



## 1. Project Data

<b>Project ID</b> P113949	<b>Project Name</b> VN-Mekong Delta Water Mgmt for Rural Dev	
<b>Country</b> Vietnam	<b>Practice Area(Lead)</b> Water	
<b>L/C/TF Number(s)</b> IDA-49510	<b>Closing Date (Original)</b> 31-Mar-2017	<b>Total Project Cost (USD)</b> 206,600,000.00
<b>Bank Approval Date</b> 07-Jun-2011	<b>Closing Date (Actual)</b> 15-Sep-2017	
	<b>IBRD/IDA (USD)</b>	<b>Grants (USD)</b>
Original Commitment	160,000,000.00	0.00
Revised Commitment	160,000,000.00	0.00
Actual	134,289,842.21	0.00

<b>Prepared by</b> Divya Kapoor	<b>Reviewed by</b> Ebru Karamete	<b>ICR Review Coordinator</b> Christopher David Nelson	<b>Group</b> IEGSD (Unit 4)
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---	--------------------------------

## 2. Project Objectives and Components

### a. Objectives

As per the Financing Agreement, the objective of the Project is to protect and enhance the utilization of water resources in Project Provinces of the Mekong Delta Region in order to sustain gains in agricultural productivity, provide access to water supply for rural households, and contribute to climate change adaptation (Financing Agreement, Schedule 1 page 5).

The Project Appraisal Document (PAD) has the same PDO (PAD, para 28).



**b. Were the project objectives/key associated outcome targets revised during implementation?**

No

**c. Will a split evaluation be undertaken?**

No

**d. Components**

**Component 1: Water Management Planning and Efficient Utilization** (Appraisal Estimate US\$10.33 million ; Actual US\$6.20 million\*):

Strengthening the capacity for water resources management planning at the regional and provincial level and increasing the efficiency in water utilization, including:

- (a) development of provincial water management plans incorporating potential impacts from upstream development and climate change, and development of a regional water analysis; and
- (b) promoting the efficient use of water through demonstration of good practices of on-farm water and agriculture management to increase water productivity, and increasing the efficiency in the operation and maintenance of the irrigation schemes supported under components 1 and 2 of the project.

\*The ICR did not explicitly present information on why the actual amount was lower than the appraisal amount

**Component 2: Improvement and Rehabilitation of Water Resources Infrastructure** (Appraisal Estimate US\$128.93 million ; Actual US\$118.62 million\*\*):

Construction and rehabilitation of water resources infrastructure in selected water management schemes, including:

- (a) major maintenance of existing under-performing infrastructure, such as canal dredging, re-sectioning and lining repairs, and rehabilitation of dykes;
- (b) completion and/or minor upgrading of existing infrastructure, such as construction of secondary and tertiary sluice gates, construction of small bridges, and upgrading of canal dykes;
- (c) rehabilitation and repairs of the tertiary and on-farm irrigation facilities to support Water Users' Organizations; and
- (d) provision of support for preparation and implementation of Sub-Projects under this component 2, including: (i) preparation of feasibility studies, detailed designs, and safeguard documents; (ii) implementation and monitoring of environmental and safeguard mitigation measures, and (iii) support for implementing integrated pest management.

\*\* The ICR (para 49) mentions that the approach to focus on the completion and improvement of existing irrigation infrastructure increased cost efficiency of the project investments. This resulted in considerable cost savings as compared to the cost estimate at appraisal. Out of these savings, an equivalent of US\$ 15.37 million was used for additional investments in civil works packages of component 2 and the equivalent of US\$ 17.86 million was used for additional investments under component 3

**Component 3: Rural Water Supply and Sanitation** (Appraisal Estimate US\$32.98 million ; Actual US\$43.96 million\*\*):



Provision of support for the construction, rehabilitation, and management of rural water supply and sanitation systems, including:

- (a) development of rural water supply infrastructure;
- (b) development of sanitation infrastructure, and hygiene promotion; and
- (c) institutional strengthening of Provincial Centers for Rural Water Supply and Sanitation (PCERWASs).

*\*\*□The ICR (para 49) mentions that the approach to focus on the completion and improvement of existing irrigation infrastructure increased cost efficiency of the project investments. This resulted in considerable cost savings as compared to the cost estimate at appraisal. Out of these savings, an equivalent of US\$ 15.37 million was used for additional investments in civil works packages of component 2 and the equivalent of US\$ 17.86 million was used for additional investments under component 3*

□

**Component 4: Project Management and Implementation Support** (Appraisal Estimate US\$7.07 million ; Actual US\$10.53 million):

Provision of support for Project management, monitoring and evaluation, including provision of technical advisory services, acquisition of logistics equipment and vehicles, and facilitation of workshops and training.

#### e. **Comments on Project Cost, Financing, Borrower Contribution, and Dates**

Project Cost:

Total Appraisal Estimate: US\$ 206.6 million;

Actual Cost: US\$ 179.38 million (84 % of the appraisal estimate\*\*)

#### **Project Financing:**

World Bank IDA loan: Original Estimate US\$ 160 million; Actual Disbursement US\$ 134.29 million

□

**Borrower contribution:** Original Estimate US\$ 46.6 million; Actual Disbursement US\$ 45.09 million

□

#### **Key Dates:**

Approval: 07 June 2011

Effectiveness: 07 October 2011

Restructurings: 12 June 2016 (to remove the project's results framework from the financing agreement and place these indicators in the project operational manual, as part of one-time amendment for 13 projects included in the Bank's Vietnam portfolio); and 26 March 2017 (to extend project closing date by 5 months and 15 days, to complete pending activities (Restructuring paper, page 3))

Project Closing: Original – 31 March 2017; Actual – 15 September 2017

*\*\* The ICR (para 49) mentions that the approach to focus on the completion and improvement of existing irrigation infrastructure increased cost efficiency of the project investments. This resulted in considerable cost savings as compared to the cost estimate at appraisal. Out of these savings, an equivalent of US\$ 15.37 million was used for additional investments in civil works packages of component 2 and the*



*equivalent of US\$ 17.86 million was used for additional investments under component 3.*

### 3. Relevance of Objectives

#### Rationale

The Mekong Delta (MKD) area accounted for 27 percent of Vietnam’s agricultural land and 40 percent of the country’s agricultural GDP at the time of appraisal (PAD page 1) and remains a major pillar for Vietnam’s agriculture sector till date. It is also one of the country’s most vulnerable areas owing to declining water resources. The project is aligned with all three pillars of the country partnership framework (CPF) FY18 – FY22 (ICR page 9). The first focus area of the CPF (Enable Inclusive Growth and Private Sector Participation) recognizes agriculture as a key sector for Vietnam’s continued efforts to reduce poverty and to ensure shared prosperity. Key interventions proposed are improvements in the regulatory environment and promotion of climate smart agricultural production. The second focus area (Invest in People and Knowledge) recognizes the importance of water and sanitation as part of the effort to reduce malnutrition. The final focus area (Ensure Environmental Sustainability and Resilience) emphasizes Vietnam’s high vulnerability to climate change along with Vietnam’s dependence on climate-sensitive natural resources such as water. The project thus has an expansive and relevant scope. It is also aligned with the following policies and strategies of the Government of Vietnam: National Rural Clean Water Supply and Sanitation Strategy 2020; National Targeted Program for climate change; National Water Resources Strategy Towards the Year 2020; and Program of Green House Gas (GHG) Emissions Reduction in Agriculture and Rural Development 2010 – 2020 (ICR page 9).

#### Rating

High

### 4. Achievement of Objectives (Efficacy)

#### Objective 1

##### Objective

Protect and enhance the utilization of water resources in Project Provinces of the Mekong Delta Region in order to sustain gains in agricultural productivity

##### Rationale

The ICR (page 6) notes that a combination of economic and upstream developments, and environmental degradation resulted in a growing competition for the available water resources that are being depleted as a result of climate change and biological and chemical pollution. The compounded impact of these developments negatively affected agricultural productivity and the overall public health in the MKD. To mitigate the impacts of flooding and saline intrusion, **structural investments in water management**



**infrastructure** – river and sea dykes, sluices, and dredging of secondary and tertiary canal systems – were required to protect and enhance the utilization of water resources in project provinces of the Mekong Delta Region in order **to sustain gains in agricultural productivity.**

**Outputs** – actuals below (no targets were provided by the ICR and the project team):

- 73,824 meters of dyke
- 83,464 meters of secondary/tertiary canal (dredging)
- 75,397 meters of secondary/tertiary canal (embankment)
- 158 secondary/tertiary sluices
- 537 culverts
- 8 pump stations
- 82 bridges
- 7,200 meters of road

The project included the following two indicators during restructuring:

- An area of 134,162 hectares was provided with new or improved irrigation or drainage services and an area of 54,033 hectares was provided with new irrigation infrastructure.
- Existing water management infrastructure was upgraded in 80,129 hectares. The ICR noted that (page 11), as the indicators were added later during the project, no targets were assigned in the results framework.

□

### **Intermediate Outcomes**

- Area transferred to WUOs for managing tertiary and quaternary irrigation facilities. Target: 40,000 hectares. Actual 42,835 hectares.
- A total of 145 WUAs have been created or strengthened. To assess whether these WUAs are actually operational, 39 WUAs were selected, and it was found that more than 90% of the farmers in the catchment area of the WUAs had become member and that an average of 96% of the members were paying their irrigation charges. Water distribution plans were prepared for all WUAs and all water users were informed in a timely manner about these plans.

### **Outcomes:**

The ICR included the following indicators to measure the achievement of this objective:

- Number of areas where agricultural production has increased (more than 2% as compared to pre-project levels) (target: 50,000 hectares); Actual: 93,358 ha. However, when increase is measured for more than 5 %, then the area size decreases to 61.762 ha; and for more than 10 % increase the increase is only 36,000 ha.
- Number of areas where agricultural production has been maintained through prevention of future salinity' (target: 50,000); Actual: 11,479 hectares).



The ICR noted that (page 11) under the economic analysis, budget models were developed for two crops, and agricultural yields were estimated using with and without project scenarios, and future estimated situation after the project closed. Based on this analysis it was estimated that the yields would increase around 10-15 %. Further clarification from the project team mentioned that though the model forecasts the agricultural production up to 5 years after the project, the estimates are derived from the 3-year average of the agricultural production before the project and the 3-year average of the agricultural production during the last three of the project. Table 3 in ICR Annex 4 presents an overview of the agricultural production of 7 key crops in all project sub-areas. The table shows that in all project areas for all project crops the agricultural production increases.

The team also highlighted that through the establishment of Water User Associations (WUAs) and Water User Organizations (WUOs) and related institutional strengthening activities, these gains would likely be sustained. The team also provided written exchanges to highlight increasing salinity in the Delta, and how the project interventions (dykes, sluices, irrigation canal improvements) positively impact agricultural production.

While the outcome target on future salinity prevention could not be met, due to substantial agricultural yield increases over the last three years of project implementation (based on clarifications from the project team), the achievement of this sub-objectives is rated as substantial.

**Rating**  
Substantial

## **Objective 2**

### **Objective**

Protect and enhance the utilization of water resources in Project Provinces of the Mekong Delta Region in order to provide access to water supply for rural households

### **Rationale**

Providing people, including the poor, with household-level access to sustainable, safe and potable drinking water supply through piped water-supply schemes and improved sanitation through a **combination of structural (improved latrines) and non-structural (behavioral change) interventions** contributes to the improvement of their health and livelihoods.

□

**Outputs** – actuals below, targets not mentioned in ICR:

- 89 water supply stations constructed/expanded
- 66,615 water meter device installed



- 1 laboratory for testing water quality set up
- 42 school toilets constructed
- 18,607 household latrines constructed
- 3 workshops on behavior change communication and sanitation marketing
- 32 workshops with 1,423 participants on behavioral change and training
- 30 sanitation on-stop-sanitation shops supported by the project

#### **Intermediate Outcomes:**

The ICR reported the following results of the behavior change activities and utilization of sanitation facilities:

- The remaining 8,552 toilets were constructed through an intensive behavioral change communication and awareness campaign combined with the establishment of 30 one-stop sanitation shops across the project provinces. The high likelihood of latrines, actually being used, has been reconfirmed by the findings of the Multi Indicator Cluster Survey which found that only 3% of the population in the MKD now practice open defecation, which was also supported by interviews with key informants.

#### **Outcomes:**

The project included two indicators to measure this objective, which were relevant and clear:

- Provision of sustainable and safe potable water supply to rural population. Target: 60,000 households; Actual 66,615 households
- Number of rural households served by improved sanitation. Target: 10,000 households; Actual 18,607 households

The targets were surpassed. The ICR also provided additional information on of the quality and sustainability of water supply works (page 12), that were adequate. Therefore, achievement of this objective is substantial.

#### **Rating**

Substantial

### **Objective 3**

#### **Objective**

Protect and enhance the utilization of water resources in Project Provinces of the Mekong Delta Region in order to contribute to climate change adaptation

#### **Rationale**

To mitigate the negative long-term impacts of upstream developments and to contribute to climate change adaptation, a combination of the structural and non-structural measures including awareness raising, water resources management planning, etc. were designed to create the needed water management infrastructure



and to increase the institutional capacities at all levels to cope with increasing saline intrusion, variable flow regimes and growing competition for water resources. In addition, to cope with the effects of the future growing scarcity of water suitable for agriculture, climate smart agricultural techniques were tested to increase water productivity (more crops per drop) in the agricultural sector (ICR para 8). The ICR (para 39) notes that the results chain for climate change is not immediately evident for the PAD, and the results framework doesn't detail it as well.

**Outputs:**

- Hydraulic law approved by National Assembly
- As part of the 6 pilot projects: 226 sluices/culverts constructed; 11 electric pump stations constructed; 9,681 meters length of dyke rehabilitated; 12,409 meters length of canal dredged; and 4,488 meters of canal embankment.

**Intermediate Outcomes:**

The project monitored improved water resource management through three indicators: (i) Number of provinces having water resources management plans considering the impacts on the upstream development and climate change and improve the current operations and maintenance practices; (2) Number of provinces implementing programs which would bring improvement in water resources operations and maintenance; and, (3) Number of pilot programs on improved irrigation and advanced high productivity agriculture practices implemented. At completion, none of the provinces had water resource management plans or had started to implement programs which would bring improvement in water resources operation and maintenance.

**Outcome:**

The project monitored "Increased water productivity in the pilot areas" to measure climate change adaptation. Although, this outcome indicator could be used as one of the indicators for measuring climate adaptation, as it requires improved yields and/or reduced water consumption for agriculture, it is not sufficient on its own. Also, the target of 20 % - was not achieved, as the achievement was 16.7 %. It is not clear what this result actually meant. The project team subsequently clarified that given that climate change is accelerating saline intrusion, outcome indicator 1a and 1b (increasing or maintaining agricultural production) is a reflection of the project's efficacy to contribute the climate change adaptation (ICR para 24 to 30). In addition, as mentioned above, the institutional support provided by the project on improved water resources management plans that included climate adaptation measures were not adopted. As a result, achievement of this sub-objective is modest.

**Rating**  
Modest



## Rationale

A cohesive and concise theory of change was missing from the ICR, given the expansive scope of the project. Having said that, the achievement of the first and second sub-objectives was rated substantial, and the third sub-objective was modest, thus the overall project efficacy is rated as Substantial.

## Overall Efficacy Rating

Substantial

## 5. Efficiency

**Economic Efficiency:** The ICR (page 14) notes that the economic analysis at completion estimated that the economic rate of return (ERR) was 13.2 percent and the net present value (NPV) \$24.7 million using the discount rate of 12% that was used for the economic analysis at appraisal. The sensitivity analysis brought out that the project's ERR is highly sensitive to failure of the scaling up and replication of the climate smart agriculture technologies after project completion. Failure to do so would result in a reduction of the ERR to 5.3 percent. ICR para 46 states that the ERR at completion was lower than the ERR estimated at appraisal and at mid-term review (MTR). This was mainly due to the delays in implementing component 1 which negatively affected the replication and scaling up of CSA technologies validated through the six pilot projects during project implementation and after project completion

□

**Cost effectiveness:** The ICR (para 49) notes that "the approach to focus on the completion and improvement of existing irrigation infrastructure increased cost efficiency of the project investments. This resulted in considerable cost savings as compared to the cost estimate at appraisal. Out of these savings, an equivalent of US\$ 15.37 million was used for additional investments in civil works packages of component 2 and the equivalent of US\$ 17.86 million was used for additional investments under component 3."

**Administrative and Implementation Efficiency:** In terms of administrative efficiency, the ICR (page 18) notes that the complex and semi-decentralized implementation and financial management arrangements (total of 37 implementing agencies, of which 15 were at provincial levels) continued to cause delays in procurements, approvals, and payments.

□

Given the results of the sensitivity analysis for economic efficiency and the above mentioned administrative inefficiencies owing to the semi-decentralized implementation, the overall efficiency is rated modest.

## Efficiency Rating

Modest

a. If available, enter the Economic Rate of Return (ERR) and/or Financial Rate of Return (FRR) at appraisal and the re-estimated value at evaluation:



	Rate Available?	Point value (%)	*Coverage/Scope (%)
Appraisal	✓	17.00	0 <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
ICR Estimate	✓	13.20	0 <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable

\* Refers to percent of total project cost for which ERR/FRR was calculated.

## 6. Outcome

Combining the high overall project relevance, the substantial overall project efficacy, and modest project efficiency results in an overall outcome rating of moderately satisfactory.

### a. Outcome Rating

Moderately Satisfactory

## 7. Risk to Development Outcome

The project faces the following risks to achievement of development outcomes (ICR page 26):

- Institutional Support and Sustainability - continuous long term institutional support mechanisms are limited for the water users associations, and that poses a risk to effectively manage irrigation infrastructures. Safe management or disposal of fecal sludge is important otherwise it can become a health hazard.
- Financial Sustainability - although O&M arrangements were made both for irrigation and water supply structures through user fees, they were reportedly still under moderate risk particularly the ones that required additional financial support from provinces.
- Ownership and Commitment - scaling up of soft activities may not go as planned; approval of plans may be delayed at the provincial levels and scaling up of pilot projects might be partial.
- Climate change and upstream development - increasing saline intrusion and intensification of rice cultivation pose additional risks.

## 8. Assessment of Bank Performance

### a. Quality-at-Entry

The ICR (para 100-101) notes that the bank team explored measures to contribute to climate change adaptation and to address the negative impacts of upstream regional developments in a timely project. Project risks were well assessed except for the delay in counterpart funding and insufficient budget allocation which was not included in the project's Operational Risk Assessment Framework (ORAF). Implementation arrangements could have been simplified and the team could have considered inviting new partners for the



non-structural component. Some parts of the project such as the adaptation to climate change, the sanitation component, and the results and the detailed M&E frameworks were not completely developed at appraisal. Also the results framework at appraisal had some shortcomings as mentioned above, with regards to indicators as well as climate change adaptation.

### **Quality-at-Entry Rating**

Moderately Satisfactory

#### **b. Quality of supervision**

Despite delays caused by the lack of counterpart funding, the Bank team performed well to ensure that the project disbursed 88.1% of the available project funds at completion, and managed to achieve or to exceed targets for components 2 and 3 (ICR para 102). The ICR (para 103) notes that additional focus on the implementation of the non-structural components of the project would have further strengthened the project outcomes. Also, despite a series of challenges – such as the results framework, the definition of indicators, and implementation arrangements, which hampered implementation and the measurement of progress towards the PDO, the team could have better used the two restructurings of the project to fully address these issues. Transitions in the team were minimal and the supervision was regular and adequate. However, the team’s focus remained mostly on the structural components of the project (ICR para 104).

### **Quality of Supervision Rating**

Moderately Satisfactory

### **Overall Bank Performance Rating**

Moderately Satisfactory

## **9. M&E Design, Implementation, & Utilization**

### **a. M&E Design**

Shortcomings during project preparation:

- The PAD did not clearly define *climate change adaption* or describe the results chain towards the contribution to climate change adaption; hence, this contribution was only partially captured in the results framework.
- The boundaries between ‘*increasing*’ and ‘*maintaining agricultural production*’ (PDO-level indicators 1a and 1b) were not clearly defined in the results framework. Moreover, these indicators do not provide insight in the quantitative increase of the agricultural yields in the project area.
- Some of the intermediate income indicators in the results framework – such as ‘*number of provinces having water resources management plans considering the impacts on the upstream development*’ – left room for interpretation

### **b. M&E Implementation**



The detailed design and implementation of the M&E system was delayed and only started after the MTR. Though, the TOR for the M&E firm was approved late 2012, the procurement of the firm took considerable time and the M&E firm commenced its work – just after the MTR – in July 2014 (page 22).

### c. M&E Utilization

An integrated database, rather than the interlinked Excel and Word documents that were used, would have made the M&E system more user-friendly and accessible. The ICR notes (page 22) that discussions with project staff and observations during the completion mission, indicated that the M&E system was mainly used as a system to report progress against targets rather than an integrated management tool and a tool to support evidence-based learning.

### M&E Quality Rating

Modest

## 10. Other Issues

### a. Safeguards

**Environment safeguards:** The project triggered four environmental safeguard policies: environmental assessment (OP/BP 4.01); natural habitats (OP/BP 4.04); pest management (OP 4.09); and, physical cultural resources (OP/BP 4.11). One legal safeguard policy was triggered by the project: projects on international waterways (OP/BP 7.50): The project was fully compliant with all these five operational policies.

**Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01):** A project ESMF was prepared acceptable to the Bank during project preparation. During implementation, all sub-projects were prepared with ESMP which were reviewed and cleared by the Bank. In line with the Bank-approved ESMP, the monitoring of the ESMPs was carried out by PPMUs in coordination with CPMU, local authorities, and communities. Monitoring reports were periodically submitted to the Bank for information.

**Natural Habitats (OP/BP 4.04):** Environmental screening was done for all proposed subprojects. This confirmed that there were no critical natural habitats within the project's area of influence. During project implementation, measures to mitigate site-specific ecological impacts associated with proposed sub-projects have been adequately incorporated into subproject's ESMPs which were reviewed and cleared by the Bank.

**Pest Management (OP 4.09):** A pest management framework (PMF) was prepared acceptable to the Bank during project preparation. To mitigate the negative impacts associated with the increased use of agricultural chemicals, an IPM program was prepared and implemented as a part of the ESMP in all the seven provinces. The IPM was implemented in close cooperation with the PPD in Hanoi and the local authorities of all project provinces.

**Physical Cultural Resources (OP/BP 4.11):** Measures to mitigate negative impacts on Physical Cultural Resources (PCRs), such as relocating normal graves or chance finds of graves, were adequately incorporated into subproject ESMPs which were reviewed and cleared by the Bank. No significant PCRs



were affected by the project activities.

Projects on International Waterways (OP/BP 7.50): Notification to the riparian countries, including China, Myanmar, Lao PDR, Cambodia and Thailand was done by the Bank on behalf of the Government of Vietnam on February 15, 2011. None of the notified countries responded to the notification.

**Social Safeguards:** The project triggered two social safeguard policies: indigenous peoples policy (OP) (BP4.10); and, involuntary resettlement policy (OP/BP 4.12).

Indigenous peoples policy (OP) (BP4.10): Safeguard documents, ethnic minority development framework (EMDF) and ethnic minority development plans (EMDPs) were timely prepared for the ethnic minorities (EM) in two provinces by borrower and were found acceptable by the Bank. During implementation, consultation with EM was carried out in compliance with the EMDF. Some of the EMDP activities were integrated in the IPM-program and in the water supply and sanitation component. Supervision and monitoring activities were maintained throughout project implementation by the Bank team. Issues related to ethnic minority development were consolidated and reviewed in semi-annual reports on social safeguard implementation prepared by CPMU.

Involuntary resettlement policy (OP/BP 4.12): Safeguard documents including RPF and RAPs were prepared and found acceptable by the Bank. During implementation, efforts were made by the project provinces to minimize adverse social impacts and resettlement requirements

## b. Fiduciary Compliance

**Financial Management:** The project financial management arrangements were decentralized by design though rather complicated in practice. The financial management function of the project, which was managed by the CPMU performed moderately satisfactorily throughout project implementation and in compliance with the Bank's financial management policies and procedures. Financial audits by an independent firm were conducted annually and audit reports were submitted to the Bank in accordance with the Financial Arrangement (ICR page 24), and no major audit issues were reported.

□

**Procurement:** The overall procurement performance of the project was assessed to be moderately satisfactory. The procurement actions agreed with the client based on the findings of the procurement capacity assessment (PCA) have been largely implemented. The 18-month procurement plan had been prepared at appraisal and the detailed annual procurement plans have been prepared for each procurement package in the subsequent years. The procurement performance was found to be consistent with the Bank's procurement guidelines and the legal agreements (ICR page 24).

## c. Unintended impacts (Positive or Negative)

Improved rural transportation, scaling up of soil banks and integrated pest management are cited as other impacts (page 17).



**d. Other**

---

**11. Ratings**

Ratings	ICR	IEG	Reason for Disagreements/Comment
Outcome	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	---
Bank Performance	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	---
Quality of M&E	Modest	Modest	---
Quality of ICR		Substantial	---

**12. Lessons**

The standout lesson identified in the ICR for this project (page 28) is as follows (with some reformulation of language):

While water resource management in delta regions requires an integrated approach to address all water related issues, including agriculture, irrigation, sanitation, and climate change adaptation, project success can be attained through a strong results framework, and implementation arrangements with sufficient capacity building. The project had a lofty vision, which tried to integrate ‘water for agriculture’ and ‘water for people’, and introduced ‘climate change adaptation’ as a cross-cutting element. This was associated with additional technical complexity, sensitivities to changing environment, and the need for multi-sectoral solutions. In such a scenario, a stronger results framework, close monitoring and supervision, as well as sound implementation arrangements with sufficient capacity building support are key to project success.

**13. Assessment Recommended?**

No

**14. Comments on Quality of ICR**

The ICR is comprehensive and covers all areas of the updated ICR. It provides useful information about the context and the implementation challenges. It is well drafted and consistent. One weakness is that quality and amount of evidence presented for achievement of objectives in general is weak (except the second objective). Clarifications received subsequently from the Task Team Leader and ICR author were useful for completing this review.



**a. Quality of ICR Rating**  
Substantial