1. Basic Project Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country: Republic of Ghana</th>
<th>Project SAP Reference/No: 2100150006676 (P-GH-AAO-025)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Title: Livestock Development Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Costs (MUA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount cancelled (MUA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan/Grant (MUA): 19.58 17.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cofinancing (MUA): 2.31 2.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR Evaluation Note Date: 09/2001 09/2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date: February 2002 June 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Completion Date: 31 December 2010 September 1st 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Officers (Names)</td>
<td>Designation (HQ or FO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Litse</td>
<td>Regional Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.G. Taylor-Lewis</td>
<td>Sector Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Beileh</td>
<td>Sector Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.R. Spencer</td>
<td>Sector Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Keita</td>
<td>Task Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. M. Sabri</td>
<td>Task Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Boulanouar</td>
<td>PCR Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Boulanouar</td>
<td>PCR Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osan.2</td>
<td>Peer Reviewer/Task Manager:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Delahaye T. Karikari</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Project Description (summary from Appraisal Report including addendum/corrigendum/loan agreement)

a. Rationale and Expected Impacts

The majority of the rural poor are in agriculture raising livestock, in particular small ruminants. But investment in livestock sub-sector has not been substantial except the investments in 1974-81 and the recent National Livestock Services Project (NLSP). This project, Livestock Development Project (LDP), was intended to consolidate these past investments with a focus on promoting smallholder livestock and dairy production, processing and marketing to reduce poverty and improve food security.

Expected impacts: reduce poverty and improve food security

b. Objectives and Expected Outcomes

Project specific objective: increase income of smallholder livestock farmers and dairy farmers, processors and traders in the project area
Expected outcomes: access to improved breeds, access to water points, access to improved fodder, access to credit (% of beneficiaries and amount borrowed by type), and access to trained agriculture staff, percentage of animals vaccinated, improved livestock productivity (gain in weight for beef cattle and milk yield for dairy cows), and reduced livestock mortality.

c. Outputs and Intended Beneficiaries

Multiple outputs: Breeding stations restocked, farm structures rehabilitated, breeders trained, breeds improved, heifers cross bred, farmers in urban areas trained in zero grazing management, farmers trained in mil collection, processing and marketing, water points for livestock established, farmers trained in forage establishment and management, fodder banks established, area of communal grazing land with improved seeds, cattle vaccinated, sheep and goats vaccinated, veterinary checkpoints and quarantine stations rehabilitated, credit disbursed (both number of LDP beneficiaries, amount of credit extended, and recovery rate), farmer groups established and trained, and agricultural staff trained.

d. Principal Components and/or Activities

1. Development of animal production – breed improvement, dairy improvement, animal feed and water resources improvement

2. Development of animal health – focusing on disease surveillance, control and prevention

3. Credit provision – credit facility for livestock farmers, processors and traders to access short-term and medium-term loans. The mid-term credit was also intended for improving means for transporting animals.

4. Capacity building – train farmers, processors, traders and MOFA staff to enhance knowledge and technical skills

5. Project Management

3. Evaluation of Design and Implementation

a. Relevance of Project Design

Several factors constrain increase in livestock production and income in mixed farming smallholder livestock sub-sector in Ghana such as: (1) low livestock genetic variety; (2) poor nutrition due to low nutritive feed and constrained access to water; (3) disease burden related to infectious and parasitic diseases; and (4) undeveloped marketing and processing value chains.

The design of LDP as specified relates the objective of increased livestock production and income to: (1) breed improvement (beef as well as dairy); (2) forage improvement and improved animal husbandry; (3) access to water points; (4) disease surveillance, control and prevention; and (5) improved processing and marketing. This design in part was informed by lessons learned particularly from the National Livestock Services Project (NLSP) of 1993 to 1999.

The causal relations between these project inputs (i.e. improved livestock breed, improved feeds and access to water, disease control and prevention, and improved processing and marketing) and objectives (i.e. increased livestock production and income) are depicted in the reconstructed albeit incomplete log-frame in the PCR. The frame, however, falls short to identify other factors that potentially condition the achievement of the project objective and the risk factors that are likely to affect the project outcomes.

Recognizing that project beneficiaries (mainly smallholder livestock farmers,
processors and traders) might be constrained by lack of working capital to access these improved inputs and services (e.g., livestock breeds, feeds, and vaccines and drugs), the project incorporated as its sub-component a provision for a credit facility that comprised of short-term (6-12 months) and medium-term loans. In addition, whilst recognizing that the country has the institutional framework and the relevant professional expertise to implement the project (reference to page 3 in the appraisal), the project nevertheless built into capacity building for enhancing knowledge and technical skills of farmers, processors, traders, and MOFA staff including project coordination.

Overall, the design of the project is rated good (rated 3)

b. Project Cost (including Borrower Contribution), Disbursements, and Adherence to Schedules (as relevant to project performance)

c. Implementation Arrangements, Conditions and Covenants, and related Technical Assistance

The main executing agency was the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MOFA). Within MOFA, the technical activities were tasked to two directorates: Animal production responsible for sub-component one – animal production and range and feed management; and Veterinary Services responsible for disease control and animal health. The M&E of the activities of the livestock sub-sector was the responsibility of the Livestock Planning and Information Unit (LPIU) within the Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate (PPMED). The PMU (Project Management Unit) was placed within PPMED. The PMU served as secretariat to the Project Steering Committee, which liaises with beneficiaries and relevant institutions, approves work plans and budgets, and guides the implementation of the project. Within the project districts, the district agricultural units implemented the project in collaboration with the PMU and the technical directorates (Animal Production and Veterinary Services).

Other institutions that cooperated in the implementation of the project were the Agricultural Development Bank (AgDB), which was responsible for channeling the credit fund to the beneficiaries, the Environment Protection Agency (EPA), which was responsible for monitoring impact on the environment and enforcing mitigation measures, and the private sector, which was involved in contractual works. Agreements for implementing various activities of the project were established between MOFA and these other institutions. However, such special agreements were not necessary within MOFA since the activities of the project were integral into the existing administrative structure.

The project procurement and financial management systems were based on those that existed. As underscored in the PCR, the Bank reviewed the existing procurement laws and regulations, and financial systems and found them acceptable and used them during implementation. However, the necessary implementation documents were not ready at entry.

Notwithstanding these institutional arrangements and readiness, there were some implementation weaknesses as highlighted in the supervision mission reports and the PCR. First, the project was originally planned to close by December 2008 but closed in June 2011; there was a 30-month time overrun. Second, the delivery of cash credit through AgDB was unsatisfactory as evident from low credit uptake and recovery rate. Following the mid-term review, decision was made to convert the cash credit into a credit in kind scheme. Third, the performance of some of the consultants and contractors engaged in civil works was unsatisfactory leading to delays and sub-optimal quality of the works. Finally, the commitment of the Government to the project waned over time as evident in delays in release of counterpart funds, which
as noted in the PCR, slowed the implementation of the project. Notwithstanding these shortcomings, the overall readiness and implementation effectiveness of the project was good (rated 2).

d. Monitoring & Evaluation Design, Implementation, & Utilization (Evaluator assessment)

The M&E system was partially developed. There were some agreements to monitor selected input and output indicators to report on physical progress, and procurement and financial performance. There was baseline data at entry. Hence, the initial values of the key indicators (“without project” situation) were not available at the start of the project. LPIU was responsible for tracing the agreed monitoring indicators. The PMU would prepare quarterly and annual progress reports to the Project Steering Committee and the Bank. These reports were also used for developing annual work plans and budgets.

Note though that the various data sources listed in the log-frame are not applicable for capturing project outcomes at beneficiary level. The PCREN rates the M&E design, implementation and design fair (2).

e. Other Issues (such as Safeguards, Fiduciary)

The project was rated in category 2 for environmental safeguards. The tasks of environmental impact assessment, monitoring and enforcing were assigned to EPA at appraisal. However, the EPA was not funded to accomplish its assignments.

As noted in the PCR, the project submitted annual financial audit reports with delays at times and the Bank reviewed and found them acceptable.

4. Evaluation of Performance

a. Relevance of project objectives

The project objectives of increased livestock production and income, and poverty reduction were consistent with Ghana’s development priorities – poverty reduction and agricultural sector development. These objectives were also consistent with the Bank Group vision and strategy for Ghanian Agricultural Sector as stipulated in the CSP (2005-09), and in line with the Bank’s corporate priorities of achieving food security and poverty reduction through agricultural development.

b. Effectiveness in Delivering Outputs

The project undertook multiple activities especially in animal production, nutrition and health, and recorded substantive achievements in all except few (see the full listing in the PCR). The PCREN agrees with the PCR on the overall weighted rating of good (scored 3) despite some time overrun.

c. Effectiveness in Achieving Outcomes

Note that the project outcomes are supposed to measure, for example, the percentage of smallholder livestock producers in the project area with access to improved breeds, water points, improved fodder, credit (% of beneficiaries and amount borrowed by type) and trained agriculture staff, and improved livestock productivity (gain in weight for beef cattle and milk yield for dairy cows) or reduced livestock mortality based on representative sample of the beneficiaries. Ideally, these outcomes need to be compared with counterfactual data.

Where such data on project outcomes are not available, it is hard to demonstrate the extent to which the project is achieving its objectives, i.e., improving livestock income and reduce poverty. The PCR reports estimated productivity or income gains for an average farmer using values of outcome indicators either projected or based
on field observations.

Although the various output indicators point improvement in project outcomes, there is still uncertainty about the extent to which the project reached the intended beneficiaries especially given the difficulty with credit delivery. Discounting for the uncertainty, the PCREN rates the overall project outcome fair (2) but subject to future empirical validation.

d. Efficiency in Achieving Outputs and Outcome

Notwithstanding the financial and economic worthiness of the project, there is some evidence of cost inefficiency arising from time overruns, irregularity in counterpart funds especially if such funds are necessary complementary financing, and poor quality of some of the civil works. Assuming the other important components of the project were done cost effectively, the PCREN considers the cost inefficiency is modest.

Hence, the overall project efficiency is rated fair (scored 2) but subject to further empirical validation.

e. Project/Development Outcome (PO)

The project is rated good for its relevance and delivery of multiple outputs. It is plausible these outputs would translate into visible gains in the project outcomes. Hence, the PCREN rates the development effectiveness of the project fair (scored 2).

f. Risk to sustained achievement of Project Outcomes

The important risk factors (threat) that would affect the project outcomes were not properly identified and analyzed.

g. Additional Outcomes/Impacts (positive and negative, not captured in the logframe)

h. Performance of Borrower

The design of the project was based on cumulated expertise knowledge and lessons learned from its predecessor project within the country. Key institutions necessary for implementation of the project were in place prior to the project, especially the participating directorates of MOFA both at national and district levels. The project procurement and financial management systems were based on those that existed. The project M&E was also integrated into the existing M&E for livestock sub-sector within MOFA. Notwithstanding such level of readiness, the Borrower nevertheless faced compliance challenge arising from conditions preceding first disbursement that caused project start up delays.

The Borrower was reasonably effective in the project implementation especially the technical directorates of MOFA and the PMU. Where there was implementation weakness, it was related to inadequate articulation of responsibilities, provision of resources, and effective enforcement of contracts with MOFA partners (e.g. AgDB, EPA, and contractors for the civil works) as evident in the underperformance of the cash credit component and some civil works. Notwithstanding these challenges, the Borrower achieved substantive outputs that would influence positively the project objectives.

The Borrower complied with the fiduciary requirements and reported regularly progress on project activities and outputs to the Bank. The Borrower was also responsive to the Bank’s findings and recommendations.

Overall, the borrower performance was good in design, readiness and implementation (scored 3).
### i. Bank Performance

The Bank too contributed to sound design of the project. It also contributed to strengthen capacity for implementation through its support to the capacity building component of the project. The Bank ensured adherence to the conditions to loan effectiveness and preceding first disbursement, fiduciary requirements, and reporting on physical progress on activities and outputs as well as procurement and financial performance. The Bank supervised the project regularly and provided practical solutions to emerging issues. However, issues of adequacy of skills mix of the supervision missions and frequent changes of task managers were not resolved to the satisfaction of the Borrower.

Overall, the contribution of the Bank to the project design and implementation effectiveness was good (rated 3).

### i. Overall Assessment

Overall, the PCREN rates the project good (scored 3) in its relevance, fair (2) in readiness and implementation, good in generation of outputs and uncertain in project outcome. The project promise of strong financial and economic worthiness was yet to be demonstrated in marked improvement in the project objectives.

### 5. Key Lessons, and Recommendations (Evaluator assessment)

The following selected lessons and recommendations taken from the PCR are specific to the experience of the project design, readiness and implementation

a. Lessons Learned

- Analytical and sector work before project appraisal is key to successful implementation and M&E efforts (According to the PCR, the analytical work during or prior to appraisal did not seem to have been thoroughly informed the project design)
- It is important to clearly articulate content, implementation modalities and responsibilities, and dedicated resources in establishing implementation agreements between projects and other national implementing agencies (e.g. EPA).
- Lack of success in implementing an activity (e.g. cash credit) should not be detrimental to the whole project. Instead, other alternatives should always be sought by the Borrower and the Bank.

b. Recommendations

- Conditions preceding first disbursement should be few, simple, implementable and relevant to avoid project start up delays
- The Bank should refrain from frequent changes of task managers unless justified and should enforce the practice of leaving clear handover notes by the outgoing task manager.

### 6. Comments on PCR Quality and Timeliness

The PCR was timely (4), reasonably complete, objective, consistent and analytical, and some of the lessons learned were specific to the project’s experience.

Overall, the quality of PCR is rated good (scored 3)

### 7. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings:</th>
<th>PCR</th>
<th>OPEV Review</th>
<th>Reason for Disagreement/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness in delivering outputs:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness in achieving outcomes:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discounted for outcome uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency in achieving outputs &amp; outcomes - Timeliness:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency in achieving outputs &amp; outcomes –other criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall efficiency in achieving outputs &amp; outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk to sustained achievement of project/development outcome:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrower Performance:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Performance:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of PCR:</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- Project is part of series and suitable for cluster evaluation
- Project is a Success Story
- High priority for impact evaluation
- Performance evaluation is required to sector/country reviews
- High Priority for thematic or special evaluation studies (Specify )
- PPER is required because of incomplete validation rating

Major areas of focus in future evaluation work:

**PCREN:** No further evaluation is recommended except for thematic study on credit for small farmers

**Follow Up Action by OPEV:**

**Manager Clearance & Signing Off**
References


## Appendix

### PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT EVALUATION NOTE

#### Validation of PCR Performance Ratings

**PCR Rating Scale:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>Very Good</strong> – Full achieved with no shortcomings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>Good</strong> – Mostly achieved despite a few shortcomings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>Fair</strong> – Partially achieved. Shortcomings and achievements are roughly balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Poor</strong> – Very limited achievement with extensive shortcomings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UTS**  
Unable to score/rate

**NA**  
Non Applicable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria of project Objectives &amp; Design</th>
<th>Sub-Criteria</th>
<th>PCR Work Score</th>
<th>OPEV Review</th>
<th>Reason for deviation/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of project Objectives</td>
<td>1. Project objectives were relevant to country development priorities.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Relevant to Ghana development priorities – poverty reduction and agricultural sector development. Not demonstrated strong pro-poor link to justify 4-point rating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Project Objectives could in principle be achieved with the project inputs and in the expected time frame.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Achievable provided the capacity building component was implemented and the PMU functioned properly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Project Objectives were consistent with the Bank’s country or regional strategy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Consistent with the AfDB Group vision and strategy for the Ghanaian Agricultural Sector as stipulated in the CSP (2005-09). Not demonstrated strong pro-poor link to justify 4-point rating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Project Objectives were consistent with the Bank’s corporate priorities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes but not demonstrated strong pro-poor link to justify 4-point rating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Ex-post Relevance of objectives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes as evident from the GOG initiation for phase II of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Relevance of project Design -Project Design & Readiness for Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Criteria</th>
<th>PCR Work Score</th>
<th>OPEV Review</th>
<th>Reason for deviation/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The log frame presents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The re-constructed log-frame is...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A logical causal chain for achieving the project development objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The PCR shows a reasonable causal chain for achieving the project objectives. There are outcome variables but these need to be registered at beneficiary level for the causal chains not to break.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The log frame expresses objectives and outcomes in a way that is measurable and quantifiable.</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>The log-frame expresses the objectives and outcomes in a way that is measurable and quantifiable. However, these objectives and outcomes need to be measured at beneficiary level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The log frame states the risks and key assumptions.</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>Hard for the PCREN to find any analytical reasoning for the stated assumptions. PCREN agrees with the PCR that potential risks and their mitigation measures were not articulated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Project complexity was matched with country capacity and political commitment.</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>Political commitment waned over time as evidence from delays in the release of counterpart funds. The implementation capacities of the participating agencies were mixed; strong among the MOFA technical staff, but the Agricultural Development Bank and the various civil works contractors and supervisors underperformed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Project design includes adequate risk analysis.</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>The important risk factors (threat) that were likely to affect the project outcomes were not properly identified and analyzed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Baseline data were available or were collected during design.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not rated at project level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Project procurement, financial management, monitoring and/or other systems were based on those already in use by government and/or other partners.</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>The Bank reviewed existing procurement laws and regulations, and financial systems and found them acceptable and used them during implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Responsibilities for project implementation were clearly defined.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not rated at project level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Necessary implementation documents (e.g. specifications, design.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not rated at project level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
procurement documents) were ready at appraisal.

10. Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan were agreed upon during design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement of Project Outputs*</th>
<th>Breeding stations restocked (6)</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farm structures rehabilitated (65)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breeders trained (1400)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farmers established zero grazing units (477)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farmers trained in milk collection, processing and marketing (887)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOFA AI technicians trained (9)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fodder banks established()</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>307 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communal lands over sown with improved seeds ()</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>162 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water points constructed ()</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20 boreholes and 33 dugouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disease surveillance improved cases of disease outbreaks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cattle vaccinated (143,142)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheep and goats vaccinated (332,282)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veterinary quarantine station constructed (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cash credit disbursed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animals supplied on credit (45,000)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farmers trained in various livestock related activities (185,339)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOFA staff trained (712)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Output weighted Score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement of Project Outcomes</th>
<th>Gain in productivity (weight gain)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gain productivity (daily milk yield)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced mortality rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not rated at project level
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OVERALL PROJECT OUTCOME SCORE</strong></th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Discounted for uncertainty in achievement in outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Outcomes</strong>&lt;br&gt; (not captured in the log-frame) - their importance rated as high; substantial; moderate; negligible</td>
<td>Institutional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment &amp; Climate Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poverty Reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Sector Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency in achieving outputs &amp; outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Timeliness (in adhering to the original closing date)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rates of returns (Specify if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Criteria (delays in implementation, irregularity in complementary financing through counterpart funds, and poor quality of some civil works)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL PROJECT EFFICIENCY</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk to Sustained achievement of Project Outcome</strong>&lt;br&gt;**</td>
<td>Key Risks (Specify common risk factors to be a basis for rating)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The output ratings have to be weighted by the relative output costs (see PCR format). The Overall rating is given Very Good, Good, Fair and Poor. Overall rating is the sub-criteria average.

** Overall risk to sustained achievement of project outcome is rated as follows:

- High (H): 4
- Substantial/significant (S): 3
- Moderate (M): 2
- Negligible (N): 1
- UTS
- NA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Sub-Criteria</th>
<th>PCR Work Score</th>
<th>OPEV Review</th>
<th>Reason for disagreement/ Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bank Performance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Design and Readiness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Objectives were relevant to country development priorities.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Relevant to Ghana development priorities – poverty reduction and agricultural sector development. Not demonstrated strong pro-poor link to justify 4-point rating.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Project Objectives could in principle be achieved with the project inputs and in the expected time frame.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Achievable provided the capacity building component was implemented and the PMU functioned properly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Project Objectives were consistent with the Bank’s country or regional strategy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Consistent with the AfDB Group vision and strategy for the Ghanaian Agricultural Sector as stipulated in the CSP (2005-09). Not demonstrated strong pro-poor link to justify 4-point rating.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Project Objectives were consistent with the Bank’s corporate priorities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes but not demonstrated strong pro-poor link to justify 4-point rating.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The log frame presents a logical causal chain for achieving the project development objectives.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The re-constructed log-frame in the PCR shows a reasonable causal chain for achieving the project objectives. There are outcome variables but these need to be registered at beneficiary level for the causal chains not to break.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The log frame expresses objectives and outcomes in a way that is measurable and quantifiable.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The log-frame expresses the objectives and outcomes in a way that is measurable and quantifiable. However, these objectives and outcomes need to be measured at beneficiary level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The log frame states the risks and key assumptions.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PCREN agrees with the PCR that potential risks and their mitigation measures were not articulated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Project complexity was matched with country capacity and political commitment.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Political commitment waned over time as evidence from delays in the release of counterpart funds. The implementation capacities of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The participating agencies were mixed; strong among the MOFA technical staff, but the Agricultural Development Bank and the various civil works contractors and supervisors underperformed.

9. Project design includes adequate risk analysis.  
   
- The important risk factors (threat) that were likely to affect the project outcomes were not properly identified and analyzed.

10. Project procurement, financial management, monitoring and/or other systems were based on those already in use by government and/or other partners.  
   
- The Bank reviewed existing procurement laws and regulations, and financial systems and found them acceptable and used them during implementation.

11. Responsibilities for project implementation were clearly defined.  
   
- Roles and responsibilities were clearly stated in the project design for the main implementing agencies (except the civil works contractors and supervisors)

12. Necessary implementation documents (e.g. specifications, design, procurement documents) were ready at appraisal.  
   
- Not ready at appraisal

13. Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan were agreed upon during design.  
   
- There was monitoring plan to monitor project physical activities and outputs, and finance.

14. Baseline data were available or were collected during design.  
   
- No baseline data existed at the time of appraisal

| Project Design and Readiness Sub-Score | 3 | 3 |

*Shows divergence between rating at project level and the Bank performance but unexplained in the PCR*
### Fiduciary Requirements

The compliance of the borrower was good except delays in submission.

### Social Safeguards

### Other Project Covenants

The borrower faced compliance challenge and delayed it project implementation.

2. Bank provided quality supervision in the form of skills mix provided and practicality of solutions.

3. Bank provided quality management oversight.

PCR was delivered on a timely basis.

### Supervision Sub-Score

### OVERALL BANK PERFORMANCE SCORE

The Overall rating is given Very Good, Good, Fair and Poor. Overall rating is the sub-criteria average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Sub-Criteria</th>
<th>PCR Score</th>
<th>PCREN Validation</th>
<th>Justification/Reason for deviation/Disconnect/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borrower Performance</td>
<td>Design and Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Responsibilities for project implementation are clearly defined.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Roles and responsibilities were clearly stated in the project design for the main implementing agencies (except the civil works contractors and supervisors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Necessary implementation documents (e.g. specifications, design, procurement documents) are ready at appraisal.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not ready at appraisal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan are</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>There was monitoring plan to monitor project physical activities and outputs, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
agreed upon and baseline data are available or are being collected

| Project Design and Readiness Sub-Score | 3 | 3 |

### Implementation

1. Borrower complied with:

- Environmental Safeguards 2 2 The national agency responsible for the task was not sourced to implement.
- Fiduciary Requirements 3 3 Project management ensured requirements were adhered
- Social Safeguards
- Other Project Covenants 2 2 Compliance to project covenants caused delay in the project starting operation

2. Borrower was responsive to Bank supervision findings and recommendations.

3. Borrower collected and used of monitoring information for decision-making.

| Implementation Sub-Score | 2 | 3 |

### OVERALL BORROWER PERFORMANCE SCORE 3 3

The Overall rating is given Very Good, Good, Fair and Poor. Overall rating is the sub-criteria average.

- **Very Good (HS):** 4
- **Good (H):** 3
- **Fair (US):** 2
- **Poor (HUS):** 1

### M &E Design, Implementation & Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Sub-Criteria</th>
<th>PCR Score</th>
<th>PCREN Validation</th>
<th>Justification/Reason for deviation/Disconnect/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M &amp; E Design</td>
<td>M &amp; E Design</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adequate for what it was designed but not comprehensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clear, adequate and realistic M&amp;E system in place</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan are</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>There was monitoring plan to monitor project physical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
agreed upon during design activities and outputs, and finance. Note the data sources listed in the log-frame in the appraisal were not good for capturing the project outcomes at beneficiary level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender disaggregated indicators provided</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline data were available or collected during design</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No baseline data existed at the time of appraisal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Design Score | 2 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M &amp; E Implementation</th>
<th>M &amp; E Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequately staffed and equipped M&amp;E function</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project M&amp;E was integrated into existing M&amp;E within LPIU but the assignment lacked clarity and resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrower collected and analyzed relevant M&amp;E data</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes for purpose set in the appraisal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E information reported</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes reported to the project management (steering committee) and the Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Implementation Score | 2 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M &amp; E Use</th>
<th>M &amp; E Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borrower used monitoring information for decision-making.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For planning purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E information used in project reporting (progress reports; mid-term review; PCR)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Use Score | 3 |

<p>| OVERALL M &amp; E PERFORMANCE SCORE | 2 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>PCREN (1-4)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUALITY OF PCR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Extent of quality and completeness of the PCR evidence and analysis to substantiate the ratings of the various sections:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Completeness (few missing), quality (empirical based) and analytical except few instances (output and outcome are distinct concepts that need to be consistently adhered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Extent of objectivity of PCR assessment scores</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Largely empirical based and objective. For this project, outcome is realized at farm or beneficiary level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Extent of internal consistency of PCR assessment ratings; inaccuracies; inconsistencies (in various sections; between texts and ratings; consistency of overall rating with individual component ratings)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>With few exceptions, the texts and the scores match. The comparison of the distributions of the PCR and PCR scores show a good matching – another indicator of consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Extent of identification and assessment of key factors (internal and exogenous) and unintended effects (positive and negatives) affecting design and implementation:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reasonably informative (e.g. the explanations for the project time overrun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Adequacy of treatment of safeguards, fiduciary issues, and alignment and harmonization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Extent of soundness of data generating and analysis processes (including rates of returns) in support of PCR assessment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Overall adequacy of the accessible evidence (from PCR including annexure and other data provided)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Extent to which lessons learned (and recommendations) are clear and based on the PCR assessment (evidence &amp; analysis):</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Extent of overall clarity and completeness of the PCR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (to be specified)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR Quality Score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR Compliance with Guidelines (PCR/OM; OPEV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. PCR Timeliness (On time = 4; late = 1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Extent of participation of Borrower, Co-financiers &amp; field office in PCR preparation***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other aspect (Specify, e.g. completeness &amp; relevance of annexes; supporting document list)***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR Compliance Score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** rated as high/exemplary (4), or substantial/significant (3), or moderate (2), or negligible (1)