
APPENDIX C2: PERFORMANCE RATINGS FOR COMPLETED AIDS PROJECTS

OED Ratings ^a							
Country ^b	Project name	Project period	Project outcome	Institutional development	Sustainability	Bank performance	Borrower performance
Free-standing projects							
Zaire	National AIDS Control Program	1988–1994	U	N	U	U	HU
India	<i>National AIDS Control</i>	1992–1999	S	S	L	S	S
Zimbabwe	<i>STI Prevention and Care</i>	1993–2000	MS	M	U	U	U
Brazil	<i>AIDS and STD Control</i>	1993–1998	S	S	L	S	S
Uganda	<i>Sexually Transmitted Infections</i>	1994–2002	MU	S	L	S	S
Kenya	<i>Sexually Transmitted Infections</i>	1995–2001	MS	S	L	S	S
Indonesia	<i>HIV/AIDS and STD Prevention</i>	1996–1999	U	N	U	U	U
Argentina	AIDS and STD Control	1997–2003	MS	S	L	S	S
Brazil	<i>Second AIDS and STD</i>	1998–2003	S	S	HL	S	S
Project components							
Haiti	First Health and AIDS	1990–2001	U	M	U	U	U
Uganda	<i>Costs of Adjustment (PAPSCA)</i>	1990–1995	MS ^c	P	UC ^d	S	S
Burkina Faso	Population and AIDS Control	1994–2001	MU	M	L	S	S
Chad	<i>Population/AIDS Control</i>	1995–2001	MS ^c	S	L ^e	S	S
Bulgaria	Health Sector Restructuring	1996–2001	HS	H	L	S	S
Sri Lanka	Health Services	1996–2002	S	M	L	S	S
Cambodia	<i>Disease Control and Health Development</i>	1996–2002	S	H	L ⁵	S	S
Guinea	Population and Reproductive Health	1998–2003	U	M	U	U	S
Rwanda	Health and Population (suppl) and Management	2000–2002	MS	N	U	S	S

a. Explanation of ratings: Outcomes, Bank and Borrower Performance: HS (highly satisfactory); S (satisfactory); MS (marginally satisfactory); MU (marginally unsatisfactory); U (unsatisfactory); HU (highly unsatisfactory). Institutional Development: H (high); S (substantial); M (modest); P (partial); N (negligible). Sustainability: HL (highly likely); L (likely); U (unlikely); UC (uncertain); NE (not evaluable).

b. Ratings for projects in italics are based on OED Project Performance Assessments (PPARs) undertaken in the field. Ratings for all other projects are based on an OED desk review of the project's Implementation Completion Report, which is a document prepared by the implementation team (the Bank and the Borrower) that includes the team's own ratings.

c. While the overall project was rated MS, the AIDS components were informally assessed to be S in OED's PPARs of these projects.

d. The sustainability of the activities comprising the AIDS component of this project (primarily recurrent assistance to widows and orphans) was rated either uncertain or unlikely.

e. Sustainability of the AIDS component was similar to that of the overall project.