



<b>1. Project Data:</b>		<b>Date Posted :</b> 06/20/2003	
<b>PROJ ID:</b> P057345		<b>Appraisal</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>Project Name:</b> Borgou Pilot Rsp	<b>Project Costs (US\$M)</b>	5	4.75
<b>Country:</b> Benin	<b>Loan/Credit (US\$M)</b>	4	3.79
<b>Sector(s):</b> Board: RDV - Other social services (25%), Water supply (24%), Roads and highways (24%), Agricultural extension and research (15%), Central government administration (12%)	<b>Cofinancing (US\$M)</b>	NA	NA
<b>L/C Number:</b> C3098			
	<b>Board Approval (FY)</b>		98
<b>Partners involved :</b> None	<b>Closing Date</b>	12/30/2001	06/30/2002
<b>Prepared by :</b>	<b>Reviewed by :</b>	<b>Group Manager :</b>	<b>Group:</b>
Nalini B. Kumar	Ridley Nelson	Alain A. Barbu	OEDST

**2. Project Objectives and Components**

**a. Objectives**

The project was a LIL whose primary objective was to improve the capacity of rural women and village communities to better manage their socio-economic environment. In particular the project was to:

- strengthen the capacity of village communities to design, prepare and implement village development plans by using a participatory approach and simple procedures for the diagnosis of priorities and implementation of solutions;
- meet the immediate needs of 50 percent of the rural communities of the region for increased access to services and basic productive and social infrastructure;
- test new resource mobilization and implementation arrangements as a prelude to the pending decentralization law under consideration by the Government.

**b. Components**

As designed the project had three main components:

**a capacity building in rural villages component** to be supported through adult and functional literacy, technical training and consolidation of the village based participatory diagnosis approach;

**a community-based local development component** to be supported through the financing of priority village infrastructure, promotion of natural resource management technologies, extension and adaptive research; and

**a participatory management, technical support and monitoring component** to be supported through financing of training in basic planning and management processes for village groups, provision of decentralized technical support to them, establishment of simple procurement and financing mechanisms to be managed by the beneficiary groups, and establishment of simple monitoring (self assessment) by the beneficiaries.

The project components were not revised during implementation.

**c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates**

At appraisal total project costs were US \$ 5 million of which the IDA contribution was to be US \$ 4 million. Government contribution was to be US \$0.78 million and beneficiaries were to contribute US \$0.22 million. 94.68 percent of the credit was disbursed. Actual IDA amount disbursed was US \$ 3.79 million. The project was appraised in April 1998, approved in June of the same year and became effective in March 1999, 6 months later than planned because of the delay in ratification of the credit by the National Assembly. The mid term review was held in January 2001 and the project closed in June 2002, six months behind schedule largely to compensate for the 6 month delay in credit effectiveness.

**3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:**

The project largely achieved its quantitative objectives. As in the case of most community driven development projects supported by the Bank, no ERR was calculated at either the appraisal or the completion stage. The ICR however reports that a socio-economic

Impact study estimated an ERR of 57 percent for the whole project. However few details on how the calculations were made are reported in the ICR. Annex 3 (ICR) shows that the economic costs and benefits were not calculated for social investments like literacy centers and health units and for capacity building activities like training sessions (other than mid-wife), which were a significant part of the project. Hence the evaluation summary (ES) has concerns about the applicability of the estimate to the whole project. The recent OED assessment also raised concerns about the quality of the analysis.

#### 4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts:

There were several significant outcomes:

- 296 village level infrastructure were completed and made functional;
- Literacy training was provided to more than 5000 individuals and a significant amount of technical training was also imparted;
- Decentralized procurement procedures led to emergence of new capacities and skills in the communities;
- A partnership between communities, the private sector and local government was developed;
- The project was able to test a number of decentralized procedures and rules as the basis for future rural development in the country.

#### 5. Significant Shortcomings (including non-compliance with safeguard policies):

Three significant shortcomings:

- The performance indicators largely track progress on quantitative targets. It is difficult to tell how far the actual capacity of the communities to manage their socio-economic environment improved because of the project. Given the importance that the LIL places on increasing community capacity it is imperative that project performance indicators are able to track changes in this capacity.
- The project had a limited impact on improving the participation of women in managing their socioeconomic environment.
- Success in adopting new agricultural production technologies was limited as the available technological packages were not well adapted to field realities.

6. Ratings:	ICR	OED Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
<b>Outcome:</b>	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	OED rates a project as satisfactory when it achieves or is expected to achieve most of its major objectives efficiently with only minor shortcomings. The shortcomings listed under 5 are consistent with this rating.
<b>Institutional Dev .:</b>	High	Substantial	Lack of baseline and adequate monitoring indicators makes it difficult to assess how much of the achievement in literacy levels and capacity for collective decision making in the communities was because of the project. Further, the OED assessment also noted some crucial institutional issues that received less attention than warranted.
<b>Sustainability :</b>	Likely	Likely	
<b>Bank Performance :</b>	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	While supervision was highly satisfactory the Bank's performance was wanting on two fronts: First for not following through effectively on the LIL. Despite the initial commitment from the Bank and the government's request for extension of the Borgou Pilot there was a considerable period of uncertainty as to whether future support would be available which dampened the momentum generated for community driven approaches in the country. Second, the confusion at the community level because of the lack of coordination between different Bank projects that supported similar activities. Timely attention to both these factors would have led to a stronger and more positive project impact.
<b>Borrower Perf .:</b>	Highly Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory	
<b>Quality of ICR :</b>		Satisfactory	

**NOTE:** ICR rating values flagged with '\*' don't comply with OP/BP 13.55, but are listed for completeness.

#### 7. Lessons of Broad Applicability:

Some important lessons are identified by the ICR. One is repeated here. (i) Decentralized procurement procedures can lead to emergence of new capacities and skills in communities, can reduce the completion time for micro-projects and can generate a feeling of ownership among project beneficiaries;

The Evaluation Summary adds the following lessons: (i) In a PTI intervention like the Borgou pilot development objectives should be framed at least partly in terms of poverty alleviation. This should be done in a way that is monitorable and should be backed up in design by a monitoring and evaluation system capable of measuring poverty impact. (ii) In a project whose primary objective is to build the capacity of the rural communities to better manage their socio-economic environment performance indicators need to be

set up in a way that they are able to track qualitative progress on achievement of this objective.

**8. Assessment Recommended?**  Yes  No

**Why?** Already done for four reasons:

- (i) to provide an independent perspective on lessons for a larger follow on phase and for wider replication of the model;
- (ii) to provide lessons of broad applicability for programs on community driven development supported by the Bank;
- (iii) to verify the outcome, sustainability and institutional development impact of the community empowerment effort begun under the project;
- (iv) to serve as a building block for OED's study on Community Driven Development.

**9. Comments on Quality of ICR:**

The ICR is satisfactory and gives a good account of the project.