural resources, regardless of whether or not these changes were foreseen in the project's objectives? Only some CPRs discuss whether projects in the portfolio have created institutional capacity and therefore contributed to institutional development impact. For example, the CPR for Rwanda does not address the subject, while the CPR for Ethiopia discusses it in some detail.

4.5 Coordination with Other Donors

There were two criteria in this category

Criterion 7: How well did the CPR report assess the government's capacity and role in coordinating external assistance?

- 4.5.1 In general, the content quality is satisfactory for half the CPRs under review. The reports indicate the strengths and weaknesses of the government in coordinating external assistance. They state its institutional progress and the developments made in establishing better mechanisms for channeling external resources to development

projects. They do not, however, clearly state the role of the Bank in identifying potential areas of co-financing and proposals for improving donor coordination. For example, the 2000 CPR for São Tomé and Príncipe is silent on the weak institutional capacity of the country and the absence of a coordinating mechanism at country level.

Criterion 8: How well did CPR reports assess the Bank's capacity and role in coordinating its assistance with other donors?

- 4.5.2 There was a satisfactory rating for this criterion. However, the 55% score reflects some weakness in the discussion of the number and frequency of coordination missions and country meetings; the role of country offices; and the assessment of potential measures for improving the mobilization of resources and aid coordination. For example, the 2002 CPR for Gabon would have been considerably strengthened by a discussion on some of these issues (see Annex III).

4.6 Lessons learned, Measures, Solutions and Plans of Action

There were two criteria in this category.

Criterion 9: What is the quality of the lessons learned (for future CSPs, CPRs and other processes of the Bank)?

- 4.6.1 Measures or solutions for improving portfolio quality and the action plans were partly assessed through an evaluation of the quality of lessons learned for future CSPs and CPRs, and of specific actions and measures deriving from a thorough assessment of the quality of the country portfolio. Although most reports include lessons to be learned, there appears to be a general lack of clarity on their use for future CSPs, in particular. Furthermore, subsequent CPRs for Benin, Cameroon, Mauritania and Morocco fail to discuss progress made in implementing the measures and solutions for improving portfolio quality, as set out in previous CPRs. For some countries, no particular action was undertaken to resolve the situation, particularly with regard to portfolio management issues. Moreover, the CPR is rendered less useful by the generally long delay between the close of the mission and the time the report becomes available. It may take up to one year before CPR reports are submitted to the Boards, as compared with the 3–4 months for appraisal reports, which includes the field mission (see Annex VII).

Criterion 10: What is the quality of the proposed measures and plan of action to improve the quality of the portfolio?

- 4.6.2 The quality of the action plans varies. In some countries (Equatorial Guinea and São Tomé and Príncipe), there is no evidence of borrower ownership of, and commitment to timely implementation of the proposed measures, particularly by providing the right management team and setting up an operational monitoring system. There are definite improvements in portfolio performance in those countries (Mauritania, Morocco and Togo) where the CPR process starts by reviewing the action plan of the previous review. These reports show how recommendations have been implemented, what the impact on projects, management and institutions has been, and how they have improved. The overall satisfactory rating disguises the fact that some CPRs do not have time-bound action plans (in particular, Rwanda and São Tomé and Príncipe).

4.7 Summary of Assessments

- 4.7.1 Overall, the review suggests that CPRs have been useful for promoting dialogue between the Bank Group and client countries. CPRs have also been useful to get a picture of the aggregate performance of interventions at the country level. However, a number of shortcomings that constrain its usefulness have been observed.
- 4.7.2 The review finds that there is a clear need for going beyond project-specific issues and moving toward country and sector strategic and generic issues of Bank assistance. Country outcomes need to take into account each country's priorities, needs and changing economic circumstances. The alignment of future strategies for Bank Group assistance and the implications for portfolio management are not adequately examined. There is also a need for increased attention to development outcomes and sustainability. This is room for improvement in the treatment of financial viability and borrowers' M&E capacities.
- 4.7.3 Further the review identifies the need for a time-bound action plan to be included in every CPR. These plans should outline issues on a project-by-project basis, and address specific generic or systemic issues such as decentralization for some countries (e.g. Ethiopia) and implementation and absorptive capacities for others (e.g. Equatorial Guinea or São Tomé and Príncipe). Action plans should also point the way forward and contain lessons to be used in the formulation of future CSPs.

5. GENERIC PORTFOLIO ISSUES

5.1 Portfolio Issues emerging from the CPRs Reviewed

- 5.1.1 This section goes beyond the format, process and scope of the coverage of the 24 CPRs and examines the findings of the reviews. Although the set of CPRs do not cover the entire Bank Group portfolio, they represent a significant proportion (31%) of the portfolio (179 active projects out of 579 in the APPR of 2003). As such, they can throw light on the generic problems faced by the Bank Group portfolio. The first part of this section identifies generic portfolio management issues observed while the second part of the section reviews the status of recommendations made by recent studies, as they concern the enhancement of quality of the Bank Group portfolio.
- 5.1.2 Table 5.1 summarizes the country portfolio performance ratings taken from the set of CPRs reviewed. Only one of the 18 countries had a highly satisfactory portfolio performance rating, while 14 were rated satisfactory and the remaining three (Equatorial Guinea, Gabon and Guinea-Bissau) were unsatisfactory. Overall performance ratings by sector reveal that the industry, agriculture and transport sectors did not perform well. Seven countries recorded satisfactory ratings in the multi-sector, six in the public utilities sector, four in agriculture, transport and the social sector. Only three countries recorded satisfactory ratings in the industrial sector (see also Annex V).

Table 5.1: Country Portfolio Performance Ratings Compiled from the Set of CPR Reports

Score	No. of reports	Countries
> 2.5 and <3 Highly satisfactory	1	Namibia
> 1.5 and < 2.5 Satisfactory	19	Algeria, Benin (2000 and 2004), Cameroon (2001 and 2004), Chad, Egypt, Ethiopia, Malawi, Mauritania (2000 and 2005), Morocco (2000 and 2002), Mozambique, Rwanda, São Tomé (2000 and 2002), Senegal, Togo
> 0.5 and < 1.5 Unsatisfactory	4	Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Guinea-Bissau
< 0.5 Highly unsatisfactory	-	

5.2 Generic Portfolio Management Issues

- 5.2.1 The 24 CPRs made several observations and recommendations, some of which are country-specific and others of a more generic nature (see Annex IV). The most salient generic ones are discussed below.

(a) Delays in effectiveness

- 5.2.2 Delays, by far, are the most common problem. The CPR review has confirmed the findings of evaluation results and APPRs that preconditions for the first disbursement are usually fulfilled with considerable delays and adversely affect project implementation. For the 18 countries represented by the 24 CPRs, the average delay from signing to loan effectiveness is 15 months. In contrast, the Asian Development Bank's average was 4 months in 1998 and 2002, and 3.7 months in 2001.

- 5.2.3 The key action in reducing delays in project start-up is to hold early discussions with the government to establish realistic conditions and timetables. Conditions of effectiveness should be appropriately timed and kept to a minimum. Crucial issues should preferably be resolved at project preparation, appraisal or negotiation stage, rather than simply including them as preconditions for the first disbursement. Launching missions should always assist borrowers in the fulfillment of conditions of loan effectiveness as soon as a loan is signed.
- 5.2.4 Loan effectiveness is considerably delayed due to late and protracted approval by parliament. Parliamentarians could be brought on board at the project preparation stage and be regularly updated on its status. The government team working on the project should draw up a checklist of activities and synchronize these with the Bank's timetable for project preparation. A strategy note for parliamentary approval should always be circulated before appraisal. Concerned ministries should be informed that parliamentary approval is needed before loan negotiations can be authorized.

(b) Delays in project execution

- 5.2.5 The average age of the portfolio for the 24 country portfolio reports reviewed is 4.9 years. During the past five years, the average age of the World Bank portfolio for the Africa region (excluding North Africa) has ranged from 3.9 years in 1998 to 3.4 in 2003, and for the Asian Development Bank from 3.6 in 1998 to 3.5 in 2002. For the African Development Bank (ADB), the average age has gone from 6 in 1998 to 4.5 in 2003, which is an improvement yet still significantly high. There are various reasons for the delays, notably the delay in effectiveness, followed by weak implementation capacities of executing agencies. Unfamiliarity with bank procurement rules and procedures has also been identified as a cause, as well as problems with communicating with head office, particularly for countries with no country representation.

(c) Weak technical and managerial capacities of executing agencies and frequent changes in PMU management

- 5.2.6 The shortage of qualified staff in both government and project implementation units has been identified as a critical issue affecting Bank Group portfolio performance. It is necessary to take concerted and sustained action to strengthen the development of public capacity in member countries. It is equally important for governments to improve their incentive structure for recruiting and retaining capable staff. Governments need to implement a pay reform strategy after consulting with all relevant stakeholders, including parliament. They should conduct institutional reviews, clarify roles and revise statutes in line with new roles. Through granting institutional support and reform loans, the Bank Group has supported a number of governments' efforts in capacity building and institutional strengthening. It should continue to do this, taking the lead where some governments are unable to do so on their own.

(d) Non-compliance with audit and progress reports

- 5.2.7 Some 34% of the CPR projects or programs have reported delays in receiving progress reports on external audits and borrower implementation. There have been special ongoing efforts since 2004 to clear the backlog of audit reports. The default rate was 50% in 2003.

5.3 Status of Recommendations of Past Studies on Bank Processes

- 5.3.1 Apart from the more general issues noted above, this review also observed several issues raised in previous studies. These relate to the need for quality support, monitoring, performance rating, sector and country department coordination, and incentives for quality and supervision activities.

(a) Quality supervision

- 5.3.2 Various CPRs reveal that the inadequacy of project supervision efforts has affected portfolio performance. In the CPR for Chad, for example, the quality of the supervision mission was affected by its short duration and the limited time spent on supervision due to other activities (CSP, PRSP, Portfolio Review, Identification, etc.). At the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank, an average of upward 40 and 25 staff days respectively, is spent per project per year. For ADB, there are no official Bank records in this regard, but estimates from staff suggest an average of 15-20 staff days per project per year. This is significantly lower than the figures for comparative institutions, given the low implementation capacity and hence the need for greater intensity of supervision for the region.
- 5.3.3 A significant number of staff are new and most have had inadequate exposure to, or mentoring in operational matters. Operational activities require a detailed grasp of operational policies and procedures and of the management of quality outcomes. Yet, many staff is commonly assigned task leadership of two or three projects on entry, instead of serving under experienced staff for a period of induction and familiarization. This situation has contributed to the overall problem of portfolio management. OPEV has lately been proposing the introduction of a peer review system to improve the quality of supervision.
- 5.3.4 Supervision is often entrusted to a single sector task manager. This person is sometimes unable to address all key problems and make relevant recommendations, thereby restricting the quality of supervision. The Togo report, for example, suggested that special attention be paid to the composition of supervision missions. Such missions should be expanded to include the Bank's support departments, in particular the Procurement Unit (PPRU) and the Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Unit (PSDU).

(b) Performance ratings

- 5.3.5 The reliability of portfolio performance ratings and the failure to report problems on time or act on them promptly are cause for concern, as the 2002–2003 APPR also points out. Some staff are reluctant to rate the project or country performance as being less than satisfactory, because it might lead to additional surveillance work and criticism. The Bank, in the midst of organizational redesigns over the last four years,

has unfortunately been unable to resolve completely the issue of accountability of portfolio performance at country level. Staff feedback indicates that neither managers nor staff wish to attract the additional attention that would follow more candid reporting. This is especially so because the performance evaluation of managers and staff do not take into account improvements in the portfolio.

(c) Team effectiveness – sector/country department coordination

- 5.3.6 The responsibility of country directors and their role definition in issues of portfolio performance management are not very clear. Country managers indicated their difficulty in asserting leadership in monitoring portfolio performance at country level. Currently, resources are allocated to sectors and not to countries.

(d) Monitoring and evaluation

- 5.3.7 Previous studies have highlighted the need for reviewing and improving portfolio monitoring and risk reporting. This includes reforming the entire supervision system into an instrument for reporting on project DOs and relevant performance indicators consistent with the overall focus on results. At the instruction of the Committee of Operations and Development Effectiveness (CODE), OPEV will be launching a comprehensive review of the Bank Group's supervision system, which is expected to identify areas for improvement.

6. KEY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Policy, Format and Guidelines

- 6.1.1 The 1995 policy guidelines have been useful in guiding the CPR preparation process and periodically assessing the IP of the Bank Group portfolio. Since then, there has been various developments in the operational policies of the Bank. *First*, there is an increased awareness of countries' need for greater ownership of, and responsibility for their portfolio performance monitoring. *Second*, there has been a strong movement for closer attention to links between project implementation (process and outputs), expected development outcomes and sustainability of benefits. *Third*, Bank management has lately been acting on various fronts in implementing the results agenda, including the results reporting system. These developments call for the need to update the policy, format and guidelines of the CPR process.
- 6.1.2 At the policy level, management may want to consider two basic principles identified as good practice: (a) the CPR has to be useful to the country for managing their projects and resolving problems, as well as being an integral part of the dialogue between the Bank and the national authorities; and (b) the CPR has to be useful to the Bank in tracking and monitoring inputs, outputs and intermediate outcome indicators at country level. The CPR also has to provide advance information on the level of operational compliance to Bank rules, procedures and requirements, the assessment of related risks, including fiduciary risks and safeguard risks, and the increase in development effectiveness.
- 6.1.3 Under the updated policy guidelines for CPR preparation, management may want to consider a CPR that is focused on the track record of Bank-assisted projects and operations in achieving intended results on the ground. More weight should be given to key systemic and generic implementation issues. These include the direction of future assistance and implications for portfolio management, with an action plan and timetable for resolving identified issues.
- 6.1.4 The CPR, while covering the central issue of project performance, should also review broader issues pertinent to the country portfolio. This should be done from the perspective of the key sectors and strategic thematic issues covered by the portfolio. The major challenges ahead should be identified and the key trans-sectoral issues emerging from the portfolio review examined.
- 6.1.5 The CPR process should be transformed into a more forward-looking course of action. It should be prepared in close collaboration with the borrower, project coordinators, key stakeholders and other donors. This approach will promote awareness among all concerned of common problems affecting portfolio performance. It will also help to secure borrower ownership of, and commitment to Bank Group-funded operations in the portfolio.
- 6.1.6 There is a need to strengthen the link between CPRs and CSPs. Comprehensively prepared CPRs, which should include analyses of lessons learned, strategies and priorities, should precede the preparation of CSP and CSP updates. This will guide the CSP in delineating priority sectors for the strategy for future Bank Group assistance.

- 6.1.7 Management may want to consider emphasizing project-specific issues less and focusing instead on higher systemic and strategic issues. It should provide for sector studies, sector workshops and seminars (and the use of their results), to promote a more informed understanding of sector policies, strategies and priorities. The policy should allow the CPR report to draw from the findings in the sector reviews, and include a discussion of recent developments in relevant sectors.
- 6.1.8 The new format should follow the updated approach and objective of CPR processes. In particular, it should provide for additional areas of analysis and coverage. For example, progress made since the last CPR should be routinely reported and be made key topics of the development impact of projects, the institutional development impact and the discussion on issues affecting the sustainability of projects.

6.2 Processes and Systems

- 6.2.1 The processes and systems should be improved to improve the frequency and coverage of CPRs and raise the profile level of CPR missions. Country directors should be given control of the resources for CPRs, or empowered by other means to take full charge of the CPR process.
- 6.2.2 Mandatory leadership of missions by directors or, at the very least, country managers, should be considered. The vice-president's permission should be sought where lower-level staff has to lead the mission.
- 6.2.3 Responsibility for oversight of portfolio quality should expressly be assigned to directors of country departments. The role of country offices in portfolio monitoring and reporting should be clarified in explicit instructions.
- 6.2.4 Portfolio performance rating and reporting methodologies should be harmonized and consistently applied. Operations staff and managers should be trained in the new context of results-based management.

6.3 Content of the CPRs

- 6.3.1 CPRs are currently narrowly focused on cataloguing individual projects and their problems. A CPR should review broader issues pertinent to the country portfolio from the perspective of key sectoral and thematic areas, and identify the major challenges ahead. It should also examine significant intersectoral and crosscutting issues emerging from the portfolio review.
- 6.3.2 In addition to the requirements of the existing format, future CPRs should be more analytical. They should include a discussion on the achievement of DOs, portfolio sustainability, institutional development impact, borrower performance and Bank Group performance. Future CPRs will need to provide answers to a set of evaluation questions that the current CPRs are not addressing adequately. These are: In what ways can the M&E and supervision system be improved by using the CPR? In what ways can the CPR ensure that project goals are consistent with the sector and country strategies? How can the CPR process contribute to the achievements of DOs strategy? In what ways can the review enhance the ownership and commitment of client countries? How can the Bank and the borrower ensure the sustainability of projects in the portfolio?

- 6.3.3 The assessment of Bank Group performance should include an analysis of service quality, especially of those tasks for which the Bank has primary responsibility. For instance, has the Bank Group provided appropriate advice throughout the project cycle? Was it flexible in adapting to changing circumstances? Did it oversee project activities satisfactorily? The analysis should also focus on the Bank Group's role in ensuring project quality at entry, satisfactory implementation and future operation.
- 6.3.4 CPR content should provide detailed and candid assessments of rating criteria. Project staff and managers should be trained and guided in the methodology and extent of coverage in narrative assessments. Managers should establish incentives and accountability for more reliable, timely risk and progress monitoring ratings, and review them adequately before signing them off.
- 6.3.5 The POPR and OPEV should accelerate the harmonization of rating scales and methodology for reports on supervision, project completion and performance evaluation.

6.4 Generic Portfolio Issues

- 6.4.1 The review has identified several portfolio performance indicators on which action is needed. Delays in project effectiveness and execution of projects remains to be a problem. The quality of supervision and weak monitoring of the portfolio at the country level is becoming a concern. Risks and factors that most influence project outcomes are not identified and tracked systematically. In this connection, the proposed review of Bank Group Supervision Monitoring System that CODE has instructed OPEV to undertake is timely.
- 6.4.2 The frequency of supervision missions needs to be increased, as well as the number and skill mix of staff days, particularly for projects with weak executing agencies. If missions are intensified and their duration enhanced, project staff would become more involved. They could assist or advise project executing agencies or implementation units on implementation activities. Supervision missions should be expanded to include the Bank's support departments, in particular the procurement unit and disbursement division.
- 6.4.3 It is necessary to pursue the recommendations of CPR and supervision reports. Concerted action is needed, especially as regards the action plans for resolving generic problems that hamper project implementation, such as compliance to Bank rules and procedures and reporting requirements (progress and audit reports). Early discussions with governments should be held to establish realistic conditions and time schedules. Conditions of loan effectiveness should be appropriately timed and kept to a minimum.
- 6.4.4 The recent move to establish country offices in several countries will be helpful. However, the offices should be provided with an adequate complement of experienced staff. These offices should be able to play an active role in: (a) the physical and financial monitoring of projects in the portfolio; (b) the monitoring of disbursement requests; (c) payment of counterpart funds; (d) regular preparation of quarterly progress and audit reports; (e) country-level coordination with other donors; and (f) improve communication between the borrower and the Bank.

List of Country Portfolio Review Reports

No.	Country	Reference	Fiscal Year	Date	Region
1	Algeria	ADB/BD/WP/2004/136	2004	07/12/2004	North
2	Benin	ADB/BD/WP/2000/78 ADB/BDWP/2004/135	2000 2004	10/07/2000 27/10/2004	West
3	Cameroon	ADB/BD/WP/2001/04 ADB/BD/WP/2004/56	2000 2003	14/02/2001 14/05/2004	Central
4	Chad	ADB/BD/WP/2002/57	2001	26/09/2002	Central
5	Egypt	ADB/BD/WP/2000/159	2000	04/10/2000	North
6	Equatorial Guinea	ADB/BD/WP/2002/02 ADB/BD/WP/2003/122	2001 2003	28/01/2002 18/02/2004	West
7	Ethiopia	ADB/BD/WP/2003/42	2002	29/04/2003	East
8	Gabon	ADB/BD/WP/2002/04	2001	07/03/2004	Central
9	Guinea-Bissau	ADB/BD/WP/2004/02	2003	09/03/2004	Central
10	Malawi	ADB/BD/WP/2003/08	2002	04/02/2003	South
11	Mauritania	ADB/BD/WP/2001/192 ADB/DB/WP/2005/08	2001 2004	06/02/2002 01/03/2005	West
12	Morocco	ADB/BD/WP/2000/92 ADB/BD/WP/2002/66	2000 2002	22/09/2000 02/08/2002	North
13	Mozambique	ADB/BD/WP/2000/07	2000	20/06/2000	South
14	Namibia	ADB/BD/IF/2003/194	2003	18/12/2003	South
15	Rwanda	ADB/BD/WP/2000/19	1999	25/05/2000	Central
16	São Tomé and Príncipe	ADB/BD/WP/2000/02 ADB/BD/WP/2002/38	1999 2002	17/02/2000 29/04/2002	Central
17	Senegal	ADB/BD/WP/2004/133	2003	30/03/2005	West
18	Togo	ADB/BD/WP/2001/42	2000	03/05/2001	West

Questions and Staff Responses

No.	Questions	Responses	Frequencies	%
1	Who initiates the CPR preparation?	a. Country economist b. Country manager	2 4	33% 67%
2	Is an Issues Paper always prepared prior to the CPR mission?	a. Always	6	100 %
3	Is the Issues Paper always reviewed at internal working group, interdepartmental working group or country team meetings?	a. Country team b. Not always	4 2	66% 34%
4	What is the quality (composition and skill mix) of CPR missions?	a. Sectoral contribution	6	100%
5	What is the frequency of CPR missions?	a. Two years b. Three years c. No answer	3 2 1	50% 33% 17%
6	What is the normal duration of a CPR mission?	a. Two weeks	6	100%
7	What duration do you consider adequate?	a. Depends on portfolio b. Three weeks	4 2	67% 33%
8	How is the CPR mission team leader decided?	a. Nominated by department head b. Country economist c. Not clear	2 2 2	33% 33% 33%
9	Do CPR missions incorporate experts in the fields of crosscutting issues?	a. Depends on work schedule b. Sometimes c. No	2 1 3	33% 17% 50%
10	Are the format and guidelines for CPR preparation adequate?	a. Yes b. Should be reviewed c. No answer	2 3 1	33% 50% 17%
11	How are consultations undertaken with executing agencies and governments at the country level?	a. Workshops and meetings	6	100%
12	To what extent do the government, executing agencies and donors participate in the CPR process?	a. Very extensively b. Average c. No answer	3 1 2	50% 17% 33%
13	How much time is allowed for CPR report writing and preparation, and is this adequate?	a. Three to four weeks b. Two weeks c. Normal cycle of all reports	4 1 1	66% 17% 17%

Questions and Staff Responses (continued)

No.	Questions	Responses	Frequencies	%
14	How much interaction is there between CPR mission team members before, during and after the mission?	a. Intensive and very useful b. Good during CPR c. No answer	3 1 2	50% 17% 33%
15	Who compiles the CPR report?	a. Country division b. The economist	1 5	17% 83%
16	How do the country departments, sector departments and other departments deal with the findings of CPR reports?	a. The country department sends a letter summarizing the process b. Recommendations are taken into account in the CSP c. Findings are discussed at country-team level d. No answer	1 2 1 2	17% 33% 17% 33%
17	What is your overall assessment of the quality of the recent CPR reports? Excellent/Good/Poor. If poor – why?	a. Good	6	100%
18	How is feedback of CPR results and recommendations undertaken? • Feedback from the Boards to staff • Feedback to project executing agencies, governments and donors	a. No answer b. Yes	5 1	83% 17%
19	What are the shortcomings in the feedback process?	a. Feedback is not mandatory b. Not taken into account once the process has been finalized c. Advice about Bank decisions and positions d. No answer	1 1 1 3	17% 17% 17% 50%
20	Are CPR results/outcomes used in the preparation of CSPs?	a. Yes b. No answer	5 1	83% 17%
21	Are CPR results/outcomes used in country assessments?	a. Yes b. Not clear	1 5	17% 83%
22	What is the extent of coordination with World Bank and other multi-lateral and bilateral agencies in the field?	a. Inadequate coordination b. Adequate coordination c. No answer	1 1 4	17% 17% 66%

Questions and Staff Responses (continued)

No.	Questions	Responses	Frequencies	%
23	Are there adequate mechanisms for inter-agency coordination between donor agencies within the countries?	a. Enhanced by if there is local bank presence b. Depends on the organigram of each country c. Regular coordination meetings d. Not adequate e. Weak mechanisms in middle income countries and strong in ADF countries	1 1 1 2 1	17% 17% 17% 33% 17%
24	Do CPRs allow for the participation of all stakeholders? How do you qualify this participation: proactive, reactive or insufficient?	a. Insufficient	6	100%
25	Are there problems in providing counterpart funds for the donor-funded projects?	a. Yes b. No	3 3	50% 50%
26	Based on recent CPRs, what are the main constraints on the implementation of projects in the various sectors?	a. Adherence to Bank rules b. Unrealistic conditions c. Implementation capacity d. Poor preparation of projects e. No answer	1 1 1 1 2	17% 17% 17% 17% 32%
27	Are CPRs appropriate for detecting constraints and weaknesses in project implementation?	a. Yes b. No answer	1 5	17% 83%
28	In what ways can the CPR process be improved, if necessary?	a. Preparation before embarking on a CPR mission b. Using more time of the mission's duration c. Frequent supervision d. More attention by the country and management e. Full participation of sector departments and the PPRU	1 1 2 1 1	17% 17% 34% 17% 17%
29	How useful is the review in enhancing the ownership and commitment of the borrower countries?	a. Useful b. Useful if ... c. No answer	2 3 1	34% 50% 17%
30	What is your overall assessment of the Bank Group in the CPR process?	a. Good b. Satisfactory	3 3	50% 50%

Assessment of the Quality of CPR Reports

Criteria		Ratings		Countries	%
A. REVIEW OF ACTIVE PROJECTS					
1	How appropriately and objectively did the CPR report apply the rating methodology for each project (IP/DO)?	HS	–		
		S	12	Chad (2002); Equatorial Guinea (2003); Ethiopia (2003); Gabon (2002); Mauritania (2005); Morocco (2000); Morocco (2002); Mozambique; Rwanda (2000); São Tomé (2000); São Tomé (2002); Togo (2001)	50%
		US	10	Algeria (2004); Benin (2001); Benin (2004); Egypt (2000); Equatorial Guinea (2001); Guinea-Bissau (2004); Malawi; Mauritania (2001); Namibia (2003); Senegal	41%
		HU	2	Cameroon (2001); Cameroon (2004)	9%
2	How deeply did the CPR report identify constraints on, and causes of strengths and weaknesses for each project (both in the Bank and in the country)?	HS	–		
		S	12	Equatorial Guinea (2003); Ethiopia (2003); Gabon (2002); Guinea-Bissau (2004); Mauritania (2001); Mauritania (2005); Morocco (2000); Morocco (2002); Mozambique; Namibia (2003); São Tomé (2002); Togo (2001)	50%
		US	9	Benin (2001); Benin (2004); Cameroon (2001); Chad (2002); Egypt (2000); Malawi (2003); Rwanda (2000); São Tomé (2000)	37%
		HU	3	Algeria; Cameroon (2004); Senegal	13%
3	How objectively did the CPR report assess evidence of, and commitment to projects (fulfillment of conditions, budgetary allocations, timely provision of a management team and an M&E system in place)?	HS	–		
		S	11	Chad; Egypt (2000); Equatorial Guinea (2003); Ethiopia (2003); Gabon (2002); Guinea-Bissau (2004); Malawi (2003); Mozambique; Namibia (2003); São Tomé (2002); Togo (2001)	45%
		US	13	Algeria; Benin (2001); Benin (2004); Cameroon (2001); Cameroon (2004); Equatorial Guinea (2001); Mauritania (2001); Mauritania (2005); Morocco (2000); Morocco (2002); Rwanda (2000); São Tomé and Príncipe (2000); Senegal	55%
		HU	–		

Key: HS = highly satisfactory; S = satisfactory; US = unsatisfactory; HU = highly unsatisfactory.

Assessment of the Quality of CPR Reports (continued)

Criteria	Ratings	Countries	%		
B. ASSESSMENT OF BORROWER AND BANK PERFORMANCE					
4	Performance of borrower and execution agencies: How did the CPR report analyze borrower capacity to supervise Bank Group projects through the existing M&E system and timely provision of local funds to ensure the financial sustainability of projects?	HS	–		
		S	18	Benin (2001); Cameroon (2001); Chad (2002); Egypt (2000); Equatorial Guinea (2001); Equatorial Guinea (2003); Ethiopia (2003); Gabon (2002); Guinea-Bissau; Malawi (2003); Mauritania (2005); Morocco (2000); Morocco (2002); Mozambique (2000); Namibia (2003); São Tomé (2002); Senegal; Togo (2001)	75.5%
		US	4	Algeria; Benin (2004); Mauritania (2001); Rwanda (2000)	15.5%
		HU	2	Cameroon (2004); São Tomé (2000)	9%
5	Bank Group performance: How objectively did the CPR report assess Bank Group performance and proactivity (frequent supervision missions, medium-term review, portfolio clean-up, loan cancellation)?	HS	–		
		S	16	Cameroon (2001); Egypt (2000); Equatorial Guinea (2001); Equatorial Guinea (2003); Ethiopia (2003); Gabon (2002); Guinea-Bissau; Malawi (2003); Mauritania (2005); Morocco (2000); Morocco (2002); Mozambique (2000); Namibia (2003); São Tomé (2002); Senegal; Togo (2001)	65.5%
		US	6	Benin (2001); Cameroon (2004); Chad (2002); Malawi (2003); Mauritania (2001); Rwanda (2000)	25.5%
		HU	2	Algeria; São Tomé (2000)	9%
6	How well did the CPR report assess institutional development through analysis and proposals to strengthen/build/improve borrower capacity and institutions (restructuring; reform measures undertaken)?	HS	–		
		S	12	Benin (2001); Cameroon (2004); Chad (2002); Equatorial Guinea (2001); Equatorial Guinea (2003); Gabon (2002); Guinea-Bissau (2004); Morocco (2002); Mozambique; Namibia (2003); São Tomé (2002); Togo (2001)	50%
		US	10	Benin (2004); Cameroon (2001); Egypt; Ethiopia (2003); Malawi; Mauritania (2001); Mauritania (2005); Morocco (2000); Rwanda (2000); Senegal	41%
		HU	2	Algeria; São Tomé (2000)	9%

Key: HS = highly satisfactory; S = satisfactory; US = unsatisfactory; HU = highly unsatisfactory.

Assessment of the Quality of CPR Reports (continued)

Criteria	Ratings	Countries	%		
C. COORDINATION WITH OTHER DONORS					
7	How well the CPR report assess the Bank's capacity and role in coordinating its assistance with other donors?	HS	–		
		S	11	Benin (2001); Egypt (2000); Gabon (2002); Guinea-Bissau (2004); Malawi (2003); Morocco (2000); Morocco (2002); Mozambique (2000); Namibia (2003); São Tomé (2002); Togo (2001)	45.5%
		US	11	Benin (2004); Cameroon (2001); Cameroon (2004); Chad (2002); Equatorial Guinea (2001); Equatorial Guinea (2003); Ethiopia (2003); Mauritania (2001); Mauritania (2005); Rwanda (2000); Senegal	45.5%
		HU	2	Algeria; São Tomé (2000)	9%
8	How well did the CPR report assess the government's capacity and role in coordinating external assistance?	HS	–		
		S	13	Benin (2001); Benin (2004); Cameroon (2001); Cameroon (2004); Chad (2002); Egypt (2000); Guinea-Bissau (2004); Malawi (2003); Mauritania (2001); Morocco (2002); Mozambique (2000); Namibia (2003); Togo (2001)	55%
		US	10	Algeria; Equatorial Guinea (2001); Equatorial Guinea (2004); Ethiopia (2003); Gabon (2002); Mauritania (2005); Morocco (2000); Rwanda (2000); São Tomé (2002); Senegal	40%
		HU	1	São Tomé (2000)	10%

Key: HS = highly satisfactory; S = satisfactory; US = unsatisfactory; HU = highly unsatisfactory.

Assessment of the Quality of CPR Reports (continued)

Criteria	Ratings	Countries	%		
D. LESSONS LEARNT, MEASURES, SOLUTIONS AND PLANS OF ACTION TO IMPROVE THE COUNTRY PORTFOLIO					
9	What is the quality of the lessons learned (for future CSPs, CPRs and other processes of the Bank)?	HS	–	Morocco (2000)	
		S	9	Cameroon (2004); Chad (2002); Egypt (2000); Ethiopia (2003); Guinea-Bissau (2004); Morocco (2002); Mozambique (2000); Namibia (2003); Togo (2001)	32%
		US	12	Benin (2001); Benin (2004); Cameroon (2001); Equatorial Guinea (2001); Equatorial Guinea (2003); Gabon (2002); Malawi (2003); Mauritania (2001); Mauritania (2005); Rwanda (2000); São Tomé (2002); Senegal	50%
		HU	2	Algeria; São Tomé (2000)	9%
10	What is the quality of the proposed measures and plans of action to improve the quality of the portfolio (relevance, realism and appropriateness; specific time-bound action plans for individual problem projects and the entire portfolio)?	HS	2	Morocco (2000); Morocco (2002)	9%
		S	15	Benin (2001); Benin (2004); Cameroon (2001); Cameroon (2004), Chad (2002); Egypt (2000); Equatorial Guinea (2001); Equatorial Guinea (2003); Guinea-Bissau (2004); Mauritania (2005); Mozambique (2000); Namibia (2003); São Tomé (2002); Senegal; Togo (2001)	63%
		US	4	Ethiopia (2003); Gabon (2002); Malawi (2003); Mauritania (2001)	16%
		HU	3	Algeria; Rwanda (2000); São Tomé (2000)	12%

Key: HS = highly satisfactory; S = satisfactory; US = unsatisfactory; HU = highly unsatisfactory.

Portfolio Review Matrix – Summary of Generic Problems – (Number of Projects with Generic Problems)

General problems	Algeria	Benin (2000)	Benin (2004)	Cameroon (2001)	Cameroon (2004)	Equatorial Guinea (2001)	Equatorial Guinea (2004)	Ethiopia	Gabon	Guinea-Bissau	Malawi	Mauritania (2001)
Total number of active projects	6	9	12	9	17	4	4	13	6	9	24	10
Weak technical and management capacities of the executing agencies		5	2	6	7			3		6	5	6
Lengthy communication channels between the Bank and the executing agencies	3			2	5	2	2	4		8	3	
Long delays in the fulfillment of loan conditions for effectiveness	4	7	8	8	12	4	4	4	2	8	9	5
Long delays in project execution	2	4	5	7	13	4	3	6	4	8	7	5
Non-compliance with Bank procurement and disbursement procedures by the executing agencies	2		1	5	9	2	4	4	2	7	1	2
Inadequate government contributions to projects				3	7	1		1	2	3	2	2
Non-compliance with Bank requirements as regards progress and audit reports	3		2	5	6	4	3		3	5	2	6
Lack of adequate supervision	3			6	2						1	
Political instability and unusual economic situation								1		3		

Portfolio Review Matrix – Summary of Generic Problems – (Number of Projects with Generic Problems) (continued)

General problems	Mauritania (2004)	Morocco (2000)	Morocco (2002)	Mozambique	Namibia	Rwanda	São-Tomé & Príncipe (2000)	São-Tomé & Príncipe (2002)	Togo	Senegal	Egypt	Chad	Total of active projects	%
Total number of active projects	11	17	14	18	5	16	4	4	7	n/a	5	8	232	100%
Weak technical and management capacities of the executing agencies	4	1	1	7		13	2	1	5	n/a	1	4	79	34%
Lengthy communication channels between the Bank and the executing agencies	3						4			n/a			36	16%
Long delays in the fulfillment of loan conditions	3	4	3	11	1	10	4	2		n/a	5	6	124	53%
Long delays in project execution	9	9	4	12		10	4	4	5	n/a	2		127	55%
Non-compliance with Bank procurement and disbursement procedures by the executing agencies		1		3		2		1	2	n/a	2	4	54	23%
Inadequate government contributions to projects		1		4			4		5	n/a		5	40	17%
Non-compliance with Bank requirements as regards progress and audit reports	4	5	3	1		10		2	3	n/a	3	8	78	34%
Lack of adequate supervision										n/a		3	15	6%
Political instability and unusual economic situation										n/a			4	2%

Active Portfolio and Performance Ratings

Table A1: Active Portfolio – Average Performance Ratings by Country

Country	No. of projects	Compliance with loan conditions	Procurement performance	Financial performance	Activities and outputs	Impact on development	Overall assessment
Algeria	6	2.3	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.7	2.3
Benin	13	1.64	1.91	1.97	1.90	2.13	1.92
Benin (2000)	8	1.53	1.89	1.99	1.66	2.04	1.80
Cameroon (2001)	9	1.6	1.7	1.8	1.6	2.0	1.70
Cameroon (2004)	17	1.54	1.77	1.74	1.58	2.09	1.72
Chad	9	1.62	1.50	1.42	1.70	2.03	1.70
Egypt	6	1.57	2.08	2.37	1.87	2.42	2.06
Equatorial Guinea	4	1.15	1.38	1.23	1.06	1.19	1.20
Equatorial Guinea	4	1.13	1.38	1.31	1.27	1.73	1.40
Ethiopia	11	2.3	2.6	2.3	1.9	2.0	2.3
Gabon	5	1.5	1.3	1.30	0.7	2.10	1.40
Guinea-Bissau	10	1.20	1.55	1.18	1.38	1.67	1.40
Malawi	22	1.82	1.97	2.40	1.76	2.07	2.01
Mauritania (2000)	11	2.22	1.80	2.16	1.61	2.22	1.97
Mauritania (2005)	10	2.15	2.06	2.23	2.13	2.48	2.20
Morocco (2000)	17	2.23	2.47	2.41	2.09	2.56	2.40
Morocco (2002)	11	2.37	2.45	2.41	2.27	2.50	2.39
Mozambique	18	1.62	1.89	1.87	1.77	2.49	1.93
Namibia	4	2.5	2.75	2.50	2.25	2.50	2.50
Rwanda	14	1.52	1.68	1.85	1.28	1.98	1.65
São Tomé (2000)	4	1.43	2.00	2.08	1.60	1.83	1.80
São Tomé (2002)	4	1.97	1.50	2.32	1.80	2.50	2.02
Senegal	10	1.75	1.92	2.06	2.10	2.25	2.00
Togo	6	1.72	2.30	1.82	1.58	2.30	1.90
Average	232	1.77	1.91	1.95	1.71	2.16	1.90

Table A2: Satisfactory Ratings by Sector

Sector	No. of countries	% of satisfactory ratings	Countries with satisfactory ratings
Agriculture	11	36%	Ethiopia, Morocco, Namibia, São Tomé and Príncipe (4)
Transport	13	31%	Benin, Ethiopia, Morocco, Namibia (4)
Social sector	15	27%	Ethiopia, Malawi, Morocco, Namibia (4)
Industrial sector	6	50%	Algeria, Ethiopia, Morocco (3)
Multi-sector	11	64%	Ethiopia, Malawi, Morocco, Mozambique, Rwanda, Senegal, Togo (7)
Public utilities	11	55%	Algeria, Malawi, Morocco, Mozambique, Rwanda, São Tomé and Príncipe (6)

Comparison of World Bank and Bank Group Policy and Procedures

World Bank CPPR policy and procedures	Bank Group CPR policy and procedures
<p>Country Portfolio Performance Reviews are conducted to strengthen portfolio performance and increase the development impact of projects. CPPRs assist the Bank to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learn from implementation experience to improve both the implementation of the existing portfolio and the quality of projects entering the portfolio; • Reinforce borrower ownership of Bank-financed projects; • Develop the design of the Bank's Country Assistance Strategy; and • Ensure the continued relevance of projects in the portfolio for sector strategies. 	<p>CPR policy objectives are to enhance country portfolio management with a view to maximizing the development impacts of projects and programs. They are geared at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving the quality of the Bank's country portfolios; • Assisting member countries in meeting their current obligations; • Adapting projects to changing economic circumstances; and • Providing guidance for future programming.
<p>The CPPR is a process of consultations between the World Bank and the borrower. Staff consult with the borrower on the objectives of the review and the range of problems to be resolved.</p>	<p>There is no prior consultation with the borrower. The CPR is an internal Bank Group document, prepared solely by staff for information of the Boards.</p>
<p>CPPRs may be preceded by sector portfolio reviews, public investment reviews and meetings of project managers.</p>	<p>CPRs are not preceded by such reviews as the World Bank's, and meetings of project managers are not organized.</p>
<p>The CPPR has strong links with other processes such as country assistance strategies, country economic and sector work, sector portfolio reviews and annual reviews of portfolio performance.</p>	<p>The CPR has only weak links with the CSP and the APPR.</p>
<p>The CPPR Discussion Paper is prepared in collaboration with the borrower, and focuses on specific issues and action plans for resolving them.</p>	<p>There is no CPR Discussion Paper and the borrower is not involved in the preparation for the CPR. The CPR is prepared on the basis of specified chapters.</p>
<p>The CPPR meeting is organized in the borrower country and attended by the World Bank country director.</p>	<p>No CPR meeting is organized in the borrower country.</p>
<p>CPPRs are scheduled every 12–18 months for countries with more than US\$ 1 billion in loan commitments.</p>	<p>The policy provides that CPRs be prepared every 2–3 years, but this is not strictly adhered to. Loan commitment size is not a criterion.</p>
<p>The primary responsibility for the CPPR process lies with the country directors.</p>	<p>The responsibility for the CPR process is not specifically assigned to country departments, and the role of sector departments is not defined.</p>

CPR Report Processing Time

Country	Date of mission (A)	Date of departmental document (B)	Date of Board document (C)	Lapse of time between (A) and (B)	Lapse of time between (A) and (C) in months
				6–12 months or less	
Algeria	July 2004	Nov. 2004	Dec. 7, 2004	5	6
Cameroon	Nov. 2003	March 2004	May 14, 2004	5	7
São Tomé and Príncipe	Sept. 1999	Dec. 1999	Feb. 17, 2000	4	6
São Tomé and Príncipe	Oct. 26 to Nov. 3, 2002	March 2002	April, 29 2002	5	6
Rwanda	Oct. 1999	Dec. 1999	May 25, 2000	3	8
Togo	Oct. 1–12, 2000	Feb. 2001	May 3, 2001	5	8
Namibia	April 8–15, 2003	Dec. 2003	Dec. 18, 2003	9	9
Benin	Sept. 1999	March 2000	July 10, 2000	7	11
Cameroon	March 2000	Oct. 2000	Feb. 14, 2001	8	12
Guinea-Bissau	April 2003	Nov. 2003	March 9, 2004	8	12
Egypt	Nov. 1999	Sept. 2000	Oct. 4, 2000	11	12
Gabon	April 2001	Dec. 2001	March 7, 2002	9	12
Morocco	Oct. 1999	April 2000	Sept. 22, 2000	7	12
				12–24 months	
Mauritania	Feb. 21 to March 5, 2004	Dec. 2004	March 1, 2005	10	13
Chad	July 23 to Aug. 6, 2001	Dec. 2001	Sept. 2, 2002	5	14
Malawi	Jan. 2002	Dec. 2002	Feb. 4, 2003	12	14
Mauritanie	Nov. 2000	Sept. 2001	Feb. 6, 2002	11	16
Senegal	Dec. 2003	Sept. 2004	March 3, 2005	10	19
Equatorial Guinea	Oct. 2002	May 2003	Feb. 18, 2004	8	17
Ethiopia	Dec. 2002	March 2002	April 9, 2003	4	17
Equatorial Guinea	July 2000	Nov. 2001	Jan. 28, 2002	17	19
Mozambique	Nov. 1998	May 2000	June 20, 2000	19	20
Morocco	Oct. 15–27, 2000	June 2002	Aug. 2, 2002	21	23
				> 24 months	
Benin	Oct. 2002	Sept. 2004	Oct. 27, 2004	24	25