



1. Project Data:		Date Posted : 02/14/2003	
PROJ ID: P057271		Appraisal	Actual
Project Name: Guyana "el Nino"	Project Costs (US\$M)	10.2	10.26
Country: Guyana	Loan/Credit (US\$M)	9	8.875
Sector(s): Board: WS - Water supply (52%), Irrigation and drainage (40%), Flood protection (6%), Central government administration (2%)	Cofinancing (US\$M)	0	0
L/C Number: C3139			
	Board Approval (FY)		99
Partners involved :	Closing Date	11/30/2001	03/29/2002
Prepared by :	Reviewed by :	Group Manager :	Group:
Kavita Mathur	Ridley Nelson	Alain A. Barbu	OEDST
2. Project Objectives and Components			
a. Objectives			
The objectives of the project were to help:			
(a) restore the country's agricultural capacity in drought-stricken areas through vulnerability reduction measures in the areas of hydrologic extremes;			
(b) provide safe and reliable potable water service to marginal urban and remote hinterland and riverine communities which have been affected by drought; and			
(c) restore flood protection in low-lying areas of the City of Georgetown.			
b. Components			
The project consisted of four components:			
1. Agricultural Production Capacity Recovery and Regeneration Program: support strengthening the drainage and irrigation system, and upgrading facilities in selected stations nationwide of the hydrometeorological network.			
2. Potable Water Service Recovery and Restoration Program: finance the restoring of the complementary distribution and transmission facilities, and other drought mitigation measures, such as draining of wells and installation of water pumps.			
3. Georgetown Flood Protection Program: support the rehabilitation of two main sluices and the installation of two supplementary pumps.			
4. Project coordination component: finance the establishment of a project coordination unit. It will provide professional staff including a project coordinator, an accountant and an environmental specialist as well as support staff and equipment to help the unit function efficiently.			
Revised Components: The overall project components were not revised. However, the scope and numbers of individual project items within the project components was revised due to design changes, time constraints, availability of other funding resources and the limited absorptive capacity of Guyana Water Authority (GUYWA).			
c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates			
At appraisal, total project cost was estimated at US\$10.2 million. The final cost was US\$10.25 million. At appraisal the credit was US\$9 million. At project closing US\$0.13 million was undisbursed. The project closed on March 29, 2002, four months after the original closing date.			
3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:			
1. The objective of helping in restoration of the country's agricultural capacity in drought stricken areas through vulnerability reduction measures in the areas of hydrologic extremes was achieved. The project supported the			

clearing of thirteen drainage canals and outfalls of silt. Also, 13 sluices and 71 water-control structures were rehabilitated/constructed throughout key coastal and interior areas. The project financed the acquisition of 12 mobile pumps and seven gravel pumps. The project investment in equipment and structures has considerably improved the drainage and irrigation in the project areas. About 275,000 acres of paddyland and other agricultural areas are estimated to have benefited from improved irrigation. The mobile pumps financed under the project were extremely useful in mitigating the effects of floods in 1999/2000 and 2002.

2. The objective of providing safe and reliable potable water service to marginal urban and remote hinterland and riverine communities which have been affected by the drought was achieved.
 - Potable water has been provided to marginal urban communities in North Ruimveldt and Georgetown Water and Sewerage Commissioners (GS&WC) has replaced leaky lines in Festival City, South Ruimveldt and Agricola. About, 15,500 residents or about 2,580 households are now receiving reliable water supply.
 - The project has also improved access to potable water service for remote hinterland and riverine communities by providing 33 hand-dug wells, 79 hand pumps and 50 four- and six-inch wells. Approximately 6,290 families (37,700 persons) living on the coast as well as in very remote interior and riverine areas, including three communities at Mathew's Ridge, Ituni and Mahdia, are benefiting from these facilities.
3. The objective of restoration of Flood Protection in low-lying areas of Georgetown was achieved. With the acquisition of five mobile pumps for the city, an estimated 100,000 residents will be protected .

4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts:

1. The project was successful in mitigating the effects of the 1997 El Nino which was manifested in the form of drought.
2. The project was instrumental in triggering the shift in the procurement system. The Government is considering reforming its procurement processes with the assistance of IDA. A new procurement law was passed by the Parliament in May 2002.
3. The data collection and dissemination of hydrometeorological data has been significantly improved. With the establishment of automatic weather stations, real time data is available.
4. The project assisted in developing a simplified cost-effective computerized project financial management system. This system has served as the model for the development of computerized systems in several projects in Guyana.
5. The project resulted in the mainstreaming of environmental aspects in project design and construction activities.
6. The remote Amerindian communities have significantly benefited from the project facilities.

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

- The project implementation suffered due to delays in approvals of the contracts and slow decision making processes of the government.
- Given the relatively high failure rate of wells financed under the project, the government failed to respond to the project teams proposal to undertake a hydrological mapping of the affected areas and to use more precise scientific instruments to identify likely water sources.

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:

- In designing emergency assistance projects, adequate attention should be given to the absorptive capacity of the country. Weak administrative capacity, lack of skilled staff, and limited pool of qualified contractors and consultants can cause serious implementation delays.
- Emergency projects should follow-up with appropriate maintenance policies and operational and institutional support.

8. Assessment Recommended? Yes No

9. Comments on Quality of ICR:

The quality of ICR is satisfactory. It covers all the relevant and important issues relating to the implementation experience and the outcome of the project.