



1. Project Data:		Date Posted : 11/12/2001	
PROJ ID : P009961		Appraisal	Actual
Project Name : Up Sodic Lands Recla	Project Costs (US\$M)	80.2	103.7
Country : India	Loan/Credit (US\$M)	54.70	54.67
Sector(s) : Board: RDV - Crops (70%), Irrigation and drainage (11%), Agricultural extension and research (10%), Sub-national government administration (9%)	Cofinancing (US\$M)	NA	NA
L/C Number : C2510			
	Board Approval (FY)		93
Partners involved : None	Closing Date	03/31/2001	03/31/2001
Prepared by :	Reviewed by :	Group Manager :	Group:
Nalini B. Kumar	Madhur Gautam	Alain A. Barbu	OEDST
2. Project Objectives and Components			
a. Objectives			
<p>The project was a part of a long term program to improve agricultural productivity in areas with high concentration of sodic lands and was to be implemented over a 7 year period in 10 districts of the state of Uttar Pradesh . It had three objectives: (i) to develop models for environmental protection and improved agricultural production through large scale reclamation of sodic lands; (ii) to strengthen local institutions to manage such schemes; and (iii) to contribute to poverty alleviation of the families concerned .</p> <p>Though project design allowed for flexibility to introduce changes based on implementation experience and increasing farmer participation, project objectives remained unchanged throughout the project period . However, at Mid Term Review (MTR), following initial good progress, the targets for project coverage were increased by more than 50 percent---from 45,000 to 68,800 ha for land reclamation, drainage and cultivation .</p>			
b. Components			
<p>The project had four main components: Land reclamation, institutional development, agriculture development and technology dissemination, and reclamation technology development and special studies .</p>			
c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates			
<p>The project was approved in June 1993 and became effective in August of the same year . The MTR took place in April 1997 and the project was closed in March 2001, on schedule. Total costs at appraisal were US \$ 80.2 million of which the IDA share was to be US \$ 54.70 million. Actual total costs at US \$ 103.7 million were 30 percent higher than appraisal estimates. This was because the area of land reclaimed was 52 percent higher and the number of beneficiaries were nearly double the SAR prediction . The beneficiary contribution to project financing, though principally in kind, increased from 15 percent estimated at appraisal to 36 percent.</p>			
3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:			
<p>The project achieved its three objectives . The re-estimated economic rate of return was 28 percent against the appraisal estimate of 23 percent.</p>			
4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts:			
<p>An area of 68,414 ha of sodic lands (152 percent of the SAR target) was reclaimed and about 36,000 ha of barren land was brought under green cover for the first time . There was a significant increase in cropping intensity because of successful land reclamation . In addition the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • helped develop procedures for carrying out large scale reclamation of sodic lands; • had a significant impact on raising living standards (including health and education) in the project area; • helped develop and strengthen grass root social capital including women and men self help groups through investment in participatory processes and community mobilization efforts; • helped strengthen the Uttar Pradesh Bhumi Sudar Nigam (UPBSN) which has developed professional capability 			

in areas like land reclamation, participatory management technology dissemination and women empowerment; The Remote Sensing Application Center (RSAC) has been strengthened in terms of capacity for identification and selection of suitable land reclamation sites; Capacity of NGOs to work in development programs has also been strengthened;

- provided an opportunity for allotment of 9479 ha community land to 22,258 landless farmers. 40536 old allottees were provided possession of 15887 hectares of land that had been allotted to them in the past;

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

The performance of the reclamation technology and special studies component was below appraisal estimates .

6. Ratings :	ICR	OED Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
Outcome :	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Institutional Dev .:	Substantial	Substantial	
Sustainability :	Likely	Likely	
Bank Performance :	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Borrower Perf .:	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Quality of ICR :		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:

Several important lessons are identified by the ICR . Two are repeated here: (i) Project success is founded on a preparatory process that directly involves line departments and intended beneficiaries, allows ample time for preparatory studies, assimilates experience from similar operations, carries out pilot operations and allows for flexible implementation. (ii) Establishing a logical sequence of development activities is a key ingredient to success; in this case, the establishing of property rights and land titling provided the basis for assuring beneficiaries' involvement . Then, creating organizations of poor people followed by mechanisms for resolving technical problems and provisions of associated resources .

The ES adds the following lesson: reclaiming sodic lands with sound land and water management policies through beneficiary participation is a challenging task that requires the cooperative effort of all the stakeholders --the communities, research organizations, NGOs, various government departments /agencies and grass root village organizations. The building of this kind of participation requires time, resources and explicit attention to incentives for the stakeholders--costs that need to be explicitly recognized and built into a project . Setting up grass root organizations is just the first step . More time and resources are needed to strengthen and consolidate gains so that their sustainability over the long run is assured .

8. Assessment Recommended? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Why? For three reasons: (i) To verify outcome, sustainability and the institutional development impact of the project; (ii) to develop lessons on how all relevant stakeholders can be brought together to work towards a common cause--in this case reclamation of sodic lands; (iii) to provide an independent perspective on lessons for a follow on phase and for wider replication of the model . (Though the Uttar Pradesh Sodic Lands Reclamation Project II-Credit 3152 is already under implementation);

9. Comments on Quality of ICR:

The ICR is satisfactory.