



MULTILATERAL INVESTMENT FUND (MIF)



PROJECT PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT (MPPMR)

I. BASIC DATA (Amounts in US\$ millions)					
Country: Argentina	Project Title: Programa de capacitación de reguladores en energía para Argentina AT Number: ATN/ATC Number (s) ATN/MH-7046-AR	Date of Donor Approval: 12 jul 2000 Date of Contract Signature: No se firmó aún Date of Contract Validity: Date of Eligibility for Disbursement: Original Date of Final Disbursement: Current Date of Final Disbursement:			
Executing Agency (EA): Universidad de Buenos Aires Window: Has the project been reformulated: [] Yes [X] No (If yes see Section V)	Months in Execution from approval: from signature: Cumulative Extension of Original Disbursement Date (months): % Deviation from original Disbursement period:	Original TC Amount: 1,4 Current Amount: Disbursements: % Disbursed: Counterpart:	TC Modality: [X] NR [] R [] CR		
CO Specialist: J. Martinez Riva Headquarters Staff Member Assigned: Jaime Sujoy Date of Latest Report Update: Date of Latest Report Review by Representative:					
II. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)					
Components/Outputs:	Key Delivery Performance Indicators:	Classification of Component			
		HS	S	U	VU
1. Implantación del Programa de Capacitación de Reguladores del Sector Energía (PCRE)	<u>1. Formación de capacitadores en regulación</u>				
	1.1 Realizados dos talleres de trabajo en cada país		X		
	<u>2. Formación de Especialistas en Regulación</u>				
	2.1. Capacitados 30 profesores en ambos países		X		
	2.2. Se dicta en forma periódica el PCRE en sus módulos Básico, Intermedio y Avanzado, en Argentina y en Brasil		X		
	2.3. Ha sido elaborado material didáctico		X		
	<u>3. Actividades de promoción del PCRE</u>				
	3.1 Realizados seminarios de lanzamiento y cierre del PCRE, y otras actividades de promoción.		X		



MULTILATERAL INVESTMENT FUND (MIF)



PROJECT PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT (MPPMR)

2. Diseminación del PCRE	1. Desarrollo de una red regional de reguladores del sector energía 1.1 Implementado en el primer año un sitio en Internet 1.2 Mecanismo de coordinación entre las entidades involucradas en el PCRE funcionando. 2. Otorgamiento de becas 2.1 30 becas otorgadas en los tres años de ejecución del Programa 3. Fortalecimiento Institucional 1. Dirección del Programa 1.1 En funciones y a cargo del PCRE un profesional de elevado perfil académico. 2. Participación de un asesor externo regional 2.1 Universidad de prestigio internacional supervisa la implementación del PCRE 3. Fortalecimiento de instituciones académicas 3.1 Las UEP de cada país están en funcionamiento 3.2 Adquirido el equipamiento necesario para el PCRE 3.3 Cincuidas las evaluaciones intermedia y final	<table border="1"><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>X</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>X</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>X</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>X</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>X</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>X</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>X</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>				X			X			X			X			X			X			X		
X																										
X																										
X																										
X																										
X																										
X																										
X																										
Assumptions Related to the Implementation of each Component 1. No fueron indicadas. Se consideró que “el Programa no presenta riesgos destacables” 2. 3. 4. etc. ----- Summary Component Assumptions Classification (check one)		<table border="1"><tr><th colspan="2">Probability</th></tr><tr><th>High</th><th>Low</th></tr><tr><td>X</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	Probability		High	Low	X																			
Probability																										
High	Low																									
X																										
Implementation Progress Summary Classification (IP): (A satisfactory or higher classification indicates, among other things, that the project will be completed during the currently approved disbursement period) [] Highly Satisfactory (HS) [X] Satisfactory (S) [] Unsatisfactory (U) [] Very Unsatisfactory (VU)																										
III. ACHIEVEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES (DO)																										
Project Development Objective(s): 1. Apoyar el diseño e implantación de capacitación de agentes reguladores en el sector energético para Argentina y Brasil 2. etc.	Key Performance Indicators: 1. No se indicaron. Debe entenderse que cumpliendoe con los indicadores de los componentes se cumplirá con el objetivo el programa. 2. etc.																									
Assumptions Related to each Development Objective 1. No fueron indicadas. Se consideró que “el Programa no presenta riesgos destacables” 2. 3. ----- Summary Development Objectives Assumptions Classification (check one)		<table border="1"><tr><th colspan="2">Probability</th></tr><tr><th>High</th><th>Low</th></tr><tr><td>X</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	Probability		High	Low	X																			
Probability																										
High	Low																									
X																										
Expected Achievement of Development Objective Classification (DO): [] Highly Probable (HP) [X] Probable (P) [] Low Probability (LP) [] Improbable (I)																										



MULTILATERAL INVESTMENT FUND (MIF)



PROJECT PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT (MPPMR)

Briefly explain major factors taken into account to justify the DO Classification:

Annex 2

IV. OVERVIEW OF PROJECT PERFORMANCE ISSUES

Check key reasons for Unsatisfactory/Very Unsatisfactory IP Classification or Low Probability/Improbable DO Classification

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legislative approvals | <input type="checkbox"/> Consultant performance | <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental issues |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Borrower / executing agency commitment | <input type="checkbox"/> Inter-agency coordination | <input type="checkbox"/> Cost overrun |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Counterpart funding shortfall | <input type="checkbox"/> Supplier/contractor performance | <input type="checkbox"/> Qualified external audit |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Executing agency institutional capacity | <input type="checkbox"/> Project/component design | <input type="checkbox"/> Policy changes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Organizational changes in executing agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Contract condition compliance delays | <input type="checkbox"/> Organizational changes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community/political opposition | <input type="checkbox"/> Bank efficiency (response delays) | <input type="checkbox"/> Executing agency personnel changes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Executing agency staff deficiency | <input type="checkbox"/> Procurement difficulties | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (see Issues, Section VI) |

V. PROJECT STATUS

Progress to date in implementing each component (Include reference to IP assumptions, if applicable)

- 1.
 - 2.
 - 3.
- etc.

Current Status of each Assumption related to DO

- 1.
 - 2.
- etc.

Timeliness of Compliance with contractual conditions (If applicable)

“Qualified opinions” of external auditors

Reformulation (If applicable): Date of last reformulation _____. Briefly describe:

Lessons learned (If applicable):

Potential Problems (If applicable):

VI. ISSUES AND ACTIONS

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Responsible Unit</u>	<u>Date Action to be taken</u>	<u>Completed</u>
1. Firmar el Convenio 2. etc.	Firma	CAR - Beneficiarios		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

