

PCR EVALUATION NOTE (Form)

Agriculture and Rural Institutions Support Project (ARISP) NIGERIA

1. Basic Project Data				
Country:	NIGERIA	Project SAP Reference/No:	2100155004671	
Project Title :	Agriculture and Rural Institutions Support Project (ARISP)			
Sector :	Agriculture		Appraisal/Planned	Actual
Theme	Environmental Classification	Project Costs (MUA)	3 220 630	
Amount cancelled (MUA)		Loan/Grant (MUA)	3 000 000	2636876.27
PCR Date		Cofinancing (MUA)	220 630	
PCR Evaluation Note Date	26/07/2011	Board Approval Date	27/04/2005	
Partners		Signature Date	17/05/2005	
		:Effective Date	01/06/2005	06/02/2006
		Project Completion Date	31/05/2009	31/05/2010
Project Officers (Names)	Designation (HQ or FO)			
Mr. J. Liste	Regional Director		At Completion	
Mr. R. Spencer	Sector Director		At Approval	
Mr. D. Keita	Sector Director		At Completion	
Mr. M. Basalirwa	Task Manager		At Approval	
Mr. E. Ntagwabira	Task Manager		At Completion	
Mr. E. Ntagwabira	PCR Team Leader			
Mr. C. Omoluabi	PCR Team Member (Consultant)			
Evaluator/consultant: Benedict P. Satia		Peer Reviewer/Task Manager: Foday Turay		

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

a. Rationale and Expected Impacts:

The project stemmed from the recognition by the Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN) and donors that institutional arrangement for coordinating rural and agricultural development activities in the country was weak; that such poor coordination or the absence of it, leads to duplication of responsibilities and wastages of resources. It was concluded that greater emphasis needed to be placed in addressing capacity building issues at federal, state and local government levels as well as among rural communities. It was considered that these changes would contribute to improve the delivery of services and increase the effectiveness of both government and donor interventions in the agriculture and rural development sector.

In the year 2000, the FGN undertook the study of the rural sector under the theme: "Nigeria Rural Sector Strategy Study", which resulted into a Rural Development Strategy. The goal of this strategy, which was based on the principles of non-intervention; consistency; participation; sustainability and greater equity, was poverty reduction by improving the livelihood and living conditions of the rural poor.

The strategy also aimed to contribute to food security through improved service delivery to farmers.

The challenges of implementing the recommendations of the 2000 Rural Sector Strategy Study compelled the FGN to seek assistance from the African Development Bank, World Bank, and International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and FAO in 2001 to review and later on further help in streamlining institutional framework to assure efficient provision of technical and social services to the agriculture and rural sector. The major recommendation was the fundamental need to rationalize the existing institutional arrangements so as to enhance efficiency in planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluating agriculture and rural development activities and initiatives for the rural population.

The present project (Agriculture and Rural Institutions Support Project –ARISP-) was one of the outcomes of that process. It was part of a long term program under the Agriculture Policy Support Facility (A-PSF)¹ which demonstrated the Government’s commitment to improve the efficiency of agriculture and rural institutions so that they can effectively and efficiently deliver services to farmers. The other projects of the program included: (i) the National Programme for Food Security, (ii) the National Fadama III Development project and (iii) the Multinational NERICA rice dissemination project. The project (ARISP) was to be implemented over three years.

In terms of impact, the Project was expected to contribute to the sustainable management of the agricultural resource base and substantially increase food production and farm incomes, which in the long run would contribute to improve household food security and poverty reduction. Further, by strengthening the country’s capacity in project planning and programming, the project would indirectly have a positive effect on the environment through improved project design, appraisal and implementation.

b. Objectives / Expected Outcomes:

.

The sector goal was to strengthen institutions to respond effectively and efficiently to the needs of the farmers and other participants in rural development for the enhancement of food security and reducing poverty. The project objective was to enhance the capacity of the agriculture and rural institutions for effective and sustainable service delivery to the farmers.

The Project’s expected outcomes included: improved data collection, analysis and storage, enhanced management of information, improved delivery of extension services, increased farm incomes, household food security and poverty reduction of farming populations. These outcomes would be facilitated by: a rationalized institutional framework necessary for the effective and sustainable development of Nigeria’s agriculture and rural sector, well trained staff, technologically equipped departments; guidelines for departmental coordination of activities, an institutional performance indicators handbook, and a comprehensive human development strategy.

c. Outputs and Intended Beneficiaries:

.

The main deliverables included: guidelines for departmental coordination of activities developed and

¹ Given the critical need to harmonize the activities of the various departments of the Ministry of Agriculture for the implementation of their interventions in the sector , the donors in particular DFID, CIDA and USAID established the Agriculture Policy Support Facility (A-PSF)

validated; Institutional performance indicators handbook developed; human resource development strategy developed and adopted; agricultural data collection and analysis computerized; robust M & E system developed; Management Information System established; and staff training based on actual needs assessment conducted.

The principal beneficiaries were the over 450 staff (approximately 40 percent of whom were women) in the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources (FMA&WR) and the six regional offices in Bauchi, Enugu, Ibadan, Kaduna, Lokoja, and Port Harcourt. Since each regional office served six states, the project would indirectly benefit the states through those offices, and consequently the whole country.

d. Principal Components and/or Activities:

The three principal components were: institutional support and rationalization of responsibilities at the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (FMARD) presently called Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources (FMA&WR)², Capacity building and Project Management. The first component focused on reducing or eliminating the institutional inefficiencies arising from duplication of responsibilities, in the FMA&WR through the rationalization of responsibilities at the federal level and the six regional offices. Three outputs were expected to be delivered from this component, namely: i) guidelines for departmental coordination of activities, ii) an institutional performance indicators handbook, and iii) a comprehensive human development strategy. These were expected to be developed by consultants working closely with the beneficiaries.

The second component (Capacity building) aimed at improving staff skills and efficiency, strengthening the existing system for agricultural and rural development, improving communication mechanisms and avenues between institutions and the Federal Ministry of Agriculture in setting priorities and resource allocation and management for agriculture and rural development and, enhancing the use of information technology. The training was expected to be delivered by identified institutions within the country and the other activities by consultants and in close collaboration with the beneficiaries. The outputs from this component were i) Staff training based on actual needs assessment conducted, ii) agricultural data collection and analysis computerized, and iii) a management Information System established. The Project Management component was to ensure the proper implementation and management of the project.

3. Evaluation of Design and Implementation

(Evaluator's assessment of (i) PCR's completeness (in covering key aspects) and fairness (evidence adequacy, quality & discussions) and (ii) actual vs. envisioned achievements resulting ratings)

a. Relevance of Project Design

The project design was consistent with the development objectives of the Government of Nigeria. It was in line with the government's Rural Development Strategy and the National Economic and Empowerment Strategy (NEEDS). It was also in line with the Country Strategy Paper (CSP) for Nigeria

² The name of the Ministry was changed a number of times since 2005; for the purpose of this review we shall retain the present appellation FMA&WR.

2002-2004 in that was expected to address the constraints related to socio-economic infrastructure, increased production and capacity building. It was further in line with ADF IX guidelines, in particular those relating to the use of grants for capacity building.

In terms of process, the Project was designed in a participatory manner through consultation and involvement of representatives of all departments in FMA&WR. All the outputs in the project were expected to be delivered with the effective participation of the beneficiaries who either adopted or validated the final products. For enhanced transparency staff recruitment in the project was on a competitive basis and through a consulting firm. Staff who undertook external courses in the framework of the project was bonded to serve the Ministry for a maximum of five years. In addition staff selection for such training followed a transparent process thus ensuring the right staff was selected for the appropriate training. The Appraisal report did not provide for a launching of the project and there are no records indicating that the project was officially launched.

In terms of scope and content, the Project focused its interventions at the federal government and its six regional offices that provided technical backstopping to the states³. The major emphasis in the project was on capacity building to which about 65% of the budget was allotted with the majority of the balance to the development of tools to contribute to having a rationalized institutional framework for the effective and sustainable development of Nigeria's agriculture and rural sector.

In the design of the Project, positive lessons were drawn from earlier donor interventions, including harmonization of on-going donor approaches, funding and implementation mechanisms. For instance, the use of demand - driven approaches and human skills development in a coordinated manner, was in line with the Government's decentralization policy. The overall design of the project was simple, flexible and focused. The project design provided a log-frame. The objectives contained in the log-frame were clear, some of them measurable and the input-expected outcome causal chain were logical. The two components of the project complemented each other. The objectives could not be realized within the timeframe and with the resources allocated, because institutional strengthening and capacity building is a long-term process. However, the outcomes in the log-frame were not properly defined as outputs were taken to be synonymous to outcomes. For example the fact that staff was trained was no guaranty that it would result in outcome. The outcome was expected to be the use made of such training by staff. The project design did not provide for impact assessment of the training programs which represented about 65% of the grant, or of the use of the various tools developed in the project, hence the real benefits of the project could not be assessed.

Sufficient baseline data was available at appraisal and an M&E system was expected to be developed, tested and functional by PY2 but was only available in PY4. Some of the necessary implementation documents such as terms of reference of reference for the PSC, project staff and consultants (TAs) were available at appraisal but not the other documents; and the project management had challenges to work out practical procurement and implementation plans⁴. The Appraisal report indicated the risks with assumptions, which were fully captured in the Log Frame. The design did not specifically provide for environmental safeguards. No ESMP was developed and no monitoring of mitigation measures was carried out as these were not necessary, because the project was classified under category III. However, safeguards were expected to be attained mainly by strengthening the country's capacity in project

³ Most interventions in the agriculture sector in the past had focused on capacity building at state and local government levels, to the neglect of the federal government.

⁴ BTOR (Inter-Office Memorandum) of Supervision Mission of 08 – 27 June 2009.

planning and programming, and indirectly have a positive effect on environment through improved project design, appraisal and implementation. The design provided for adequate implementation arrangements and the responsibilities of the parties were clear. The Executing Agency was the FMA&WR. There was a Project Steering Committee headed by the Permanent Secretary of FMA&WR, and a well-staffed Project Team headed by a Team Leader. Although the design provided for a mid-term review this was not conducted.

In its concluding statement on project design the PCR recalled the participatory manner the project was designed and formulated and the importance of streamlining the operations of the FMA&WR.

This review assessed the design and formulation for the ARISP to be sound in process and satisfactory in scope and content. The philosophy of intimately involving the beneficiaries in all aspects of the project gave the project a strong bottom-up approach allowing them to validate and/or adopt the achievements and internalize them. Startup delays and other factors resulted in almost all important outputs, including the Monitoring and Evaluation System for ascertaining changes in the institutions, being realized towards the close of the project; and enough time was not available to test their usefulness. Although there were a few weaknesses in design, overall, the project was relevant at appraisal and at entry and the design adequate at entry.

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

The PCR treatment of this section was partially complete and fair. The total project cost was estimated during appraisal at UA 3 million as grant and UA 220 6300 as Counterpart funding. The actual grant project cost was UA 2.63 million, or 88 % of estimated cost. The balance of UA 363 123.73 was cancelled at grant closure. Delays in start-up owing to difficulties by Borrower to meet conditions precedent to first disbursement, and subsequent delays in procurement due to unfamiliarity with Bank procedures, etc. resulted in the grant closing date to be extended twice (6 months each) to enable the project execute outstanding activities in both the capacity building and institutional support and rationalization components. Counterpart disbursements was reported in a number of supervision mission reports to be small in comparison to the amount at appraisal and also released irregularly. The PCR did not refer to this or provide an estimate of actual counterpart disbursement at the completion of the project.

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

Implementation arrangements generally followed the design at appraisal. Designating the FMA&WR as both the executing agency and project implementation unit was valid and appropriate in view of improvements to its management and monitoring functions. However, the Project Steering Committee meetings were not held on regular basis to give policy direction especially with regard to implementation and budget planning⁵. This contributed to low performance of the project to achieve its objectives in time and as required in the Project Appraisal Report. Generally the performance of consultants and providers of goods and services with the exception of the Consultant for producing the MIS was rated by the PCR as good. The grant covenants of the project were relevant. Contrary to the PCR, records show that Audit reports were submitted late but compliance to these covenants was generally good. The Team Leader participated at the weekly meetings of the Inter-Departmental

⁵ The PSC is reported to have met only two times throughout the lifespan of the project, ostensibly because of frequent changes in the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry, chair of the PSC.

Committee that reviewed and provided oversight to activities under the Agricultural Policy Support Facility (A-PSF) chaired by the Permanent Secretary of the FMA&WR. Other members included representatives of CIDA, DFID and USAID.

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

The Project Appraisal Report provided for the development of an M & E system to monitor and evaluate the activities of the project and eventually those of the Ministry. However, for several reasons the M & E system was developed in the second half of PY4. The PCR provided data of numbers of training workshops organized as well as the number of participants disaggregated by gender, quantities of goods supplied to implementing partners of the project, etc. However, time series information and data that would have been generated by the computerized data collection and analysis tool and the M & E system for decision-making and resource allocation was only available a few months before project completion.

The Appraisal Report also detailed appropriate processes to monitor and evaluate the project design and implementation. These processes included (i) an initial review mission six months after the commencement of the project by Bank staff and thereafter regular supervision missions to the project, (ii) holding of weekly inter-departmental meetings, (iii) monthly meetings of the Steering Committee, (iv) production of quarterly reports on progress of the departments of FMA&WR on the implementation of the progress of activities, (v) quarterly reports on progress of project by the Project Team, (vi) the development of a Project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, which was also expected to outline in detail the scope and purpose of monitoring and evaluation system (including performance indicators, report format, etc.) to be used by the project, and (vii) the conduct of a Mid-Term review at the end of the second year of project implementation.

Generally such monitoring was to provide information needed for impact-oriented management and to involve key stakeholders in learning how to improve project implementation. The processes were also to provide information on service quality and project progress to the stakeholders, furnishing analysis to identify concrete improvements, as well as keeping funding agencies and responsible ministries abreast on project progress. The Mid-Term Review was in addition to determine compliance with project grant conditions, assess the completion progress relative to planned targets, assess the performance of the departments and provide the basis to review the project in terms of size and design to facilitate improved performance during the remaining implementation period.

The MTR was not conducted and with the exception of the quarterly progress reports on the project (14 produced during the life of the project), and supervision missions by the Bank (6 in total), the other required monitoring exercises were not performed. The Steering Committee rarely met. Supervision mission reports recounted a number of weaknesses (not reported in the PCR). These including: failure by the PMU to compile and analyze agricultural data for reporting and dissemination in the Project Regions and for use by the FMA&WR; there were no traces of records showing visits of staff to the Regional Offices, which indicated that follow up of the implementation of project activities was inadequate; there was a disconnect between the ARISP PMU M&E Section and the Regional Offices in terms of the Regional Offices not providing data to the PMU but would rather make them available to the Planning, Policy Analysis, Research and statistics Department (PPRSD) of FMA&WR; project management remained unconnected during the project implementation period by not holding weekly and monthly

meetings, which was key and critical link to effect the desired agricultural sector and institutions reforms⁶.

The late development of the M & E system, the data collection and analysis system and the inability to install the Management Information System (MIS) cumulatively affected negatively the progress of the project. There was no record indicating that information generated by the M&E system was used for decision making, although the PCR reported that, to a large extent (without citing examples) the information was used.

e. Other Issues (such as Safeguards, Fiduciary):

The borrower submitted regular progress reports (14 in total). Audit reports were also submitted regularly. There were no reported deviations from the approved statement of expenditure. There many procurement and disbursement challenges but eventually they were all performed in accordance with the provisions of the grant protocol of agreement and with the Bank's rules of procedures and policies.

4. Evaluation of Performance

(Evaluator's assessment: i) commenting on the PCR's completeness and fairness; ii) re-rating of the performance indicators)

a. Relevance of project objectives

The project was relevant at appraisal to Government priorities and was in line with ADF operational strategy for Nigeria, and in particular ADF IX guidelines especially those relating to the use of grants for capacity building. However, being an institutional strengthening and capacity building project which requires sustained long-term commitment, the project objectives could not be achieved with the project inputs and in the expected time frame. Furthermore, given the state of the delivery of services to the rural population and the risk of further deterioration, the intervention in capacity building, streamlining of activities to ensure that the investment financiers make in the sector produce positive impacts on the population, the objectives the project at appraisal and at completion was assessed by this review as very good which agrees with the rating by the PCR⁷.

b. Effectiveness in Delivering Outputs

The project encountered delays in the procurement of goods and services to implement the component activities due to unfamiliarity with Bank procedures and/or the project's noncompliance with Bank requirements for procurement of consultants in terms of submission of good quality terms of reference. There were delays in the approval of annual Work Plan & Budget, in the preparation of training plans and proposals, in the procurement of MIS consultant, etc. These situations contributed to slow deliveries and necessitated the extension of the project on two occasions, for a total of 12 months. Although the outputs were eventually delivered there was considerable time lost between expected and actual delivery of almost two years for several important outputs which meant they could not fulfill their objectives. Based on the above, this review rated this criterion as fair on the high side which is different

⁶ Aide Memoire on Supervision Mission of 8 – 27 June 2009

⁷ Note however, that in the body of the narrative (Project Objectives Dimensions – Assessment the PCR rated this criterion good but on the summary sheet on the last page very good. There are several such inconsistencies in the PCR.

from the PCR's rating of good.

c. Effectiveness in Achieving Outcomes

The PCR provided an impressive list of staff trained (311 of which about 30% were females) in various subject matters, several equipment and goods procured and distributed to research institutions and line departments in FMA&WR, tools developed to streamline operations and avoid duplications of responsibilities between departments and staff etc. (all identified in the log-frame as outcomes). However, there is no evidence that service delivery in the agriculture and rural development sector improved performance in the sector, in other words that these indirect benefits produced any actual or intended changes in development. An impact assessment to determine if staff capacity was enhanced was not undertaken or was an impact analysis of the training and application of tools on staff performance done. This review had considered rating the project fair, but in fairness to the PCR which rating was based on the information in the log-frame, this review agrees that the project was good in achieving outcomes but on the lower side of the scale, because delays in achieving reduced their effectiveness.

d. Efficiency in Achieving Outputs and Outcome

Without the extension of the life of the project by one year many of the key outputs could not be delivered or the outcomes attained. The great emphasis on capacity building of existing staff where over 60 percent of the project cost was allocated, and the rationalization of responsibilities and improved interdepartmental communication would reduce duplication of activities. They would also enhance the efficient use of available staff and financial resources. Such efficiency will be reflected in the institutional performance of the FMA&WR in terms of quality of services provided to farmers and rural populations. However, there were inefficiencies in the implementation process. The project was delayed by 1 year, about 15 percent of the grant was cancelled, and counterpart funds were not disbursed regularly. The outcomes were achieved with higher investments because of delays and escalated costs. Thus from both point of view of process and investment the project was less efficient. This review rated the project fair in achieving outputs and outcome, which is different from the PCR rating of good.

e. Project/Development Outcome (PO)

The project was relevant to the situation in the country at appraisal, continued to be relevant at completion and at this review. It addressed such strategic areas/issues as effective service delivery, improvements in rural/farm incomes, food security and poverty reduction. By re-aligning and strengthening the institutional capacity of the FMA&WR, the project aimed at assisting the Federal Government achieve its objectives with particular emphasis on the efficient implementation of the activities geared towards agriculture and rural development. The Project focused on defining an appropriate institutional framework for the effective and sustainable development of Nigeria's agriculture and rural sector that is consistent with democratic decentralized governance and was aimed at promoting collaboration and linkages both within the public sector and between the public and private sectors. By nature of the fact that this was an institution strengthening and capacity building project, which implies patience and time, the outcomes will continue to be improved if the appropriate enabling environment was provided. There is evidence that the Federal Government of Nigeria is committed to see positive changes in the agriculture and rural sector and beneficiaries expressed their conviction of the usefulness and potential importance of the development objectives pursued in the project. Overall, this review concurs with the PCR in rating the development objective of the project

good

f. Risk to sustained achievement of Project Outcomes

The main risks to sustained achievement of project outcomes are lack of commitment by government, limited dedication by staff to the objectives pursued by the project and mistrust and conflicts among the staff. The general approach of the project drew strong interest from staff during implementation. However, the rationalization of responsibilities, a process that was just started at project completion, will result in some staff being considered as winners and others losers; and there could be strong resistance to change. In the effort to reduce the effects of these situations on the sustainability of the project's achievements, the Project Team organized eight meetings to which all staff was invited. Participants were informed of progress in the project implementation and their views were obtained on the matter. In addition to these staff related risks, a fundamental and critical risk is the continued commitment of the Federal Government to see through with these changes. The risk level is assessed to be substantial.

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

There were no reports of additional outcomes/impacts not covered in the log-frame.

h. Performance of Borrower

The national government provided substantial counterpart funds. Progress quarterly reports on project activities and the Borrower's Project Completion Report were delivered on schedule. The same project Manager held the position throughout the project, which helped in building relationships with ADF officers, FMA&WR Directors, project staff, and personnel at federal and supposedly state level. There were delays in the completion of some activities and the submission of audit reports. The Borrower faced serious challenges with regards Fiduciary matters, due mainly to difficulties to fulfill preliminary grant requirements and unfamiliarity with Bank procedures for procurement and consultants, but these were nonetheless complied with. The less than satisfactory performance of the Project's Steering Committee deprived the Project Team and in particular the Team Leader of the oversight and guidance needed for the proper management of the project. At the same time there were a number of weaknesses in project management which could be attributed directly to the Project Management Team, such as the inability to hold regular Project staff meetings, the disconnect between the project M&E Section and regional offices, the rarity of visits by project staff to Regional Offices, etc. that negatively affected project performance and no doubt reflect on the Executing Agency and the Project Team. This review rated the borrower's performance Moderate which is different from the PCR rating of significant.

i. Bank Performance

ADF fulfilled its role and obligations adequately throughout the life of the project. The project appraisal was generally satisfactory at entry. The Bank fielded supervision missions at an average of 1.6 per year, provided reasonable management oversight, and was responsive to the national request to extend the grant closing date. However, ADF could have limited the risk of the project not being implemented on schedule through delays in procurement of goods and services by providing appropriate support, through for example the Country Office in the early stages of project implementation after grant

effectiveness. This review assessed the Bank's performance as significant, which is different from the PCR which rated it very significant.

i. Overall Assessment

The Project was relevant to the development strategies, policies and priorities of the Federal Government of Nigeria with regard streamlining institutional framework to assure efficient provision of technical and social services to the agriculture and rural sector, and was in line with ADF IX guidelines especially those relating to the use of grants for capacity building. The project objectives continued to be relevant at completion. While the Project encountered implementation delays, it accomplished over 80 percent of its outputs including the development of important systems to generate and analyze information and data for decision-making, monitor the performance of the Ministry and its staff, produced a framework for the rationalization of responsibilities and the avoidance of duplication of activities among departments and staff, significantly strengthened institutions in rural development, and improved the capacity of staff working in the sector. These project realizations effectively put to use should improve service delivery in agriculture and rural development more effectively and efficiently and eventually contribute to increased farm incomes, household food security and poverty reduction. The overall assessment of the project by this review is good, which is in agreement with the assessment by the PCR.

5. Key Lessons, and Recommendations (Evaluator assessment)

a. Lessons Learned

This validation agrees with and has reworded three out of the seven lessons learned given in the PCR:

- Project management team stability is essential for project performance. The key staff of the project remained in post throughout the duration of the project. This improved the understanding of the project objectives, tasks and the expected outputs and outcomes.
- Effective collaboration between institutions which are partners in a project is important for implementation success. The project is reported to have benefited strongly from good collaboration between the implementing agencies and other government agencies including national research institutions.
- Limited administrative competence and unfamiliarity with Bank Procedures could impact negatively the implementation and outcome of an otherwise technically sound project, indicating the need for strong and effective project management. ADF could have limited the risk and avoided implementation delays by providing appropriate support, through for example the Country Office in the early stages of project implementation after grant effectiveness.

b. Recommendations

In view of the potential importance of a Management Information System aimed at improving information management and use, FMA&WR should be encouraged to complete work on the establishment of this tool and also monitor outcomes of the project since this was not possible during project implementation.

6. Comments on PCR Quality and Timeliness

The PCR was produced in a participatory manner by the Project Team and Bank representatives. It involved visits to project sites and interaction with beneficiaries who among other things expressed appreciation for the achievements and potential benefits of the project. The PCR did not report that it was peer reviewed, but it was elaborated and submitted within the time limit. The PCR generally followed the guidance note on the preparation of Project Completion Report. It identified and assessed some of the factors that affected the implementation of the project, avoiding pointing out short comings or weaknesses in management by the borrower. The PCR matched actual performance of project in relation to targets and the lessons learned are pertinent and based on an assessment of the project. However, the PCR lacked completeness, no annexes and several inconsistencies in the scoring within the narrative (boxes in the main PCR) and the summary on the last page. Overall this review rated the PCR as fair on the higher end of the scale

ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

7. Ratings:	PCR	OPEV Review	Justification/Reason for Disagreement/Comments
Relevance of objectives	Good	Good	
Relevance of design	Good	Good on lower end of scale	There were some important weaknesses, poor definition of outcomes, failure to provide for an impact assessment of training programs, etc.
Effectiveness in delivering outputs:	Good	Fair	Key outputs delivered more than 2 years behind schedule in a 3 year project; could not contribute to project objectives.
Effectiveness in achieving outcomes:	Good	Good on lower end of scale	No substantive evidence outcomes were achieved; rating is in fairness to PCR which based rating on information on log-frame.
Efficiency in achieving outputs & outcomes -Timeliness:	Good	Fair	In terms of process and investment the project was inefficient and the delays in implementation further reduced the efficiencies.
Efficiency in achieving outputs & outcomes –other criteria	Good	Fair	Same justification as above
Overall efficiency in achieving	Good	Fair	Same justification as above

outputs & outcomes			
Risk to sustained achievement of project/development outcome:	Substantial	Substantial	
Borrower Performance:	Significant	Moderate	Both the PSC and Project Team exhibited several weaknesses that adversely affected the implementation of the project.
Bank Performance:	Very Significant	Significant	Bank could have limited delays in procurement of goods and services by providing appropriate support, through for example the Country Office in the early stages of project implementation
Quality of PCR:		Fair on the high side	Owing to incompleteness, inconsistencies in scoring or ratings, etc.

8. Priority for Future Evaluative work: Project for Performance Evaluation Report, Impact Evaluation, Country/Sector reviews or Thematic Evaluation Studies:

Not recommended for evaluation, amount of grant is small

- 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:

a).

b)

c)

Follow Up Action by OPEV:

Manager Clearance & Signing Off

Data sources for validation:

- **Task managers/Bank staff interviewed/contacted (in persons, by phone & email)**
- **Documents/reports and database**
- This review scrutinized the following document: PCR, Project Appraisal Report, Supervision mission reports, Back-to office reports, Audit reports; Aide Memoire, and Progress reports .It also consulted the Country strategic Paper at the time project was designed and formulated.

Attachment: PCR Evaluation Note Validation Sheet of Performance Ratings

PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT EVALUATION NOTE

Validation of PCR Performance Ratings

PCR Rating Scale:

Score	Description
4.	Very Good – Full achieved with no shortcomings
3.	Good – Mostly achieved despite a few shortcomings
2.	Fair – Partially achieved. Shortcomings and achievements are roughly balanced
1.	Poor – Very limited achievement with extensive shortcomings
UTS	Unable to score/rate
NA	Non Applicable

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	PCR Work Score	OPEV Review	Justification/ Reason for deviation/Disconnect/ Comments
Relevance of project Objectives & Design	Relevance of project Objectives			
	1. Project objectives were relevant to country development priorities.	Good	Very Good	Institutional arrangements are weak, coordination poor, responsibilities are duplicated within Departments in FMA&WR. The project objectives address these issues to ensure effective and efficient service delivery to farmers.
	2. Project Objectives could in principle be achieved with the project inputs and in the expected time frame.	Fair	Fair	
	3. Project Objectives were consistent with the Bank's country or regional strategy	Very Good	Very Good	
	4. Project Objectives were consistent with the Bank's corporate priorities	Very Good	Very Good	
	5. Ex-post Relevance of objectives	Good	Good	
	Relevance of project Design -Project Design & Readiness for Implementation			
	1. The log frame presents a logical causal chain for achieving the project development objectives.	Fair	Good	Clear complementarity between components and evident logic in achieving outcomes
	2. The log frame expresses objectives and outcomes in a way that is measurable and quantifiable.	Good	Good	

	3. The log frame states the risks and key assumptions.	Good	Good	
	4. Project complexity was matched with country capacity and political commitment.	Very Good	Very Good	
	5 Project design includes adequate risk analysis.	Good	Good	
	6. Baseline data were available or were collected during design.	Very Good	Very Good	.
	7. Project procurement, financial management, monitoring and/or other systems were based on those already in use by government and/or other partners.	Good	Fair	The procurement was based on existing procedures. However unfamiliarity of staff to Bank procedures resulted in serious delays at start-up and in implementation.
	8. Responsibilities for project implementation were clearly defined.	Good	Very Good	Clearly defined and set backs were due to other factors.
	9. Necessary implementation documents (e.g. specifications, design, procurement documents) were ready at appraisal.	Good	Fair	Designs and specifications not applicable but procurement documents, etc. was not available at appraisal.
	10. Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan were agreed upon during design.	Fair	Good	As the design was participatory the indicators were agreed upon during design but not the plan.
Achievement of Project Outputs*	Output 1 Guidelines on departmental coordination, developed, validated and used.	Very Good.	Fair	Target date not respected and hence effectiveness reduced
	Output 2: Institutional performance indicators developed and used	Very Good	Fair	Target date not respected and hence effectiveness reduced
	Output 3: Human resources strategy developed and used	Very Good	Fair	Target date not respected and hence effectiveness reduced
	Output 4: Staff training courses conducted	Very Good	Good	Target date not respected and hence effectiveness reduced
	Output 5: M&E System developed and used	Very Good	Good	Target date not respected and hence effectiveness reduced
	Output 6: Data collection and analysis computerized and used.	Good	Good	
	Output 7: MIS developed and used.	Poor	UTS	Was not developed
	Overall Output weighted Score	Good	Fair on the high side	
Achievement of Project	Outcome 1: Strengthen institutions and rationalized delivery systems	Very Good	Fair	No evidence performance improved or services delivery was enhanced.

Outcomes	Outcome 2: Improved staff capacity	Good	Good	No evidence performance improved or services delivery was enhanced
	Outcome 3			
	Outcome 4			
			
	OVERALL PROJECT OUTCOME SCORE	Good	Good on low side	Only because of poor classification of outcomes in log-frame
Additional Outcomes (not captured in the logframe) -their importance rated as high; substantial; moderate; negligible	Institutional Development	-	-	
	Gender	-	-	
	Environment & Climate Change	-	-	
	Poverty Reduction	-	-	
	Private Sector Development	-	-	
	Regional Integration	-	Moderate	Staff trained in Ghana
	Other (Specify)	-	-	
Efficiency in achieving outputs & outcomes	Timeliness (in adhering to the original closing date)	Good	Good	
	Rates of returns (Specify if applicable)	NA	NA	
	Other Criteria (Specify)			
	OVERALL PROJECT EFFICIENCY	Good	Good on low side	
Risk to Sustained achievement of Project Outcome**	Key Risks (Specify common risk factors to be a basis for rating)	Substantial	Substantial	Lack of commitment by government, limited dedication by staff to the objectives pursued by the project and mistrust and conflicts among the staff.
<p>* 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.</p> <p>** Overall risk to sustained achievement of project outcome is rated as follows:</p> <p>(i) High (H) : 4</p> <p>(ii) Substantial/significant (S) : 3</p> <p>(iii) Moderate (M) : 2</p> <p>(iv) Negligible (N): 1</p> <p>(v) UTS</p> <p>(vi) NA</p>				

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	PCR Work Score	OPEV Review	Justification/Reason for disagreement/ Comments
Bank Performance	Design and Readiness			
	1. Project Objectives were relevant to country development priorities.	Very Good	Very Good	Not PCR stated earlier it was good not very good
	2. Project Objectives could in principle be achieved with the project inputs and in the expected time frame.	Fair	Fair	
	3. Project Objectives were consistent with the Bank's country or regional strategy	Very Good	Very Good	
	4. Project Objectives were consistent with the Bank's corporate priorities	Very Good	Very Good	
	5. The log frame presents a logical causal chain for achieving the project development objectives.	Good	Good	Earlier PCR stated it was fair
	6. The log frame expresses objectives and outcomes in a way that is measurable and quantifiable.	Good	Good	
	7. The log frame states the risks and key assumptions.	Good	Good	
	8. Project complexity was matched with country capacity and political commitment.	Very Good	Very Good	
	9. Project design includes adequate risk analysis.	Good	Good	
	10. Project procurement, financial management, monitoring and/or other systems were based on those already in use by government and/or other partners.	Good	Fair	Only terms of reference of PSC, Project staff and consultants, not the others. Part of the reason project had serious challenges with procurement and recruitment of consultants
	11. Responsibilities for project implementation were clearly defined.	Good	Very Good	Clearly defined and set backs were due to other factors.
	12. Necessary implementation documents (e.g. specifications, design, procurement documents) were ready at appraisal.	Good	Fair	Designs and specifications not applicable but procurement documents, etc. was not available at appraisal.
	13. Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan were agreed upon during design.	Fair	Good	As the design was participatory the indicators were agreed upon during design but not the plan
14. Baseline data were available or were collected during design.	Very Good	Very Good		

	Project Design and Readiness Sub-Score			
--	---	--	--	--

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	PCR Score	OPEV Review	Justification/ Reason for deviation/Disconnect/ Comments
Bank Performance	Supervision			
	1. Bank complied with:			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Safeguards 	Very Good	Very Good	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fiduciary Requirements 	Very Good	Good	Failure to provide assistance to limit delays when project had challenges with Bank rules and procedures.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Covenants 	Very Good	Good	Failure to provide assistance to limit delays when project had challenges with Bank rules and procedures.
	2. Bank provided quality supervision in the form of skills mix provided and practicality of solutions.	Good	Good	
	3. Bank provided quality management oversight.	Good	Good	
	PCR was delivered on a timely basis	Very Good	Very Good	
	Supervision Sub-Score	Very Good	Good	
	OVERALL BANK PERFORMANCE SCORE	Very Significant	Significant	Difference due to issues raised above
<p>The Overall rating is given Very Good, Good, Fair and Poor. Overall rating is the sub-criteria average.</p> <p>(i) Very Good (HS) : 4 (ii) Good (H) : 3 (iii) Fair (US) : 2 (iv) Poor (HUS): 1</p>				

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	PCR Score	PCR-EVN Validation	Justification/ Reason for deviation/Disconnect/ Comments
Borrower Performance	Design and Readiness			
	1. Responsibilities for project implementation are clearly defined.	Good	Very Good	Clearly defined but problems are in application
	2. Necessary implementation documents (e.g.	Good	Fair	

	specifications, design, procurement documents) are ready at appraisal.			
	3. Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan are agreed upon and baseline data are available or are being collected	Good	Good	PCR had earlier stated it was fair
	Project Design and Readiness Sub-Score	Good	Good	
	Implementation			
	1. Borrower complied with:			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Safeguards 	Very Good	Very Good	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fiduciary Requirements 	Very Good	Good	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Covenants 	Very Good	Fair	Failure to hold regular meetings of PSC, low disbursement of counterpart funds, etc.
	2. Borrower was responsive to Bank supervision findings and recommendations.	Fair	Fair	
	3. Borrower collected and used of monitoring information for decision-making.	Fair	Poor	No evidence data was generated and used for decision-making
	Implementation Sub-Score	Good	Fair	
	OVERALL BORROWER PERFORMANCE SCORE	Significant	Moderate	
<p>The Overall rating is given Very Good, Good, Fair and Poor. Overall rating is the sub-criteria average.</p> <p>(i) Very Good (HS) : 4 (ii) Good (H) : 3 (iii) Fair (US) : 2 (iv) Poor (HUS): 1</p>				

M &E Design, Implementation & Utilization

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	PCR Score	PCR-EVN Validation	Justification/ Reason for deviation/Disconnect/ Comments
M & E Design	M & E Design			
	Clear, adequate and realistic M & E system in place	Very Good	Very Good	
	Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan are agreed upon during design	Good	Good	

	Baseline data were available or collected during design	Good	Good	
	Design Score	Good	Good	
M & E Implementation	M & E Implementation			
	Adequately staffed and equipped M & E function	Good	Good	
	Borrower collected and analyzed relevant M & E	Good	UTS	supervision mission reports show clearly data was not being fed to M&E Section
	Implementation Score			
M & E Use	Borrower used monitoring information for decision-making.	Fair	Poor	No evidence data was generated and used for decision-making.
	Use Score			
	OVERALL M & E PERFORMANCE SCORE	Good	Good on low side	M&E system was developed and supervision mission reports show clearly data was not being fed to M&E Section.

PCR Quality Assessment

Criteria	PCR-EVN (1-4)	Comments
QUALITY OF PCR		
1. Extent of quality and completeness of the PCR evidence and analysis to substantiate the ratings of the various sections:	Fair	Quality was high but Incomplete in several areas
2. Extent of objectivity of PCR assessment scores	Good	Clearly objective
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)	Fair	Several inconsistencies between ratings in main narrative (boxes for scoring) and the summary rating on the last page.
4. Extent of identification and assessment of key factors (internal and exogenous) and unintended effects (positive and	Fair	Did not identify the factor other than the aspect of participation and lessons learned.

negatives) affecting design and implementation:		
5. Adequacy of treatment of safeguards, fiduciary issues, and alignment and harmonization	Good	Was not applicable but could have commented on the indirect safeguards through capacity building
6. Extent of soundness of data generating and analysis processes (including rates of returns) in support of PCR assessment:	NA	
7. Overall adequacy of the accessible evidence (from PCR including annexure and other data provided)	Fair	No annex was provided
8. Extent to which lessons learned (and recommendations) are clear and based on the PCR assessment (evidence & analysis):	Good	Derived from experience in the project and pertinent.
9. Extent of overall clarity and completeness of the PCR	Good	Clear but incomplete
Other (to be specified)		
PCR Quality Score	Fair on the high side	
PCR Compliance with Guidelines (PCR/OM; OPEV)		
1. PCR Timeliness (On time = 4; late = 1)	Very Good	Submitted on time
2. Extent of participation of Borrower, Co-financiers & field office in PCR preparation***	High	Also with beneficiaries
3. Other aspect (Specify, e.g. completeness & relevance of annexes; supporting document list) ***	Negligible	Was not peer reviewed
PCR Compliance Score	Good on the low side	
*** rated as high/exemplary (4), or substantial/significant (3), or moderate (2), or negligible (1)		