## 1. Project Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Practice Area(Lead)</th>
<th>Additional Financing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P083609</td>
<td>SN-Agr Markets &amp; Agribus Dev (FY06)</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>P116301,P129164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L/C/TF Number(s)</th>
<th>Closing Date (Original)</th>
<th>Total Project Cost (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDA-41510,IDA-47200,TF-58319</td>
<td>31-Dec-2011</td>
<td>70,100,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bank Approval Date</th>
<th>Closing Date (Actual)</th>
<th>IBRD/IDA (USD)</th>
<th>Grants (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28-Feb-2006</td>
<td>31-Dec-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Commitment</th>
<th>Revised Commitment</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45,000,000.00</td>
<td>45,000,000.00</td>
<td>43,479,497.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IBRD/IDA (USD)</th>
<th>Grants (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14,100,000.00</td>
<td>15,296,121.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sector(s)
- Agro-industry, marketing, and trade(47%): Irrigation and drainage(35%): Central government administration(11%): Crops(4%): Animal production(3%)

### Theme(s)
- Rural markets(33%): Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise support(33%): Export development and competitiveness(17%): Rural policies and institutions(17%)

**Prepared by:** Hassan Wally  
**Reviewed by:** George T. K. Pitman  
**ICR Review Coordinator:** Christopher David Nelson  
**Group:** IEGSD (Unit 4)
2. Project Objectives and Components

a. Objectives

The project was the first phase of a ten-year Adaptable Program Lending known as the Agricultural Markets and Agribusiness Development Program (also known as the AgMARKET program) consisted of two five-year phases (2006-2016).

The long-term objectives of the Program by 2015 as articulated in the Project Appraisal Document (PAD, p.5) were to:

"(i) increase horticultural and non-traditional agricultural exports from their current level of 13,000 tons to 50,000 tons; and (ii) double farm revenues of producers supported by the program."

The statement of objectives as articulated in the (PAD, p. 5) was to:

"increase non-traditional agricultural exports and farm revenues for project-supported producers."

The statement of objectives as articulated in the 2006 Financing Agreement (FA, p. 6) was to:

"increase non-traditional agricultural exports and farm revenues of agricultural producers."

In May 2010, the project was formally revised through a Level 1 restructuring process.

The statement of revised objectives as articulated in the 2010 Financing Agreement (FA, p. 5) was to:

"improve competitiveness of selected domestic supply chains, increase non-traditional agricultural exports and increase rice production in Project areas."

This review assesses the project on a split rating basis against the original objectives and revised objectives as stated in their corresponding Financial Agreements.

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

Yes

Did the Board approve the revised objectives/key associated outcome targets?
c. Components

The original project included four components:

1. **Improving Domestic Marketing Conditions** (Appraisal Cost: US$10.10 million, Actual Cost: US$7.25 million). This component aimed to improve food safety and the performance of the domestic distribution channels for crop and livestock products. It included four sub-components:

   1. **Domestic Supply Chains Consolidation.** This would support three activities: (a) test innovative partnership business models adapted to small producers and SMEs in key promising supply chains for the domestic and regional markets; (b) assist eligible small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) interested in applying these innovations to implement well-defined Business Development Projects (subprojects); and (c) conduct related diagnostic assessments and studies.
   2. **Rural Market Infrastructure.** The activities under this sub-component would include: (a) design and building of innovative rural collective platforms for handling the following key products: onions, tubers, bananas and confectionary groundnuts; and (b) initial assistance in operating these logistic facilities, to fine-tune a quality management system. Later (within one year following completion of works), the project will undertake to transfer their management to the private sector.
   3. **Knowledge Management.** This sub-component would support: (a) developing and implementing an overall marketing and communication strategy for domestic supply chains; (b) putting in place a rural market information system to generate and disseminate domestic market knowledge and information; and (c) promote knowledge sharing by disseminating results of the tests conducted by the project and achievements of, and lessons learned from, the funded subprojects.
   4. **Development of Animal Products Markets.** This sub-component would focus on modernizing the domestic supply chains for animal products. It would be structured along three broad themes: (a) improvement of food safety in the marketing of animal products; (b) modernization of the marketing channels for red meat; and (c) modernization of the marketing channels for poultry and eggs.

2. **Development of Agricultural Exports** (Appraisal Cost: US$21.35 million, Actual Cost: US$4.45 million). This component would aim to expand non-traditional agricultural exports (i.e., horticultural products, confectionary nuts, essential oils and aromatic plants, and processed foodstuffs) by leveraging the results achieved under the pilot Agricultural Export Promotion Project. The project would develop a close public-private partnership with the target beneficiaries: producers, exporters, trade associations and the Senegal Origin Foundation. It consists of three sub-components:

   1. **Innovation and Quality Management.** Would undertake the following activities: (a) diversify products and production zones, following the mechanisms developed under Agricultural Export Promotion Project; (b) develop centers of innovation and training, using existing training institutions in key regions; (c) establish SeneGAP—a set of guidelines benchmarked with the quality standard for fresh agricultural produce required by EU’s importers, the Euro-Retailer Produce Working Group for Good Agricultural Practice (EurepGAP), to implement modalities of compliance with EurepGAP for small-scale farmers; and (d) assist Senegal’s effort to obtain EU accreditation for its fruits and vegetables destined for exportation.
   2. **Agricultural Export Infrastructure.** Would support: (a) developing collective, post-harvest infrastructure and services (e.g., warehousing/packaging/cold storage facilities at farm gate level) in production zones; (b) building, in partnership with the Port Authority of Dakar and a private investor a container handling/freight facility area at the port of Dakar; and (c) restructuring, for enhanced functionality, the existing Saint-Louis Agropole (a multipurpose storage, refrigeration and processing facility in Pal, a town in the region of Saint-Louis).
   3. **Building Agricultural Export Institutions.** Activities supported would include: (a) contributing to further the development of the Senegal Origin Foundation, (b) strengthening the capacities of producers/exporters’ organizations; and (c) consolidating the market information system through an integrated and dynamic database, market intelligence on export markets.

3. **Development of Private Irrigation** (Appraisal Cost: US$23.00 million, Actual Cost: US$32.58 million). This component aimed to promote demand-driven, pro-poor investments in irrigation to support the expansion of agribusiness across Senegal. It included four sub-components:
1 Construction of Public Irrigation Infrastructures in the Senegal River Delta. Would support building the following critical public infrastructures: (a) recalibration and rehabilitation of works on the Lampirsar River; and (b) creation of secondary canals that would connect to tertiary canals of private investors (including smallholders).

2 Promotion of Irrigation for Crop Diversification in the Senegal River Delta. This would help smallholders, small and medium-sized enterprises (SME) and agribusiness enterprises establish innovative irrigation schemes adapted to their business plans, and support technical advisory services to ensure the viability of the schemes. The project would also complement investors’ capital with matching grants set at different levels for family-farms, SMEs, and agribusiness enterprises.

3 Promotion of Micro-Irrigation for Crop Diversification in the Niayes zone, the Groundnut Basin and Senegal Oriental. Activities supported would include: (a) demonstrations of irrigated activities adapted to each region; (b) helping smallholders in these regions establish innovative irrigation schemes adapted to their business plans; and (c) support technical advisory services to ensure the viability of the schemes.

4 Knowledge Management and Strategic Studies. These would assist the country to assess opportunities and constraints, and define a strategy for rapid irrigation development as part of the preparation of the second phase of the program. Specifically, the project would undertake the following activities: (a) design the master management plan for the Lac de Guiers; (b) assess the irrigation and diversification potential of the mid and upper valley of the Senegal River; (c) design the national development plan for irrigation; and (d) strengthen the capacity of Senegal River and Faleme Delta Management Holding Company in M&E.


1 Project Management and Coordination (PCU). The PCU would coordinate and consolidate the annual work plans and budgets and oversee the financial management and procurement of all the other implementing agencies. The project would finance: (i) PCU staff, equipment and operating costs; (ii) technical assistance provided by the Market Integrator Firm, and local consultants on specific issues (technical, legal etc.), and audits; and (iii) capacity building for project staff through training and study tours.

2 Monitoring and Evaluation. The activities would include the coordination of M&E related activities for component 1, 2 and3 that would be performed by the implementing agencies, and specific tasks that cut across the project components.

On May 10, 2010 the project was restructured and received approval for its first Additional Financing (AF1) worth US$10.00 million through the Food Price Crisis Response Multi-Donor Trust Fund. As a result two additional components were added to the original project:

5. Rehabilitation of Irrigation Schemes in the Senegal River Valley (Estimated Cost: US$8.00 million, Actual Cost: not reported). This would support rehabilitation of 7,000 ha of village and private irrigation schemes for rice production.

6. Promotion of Intensive Rice Production in the Bignona Valley (Estimated Cost: US$2.10 million, Actual Cost: not reported). This component aimed to enhance rice production in the Bignona Valley through the exploitation of desalinated lands protected by the Affiniam Dam.

7. Promotion of Intensive Rice Production in the Senegal River Valley and the Anambé Basin (Estimated Cost: US$25.10 million, Actual Cost: not reported). This component aimed to support rehabilitation of small-scale irrigation perimeters and improvement of domestic rice marketing conditions in project areas. It included: (i) rehabilitation of 7,400 hectares of small-scale irrigation schemes in the Senegal River Valley and provision of 135 water pumps; (ii) rehabilitation of 3,180 hectares of small-scale irrigation perimeters in the Anambe Basin and 200 hectares of lowlands for rice production in the Department of Velingara with the provision of agricultural equipment and materials and development of an operations and maintenance (O&M) strategy for hydro-agricultural infrastructures in the Anambé Basin; and (iii) improvement of domestic rice marketing conditions for locally produced rice.

8. Improvement of Livestock Production in the Casamance (Estimated Cost: US$2.1 million, Actual Cost: not reported). This component aimed to provide support to the national livestock production capacity and to help increase competitiveness of the domestic livestock sector (small ruminants and swine) in the Ziguinchor and Sedhiou regions of the Casamance. It provided funding to: (i) restock the livestock population through provision of matching grants; (ii) expand existing animal health and disease control programs, such as animal vaccination and systematic deworming, through technical assistance; and (iii) provide essential infrastructure, including enhanced farm animal housing.
Independent Evaluation Group (IEG)
SN-Agr Markets & Agribus Dev (FY06)(P083609)

Implementation Completion Report (ICR) Review

d. Comments on Project Cost, Financing, Borrower Contribution, and Dates

Project Cost. The project's total cost was estimated to be US$60.1 million. Actual project cost reported by the ICR (Annex 1) was US$82.83 million. The increase was due to two Additional Financing amounts that totaled US$30.00 million.

Financing. The project was originally financed through an IDA Credit worth US$35.0 million. The project also received Additional Financing twice, the first was on May 10, 2010 where the project received US$10.00 million IDA Credit, and the second was on April 9, 2013 where the project received a Grant of US$20.00 million through the Food Price Crisis Response Multi-Donor Trust Fund. The actual total amount disbursed according to the ICR (Annex 1) was US$58.73 million including IDA and Grant funds. The project portal showed that of the original IDA credit US$31.23 million was disbursed and US$3.10 million was cancelled. While for the IDA additional financing US$7.78 million was disbursed and US$1.39 was cancelled. The second additional financing disbursed US$15.29 million and US$2.87 million was cancelled. According to the numbers reported on the project portal the total disbursed amount was US$54.3 million. The project also was expected to receive US$18.17 million as co-financing from the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) the actual disbursed amount was US$15.30 million.

Borrower Contribution. The Borrower was estimated to contribute US$13.1 million of counterpart funding, and beneficiaries' were expected to contribute (including private sector for specific public-private partnership initiatives) US$12.0 million (PAD, p. 4). According to the ICR (Annex 1) actual amounts were US$6.48 million and US$2.56 million for the Borrower and beneficiaries, respectively.

Dates. The project was scheduled to close on December 31, 2011, however, it closed three years later on December 31, 2014. This delays was to accommodate new activities that were added to the project with the two rounds of additional financing. The project was restructured six times as follows:
1. On May 10, 2010, a Level 1 restructuring with a change in PDO and project development indicators and the approval of the first Additional Financing (AF1). Also, new components were added with the approved additional financing. The amount disbursed was US$18.33 million.
2. On August 31, 2010, a Level 2 restructuring in order to reallocate funds to support the completion of key project activities. The amount disbursed was US$19.62 million.
3. On December 26, 2012, a Level 2 restructuring to extend the closing date. The amount disbursed was US$36.52 million.
4. On April 9, 2013, a Level 2 restructuring in order to approve the second Additional Financing (AF2) and include the new AF components. The amount disbursed was US$37.72 million.
5. On December 10, 2014, a Level 2 restructuring to extend the closing date of the second additional financing from December 31, 2014 to June 30, 2015, to allow for completion of AF2 activities. The amount disbursed was US$41.23 million.
6. On December 11, 2014, a Level 2 restructuring to reallocate funds to cover higher than expected operating costs and large demand for sub-project financing. The amount disbursed was US$41.23 million.

The Mid-term Review was originally planned for March 15, 2008, however, it was carried out on November 2, 2009 (about one year and eight months late).

3. Relevance of Objectives & Design

a. Relevance of Objectives

Original Objectives
High.

In Senegal agriculture has experienced stagnant production, declining productivity, and continued dominance by small farmers whose production continues to be largely rain fed and complemented by animal husbandry. Several constraints continue to limit the country’s potential for accelerated agricultural growth including: food safety and quality issues, access to investment and working capital, poorly functioning market infrastructures, inefficient distribution channels, and weak irrigation infrastructures that account for less than 4% of the total arable land. The AgMARKETS program would focus on expanding Senegal’s private-led agricultural exports through upgrading irrigation and market infrastructures, building public and private sectors’ capacities for competitiveness, and making irrigated agriculture more productive. At project appraisal objectives were highly relevant to the Government priorities and strategy for the economic and agriculture sector priorities. Objectives were in line with Senegal's Accelerated Growth Strategy (AGS), which includes agribusiness as a major pillar, among others. The AGS viewed the AgMARKETS program as a main implementing tool in agriculture and agribusiness development for shared growth. Objectives were also in line with the World Bank's Africa Action Plan (AAP, 2005) which called for strengthening the drivers of growth
through focusing on strengthening the private sector, expanding exports, increasing investment to close the infrastructure gap, scaling up regional integration, building skills for growth and competitiveness, and making agriculture more productive. Objectives were also in line with the World Bank's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP, 2002) for Senegal. The PRSP called among other things for promotion of agriculture and rural development; and increased market access in the industrial nations. The Bank's Country Assistance Strategy for Senegal (FY03-05 CAS) was based on the PRSP.

At project completion objectives continue to be highly relevant to the Government current development priorities. Objectives were in line with the most recent national strategy document the Programme d’Accélération de la Cadence de l’Agriculture Senégalaïse (PRACAS), which included two major objectives: (i) promotion of family farming through agricultural intensification, better marketing conditions, and better management of the quality of agricultural products; and (ii) emergence of agricultural and rural enterprises based on an intelligent synergy between agribusiness and family farms. Its specific objective is increased production of rice, onions, groundnuts, and fruits and vegetables. The objectives are also in line with the Bank’s FY13–FY17 Country Partnership Strategy, which supported increased agricultural productivity and marketing under Pillar 1, “Accelerating Growth and Employment & Creating Fiscal Space,” objectives also contribute to “Strengthening Governance Framework and Building Resilience” through support to sustainable land and water management.

Revised Objectives

High.

The development objectives were formally revised on May 10, 2010, upon approval of the first Additional Financing for Food Security. The revised objective was more focused compared to the original one and it clearly referred to increasing rice production in project areas and was highly relevant. Under the revised project, original project activities remained the same.

b. Relevance of Design

Design under original Objectives

Substantial.

The original design included a clear statement of objectives, however, the statement could have been more explicit with regards to the non-traditional agricultural products and the agricultural producers. The Results Framework did not provide clear connections between the inputs, outputs and intended outcome. Nevertheless, the PAD (Annex 4) included a detailed project description that provided clear links between inputs, outputs and intended outcomes. Design was ambitious and sought to introduce innovative approaches to the Senegalese agriculture including a value chain approach, public-private partnerships, introduction of new water-saving technologies; and matching grants that required beneficiaries to assume part of the investment costs based on their capacity to pay, however, design was complex. To achieve the stated objective, design featured four components.

- The first component would contribute towards achieving the objective through linking small producers to domestic and regional markets through establishing viable supply chains that rely on a sound marketing and communication strategy. Support also would extend to improving post-harvest handling of agricultural products as well as modernizing the domestic supply chains for animal products. Small producers would also benefit from project funded subprojects to introduce innovative production technologies. These activities were relevant and were expected to improve the quantity and quality of targeted products and facilitate marketing of these products. This in turn was expected to improve farm revenue.
- The second component would contribute to achieving the objectives through supporting developing public-private partnerships between producers, exporters, trade associations. The project would support good practice guidelines benchmarked with the quality standard for fresh agricultural produce required by EU’s importers, the Euro-Retailer Produce Working Group for Good Agricultural Practice (EurepGAP); and assist Senegal in its effort to obtain European Union (EU) accreditation for its fruits and vegetables destined for export. Support would also be provided to establish post-harvest infrastructure and services in production zones. In addition, the project would support establishing a marketing data base with a focus on export markets. These activities were relevant and were expected to improve the quality of targeted products and enable access to targeted European markets, and in turn increasing exports. However, activities showed some redundancy with component 1.
- The third component would contribute to achieving the objective through funding demand-driven pro-poor investments in irrigation to support the expansion of agribusiness. Activities supported would include public irrigation infrastructure, provide matching grants to
supported smallholders, SMEs, and agribusiness enterprises to support innovative irrigation schemes adapted to their business plans, and promote micro-irrigation in specific areas to help smallholder diversify from traditional crops. These activities were relevant and were expected to improve productivity in targeted areas through promoting water-efficient irrigation technologies which would enable better access to water—limited water access continues to be a constraining production factor. Efficient use of water was expected to result in higher productivity and lowering costs and therefore improving farm revenues.

- The fourth component focused on management and M&E activities. Institutional arrangements were relevant and the inclusion of a dedicated PCU for project implementation was a correct set-up for the project. Overall design included relevant activities that were aligned with the project objectives however, it was confusing with regards to the sub-projects funded by the project under different components.

**Design under Revised Objectives**

**Substantial.**

The revised design included a more focused statement of objectives that clearly mentioned rice as a target crop. Design was simple and prepared in the context of the rapid response needed to address the prevailing food security crisis in the country. To achieve the stated objective (improve competitiveness of selected domestic supply chains, increase non-traditional agricultural exports), the revised design relied on the original activities supported by the project. To achieve increasing rice production in project areas design introduced two new components. The first aimed to rehabilitate irrigation schemes in the Senegal river valley, this was expected to improve rice productivity in the targeted area. The second component would increase the rice cultivated area through the exploitation of desalinated lands. The original activities and the new components were relevant and aligned with the revised objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Revised Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Achievement of Objectives (Efficacy)

#### Objective 1

**Objective**

The original statement of objective was to: "increase non-traditional agricultural exports and farm revenues of agricultural producers."

As stated the objectives include two sub-objectives:

(a) to increase non-traditional agricultural exports

**Rationale**

**(a) to increase non-traditional agricultural exports.**

**Outputs**

- By project completion 247 sub-projects were funded through the matching grant mechanism and implemented compared to an original target of 45.
- By project completion 55% of families engaged in export have implemented "Origin Senegal" good agricultural practices guide based on Global GAP Protocols compared to a target of 33%.
- 4,062 ha have been developed or improved by small farmers and agribusinesses (SMEs) compared to an original target of 2,500 ha.
- 8,626 farming families are engaged in exports crops compared to an original target of 2,000.
- The project provided support to the renewal of the certification of Ceres Locustox (a reference chemical laboratory) for the monitoring of pesticide residues to ensure conformity of Senegalese horticulture with international market standards.
- The ICR (p. 52) reported that several drying, cold storage, and rural produce collection centers were built to handle horticultural products. However, no details were provided on the exact numbers built.
- 2,400 ha were equipped with drip irrigation technology and intensive horticultural production is now being practiced on these plots.

**Outcome**

To increase non-traditional agricultural exports, the project promoted matching grants to develop partnerships between agribusiness and
small-holders to encourage diversification to growing horticultural crops. The project also provided technologies for water-efficient irrigation combined with improved irrigation services. The project supported the adoption of good agricultural practices and strengthened the capacities of producers/exporters’ organizations. The project also facilitated better access to post-harvest infrastructure including: warehousing/packaging/cold storage facilities at farm gate level and container handling/freight facilities. In addition, the project's support for exports certification (through its capacity building of the National Directorate for Plant Protection) helped ensure that commodities shipped to Europe are not rejected at destination ports. These activities, combined with the development of a marketing strategy and information system, enabled access to international markets.

Although the original outcome indicator did not distinguish between exports due to project interventions and overall exports of the country, this differentiation was possible by project completion. National horticultural exports at project closing reached 85,000 tons of which 25,530 tons of horticultural exports (or 30%) were directly attributable to the project. The original target was 30,000 tons over a baseline of 13,000 tons in 2006.

Rating
Substantial

Revised Objective
To: “improve competitiveness of selected domestic supply chains, increase non-traditional agricultural exports and increase rice production in Project areas.”
The revised statement of objectives includes three sub-objectives:
(a) to improve competitiveness of selected domestic supply chains.

Revised Rationale
Outputs

- The outputs mentioned under the original sub-objective (a) contribute to this sub-objective as well.
- The project targeted nine domestic supply chains and a total of 247 sub-projects were funded through matching grant mechanism were implemented compared to a target of 45. Three categories of sub-projects were funded: (i) commercial partnership projects; (ii) irrigation subprojects; and (iii) livestock subprojects. More specifically these were: bananas (19), green beans (4), mangoes (11), onions (66), tomatoes (49), sweet potato, red meat (139), poultry (8), and processed foods (5).
- Completion of 55 km of rural access roads in the banana production area of Gouloumbou (Tambacounda region).
- Several drying, cold storage, and rural produce collection centers were built to handle horticultural products. However, no details were provided on the exact numbers of these (ICR, p. 52).
- By project completion local production of bananas covered 70% of domestic consumption (Target:75%, no baseline available), and local production of onions covered 70% of domestic consumption (Target 50%, no baseline available).
- The project also provided support to livestock production in the Casamance region including construction of 60 swine shelters and 131 sheep shelters; livestock deworming and vaccination campaign. However, the ICR (p. 55) provided limited details on these activities only stating that "the activities were carried out as planned; i.e., a vaccination campaign was carried out and subprojects for livestock production were financed." However, the Spanish Agency for International Cooperation and Development (ICR, Annex 7) reported several shortcomings with regards to the implementation of these activities including: overdesigned and expensive sub-projects, unclear outputs for vaccination campaigns as the number of vaccinated animals was unknown, concerns that beneficiaries were selected based on political criteria, and limited coordination between local actors and insufficient collaboration between the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Livestock.
- By project completion 5,553 tons of meat were produced and sold compared to a target of 3,500 tons. Meat production was increased through implementation of livestock sub-projects (ICR, p. 52). However, none of the five slaughtering infrastructures were constructed due to delayed contract clearance by the procurement agency. The ICR (para 80) stated that there was one project funded modern slaughterhouse constructed in Mbour which contributed to improved food safety of animal products and helped reduce unsupervised slaughter of animals.

Outcome
The absence of baseline data as well as other relevant indicators that assess value chain performance makes the assessment of improved competitiveness difficult. For example, one way of increasing competitiveness of a value chain is producing more efficiently, and this could be captured by measuring the agriculture value added per worker. Also, productivity in terms of net value added is a crucial measure of value chain performance. However, none of these measures were used to assess competitiveness. While the project almost achieved its target on bananas and exceeded it for meat (red meat and poultry were aggregated) and onions, the project impact on the competitiveness of five other domestic supply chains (green beans, mangos, tomatoes, sweet potato, and processed food) was unclear. Finally, there were shortcomings with regards to the support provided to livestock production in the Casamance region.

Revised Rating
Modest

Objective 2

Objective
(b) to increase farm revenues of agricultural producers.

Rationale

Outputs

• The above mentioned outputs contribute to this sub-objective as well.

Outcome
The project sought to achieve a 60% increase in farm revenues of producers supported by the project at the end of the project. However, assessing this outcome was not possible because beneficiaries were not known and a baseline could not be established. The increase in farm revenue was dropped at the Level 1 restructuring in 2010.

Rating
Not Rated/Not Applicable

Revised Objective
(b) to increase non-traditional agricultural exports.

Revised Rationale

Outputs

• By project completion 8,689 farming families were engaged in export of crops compared to a target of 2,000 families (target surpassed). Of these families 55% have implemented the “Origine Senegal” good agricultural practices guide based on GlobalGAP Protocol compared to a target of 33% (target surpassed).
• 67,597 tons of agricultural exports were certified conform to EC No. 1148-2001 compared to a target of 38,500 (target surpassed, no baseline data).
• The project supported renewal of the certification of Ceres Locustox (a chemical laboratory) to monitor pesticide residues to ensure that Senegalese horticultural products are admitted onto international markets.
• To support the certification of private exporters, the project produced various tools, namely: a registry of all exporters of fruits; a database that allows the origin of products to be traced; and a manual on SeneGAP for smallholders that is benchmarked with EuroGAP to allow exports to the European Union.
• Three centers of innovation and training for horticultural and non-traditional crops in key regions were created using existing training
The impact of these centers was not clear and no information was provided on the number of people who received training/capacity building support through these facilities.

- Several horticultural communication materials were published through project support including: good phytosanitary practices, how to fight fruit flies and termites, and quality characteristics of onions and bananas.
- By project completion 4,062 ha have been developed or improved by small farmers and agribusiness SMEs compared to a target of 2,500 ha (target surpassed). However, the ICR reported that not all of the originally planned 2,500 benefitted from drip irrigation. This was due to higher than anticipated cost per hectare (CFAF2.5 million per hectare compared to CFAF3.5 million per hectare at implementation) combined with a downward revision of the contribution of smallholder beneficiaries from 50% to 20%. Also, land tenure was a factor that limited private irrigation development.

**Outcome**

To increase non-traditional agricultural exports, the project promoted matching grants to develop partnerships between agribusiness and small-holders to encourage diversification to growing horticultural crops. In support of diversification, the project promoted technologies for water-efficient irrigation. To improve post-harvest handling, the project facilitated better access to post-harvest infrastructure including: warehousing/packaging/cold storage facilities at farm gate level and container handling/freight facilities. To enable access to foreign export markets, the project supported the adoption of good agricultural practices and strengthened the capacities of producers/exporters’ organizations through capacity building and training. To ensure that commodities shipped to Europe were not rejected at destination ports, the project supported capacity building efforts of the National Directorate for Plant protection in exports certification. These activities combined with the development of a marketing strategy and information system enabled better access to international markets.

By project completion national horticultural exports reached 85,000 tons of which 25,530 tons of horticultural exports (or 30%) were directly attributable to the project. The original target was 30,000 tons over a baseline of 13,000 tons in 2006.

**Objective 3**

**Objective**

(c) to increase rice production in Project areas.

**Rationale**

**Outputs**

- By project completion, 6,964 ha irrigation schemes were rehabilitated under AF1 compared to a target of 7,000 ha (Target almost achieved).
- By project completion 7,500 meters of water catchment dikes were expected to be constructed, however, due to procurement issues none of this output target was achieved.
- Under AF2, 7,400 ha of small-scale irrigation perimeters were rehabilitated in the Senegal River Valley (Target achieved), and 3,380 ha of irrigated area were also rehabilitated in Anambé Basin (Target: 3,300, surpassed). The irrigation perimeters were rehabilitated as planned and the needed motor pumps and agricultural equipment delivered.

**Outcome**

The project rehabilitated irrigation schemes and small scale irrigation perimeters. The project met or exceeded its output targets with the exception of water catchment dikes. The Senegal River and Faleme Delta Management Holding Company reported that during the 2013/2014 cropping period 5,571 ha cropped in the dry season and 7,000 ha in the rainy season resulting in an additional rice production of 86,660 tons in 2014 with an average yield of 6.76 and 7.0 tons/ha in both cropping cycles, respectively (ICR, p.37). The Senegal River and Faleme Delta Management Holding Company also estimated that rice production in project areas in the Senegal River valley would reach 111,000 tons in December 2015 compared to a target of 87,000 (Target surpassed).

**Rating**

Substantial
Revised Objective
There was no revision. It was a new objective.

Revised Rationale

Revised Rating
Not Rated/Not Applicable

5. Efficiency

Economic and Financial Efficiency

\textit{ex-ante}

- A Cost Benefit Analysis was carried out for private agricultural enterprise models in the project’s primary intervention areas: the Niayes zone, Senegal River Delta and Groundnut Basin. The analysis considered three private enterprise models (smallholders, collector/exporter, and producer/exporter) investing in fruits and vegetables in the Niayes zone and Senegal River Delta, and two enterprise models (smallholders and medium producers) in the Groundnut Basin.
- Assumptions: the analysis considered that horticultural production for export (green beans, cherry tomatoes, mangoes, melons, and herbs) was concentrated in the Niayes zone and the Senegal River Delta and that the Groundnut Basin would be mostly concerned with production for the domestic market. The model farm budgets included a combination of horticultural products and, as a result, the sensitivity analysis also uses aggregated variables. The analysis was based on farm sizes between 0.2 ha and 0.5 for smallholders, 20 ha for collector/exporter and 100 ha for producer/exporter.
  - Economic Rate of Return (ERR) for the Niayes zone and the Senegal River Valley ranged between 40% and 70% and 25% to 75% percent, respectively. While the range for the Groundnut Basin was between 37% and 41%.
  - The Financial Rate of Return (FRR) for same regions ranged between 31% and 57% and 20% and 50%, respectively. While the range for the Groundnut Basin was between 34% and 41%.
- A sensitivity analysis looked at the critical factors that could potentially impact the ERR and FRR including aggregate variables (gross revenue, combining production and prices, and annual production costs) reflecting the aggregate nature of the model farm. The analysis showed that all three models (smallholder, collector/exporter, producer/exporter) in the Niayes zone were sound investments, both economically and financially. In the Senegal River Delta, smallholders and large producer/exporters had sound investment models. However, the collector/exporter business model was risky, as it was susceptible to a single digit change in revenues (-9%). While in the Groundnut Basin the analysis showed that the smallholder and medium producer business model was susceptible to relatively small changes in revenues and production costs, particularly the medium producer models (with all switching values below the 10% threshold).
  - The analysis did not provide an overall project ERR.

\textit{ex-post}

- Data was collected from a stratified sample of 180 beneficiaries or 30 beneficiaries (small-scale and medium) by intervention areas. All project investment costs were included in the analysis. The financial and economic prices used in the project analysis were based on 2015 constant prices. Farm budgets and incomes were based on prevailing market prices. Incremental production estimates and cropping areas were estimated for target crops form the period starting 2008 up to 2104.
  - The financial and economic analysis was based on farm budgets. Two farm models, small- and medium-scale farms, were used for the analysis in each project intervention area. In the Senegal River Valley, a small-scale farm consists of an average 0.5 hectares of rice and 1.5 hectares of nontraditional crops. A medium-size farm covers 1.5 hectares of rice and 2.5 hectares of nontraditional crops.
  - Economic Rate of Return was highest for the Senegal River Valley where the estimated ERR was 57% and the Net Present Value (NPV) was US$42 million. In Gouloumbou Basin, investments in banana induced an ERR of 32% and the Net Present Value (NPV) was US$5.3 million. While the Niayes
zone and the Anambé Basin produced an ERR of 31% and 30%, and the NPV was $17.1 million and US$7.2 million, respectively. In the Casamance, the ERR was estimated to be 46% and the NPV was US$4.9 million. Finally, investments in small-scale irrigation and market infrastructure sub-projects at the Groundnut Basin induced a 25% ERR and the NPV was US$7.4 million.

- The overall calculated economic internal rate of return (ERR) for the project was 34% for the period 2007-2014, assuming an opportunity cost of capital of 17%. The NPV was US$84 million or 30% more than the initial investments over the eight-year project life. Calculated at market prices, the FRR was 25% with a NPV of US$70 million.

### Administrative and Institutional Efficiency

The project closed three years later than the expected closing date. This delay was to accommodate new activities introduced under two rounds of Additional Financing that the project received. The project faced implementation delays due to the beneficiaries’ difficulty in mobilizing their contribution (set at 50% of sub-project costs). There were also delays in the establishment of small and medium-size producers in irrigation perimeters as well as in the implementation of sub-projects for small-scale farmers in the Senegal River Valley and the Niayes zone. A procurement issue led to the eventual stopping of all activities under the “Promotion of Intensive Rice Production in the Bignona Valley” which was funded under AF1 (US$2.0 million). A candidate firm not selected for execution of the works contested the procurement process which lead to a long arbitration process, which concluded in a relaunch of the bidding process. Due to this lengthy delays, execution of the associated dam works were stopped six months before closing despite completion of all detailed feasibility studies. Delayed contract clearances from the national procurement agency resulted in the non-completion of the five planned slaughtering facilities. In total US$7.36 million of funds were cancelled representing 12.5% of the total disbursed amount reported in the ICR (Annex 1). Finally, the actual cost of component 3 (Development of Private Irrigation) and component 4 (Project Coordination and M&E) was US$32.58 million (155% of the appraisal estimate of US$21.05 million) and US$9.76 million (232% of the appraisal estimate of US$4.20 million), respectively.

Despite the economic and financial viability of the farming enterprises supported by the project, overall efficiency is rated modest due to administrative and institutional weaknesses that led to implementation delays, cancellation of activities, and cancellation of funds.

### 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Available?</th>
<th>Point value (%)</th>
<th>*Coverage/Scope (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICR Estimate</td>
<td>✓ 34.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### 6. Outcome

#### Original Objectives

Relevance of objectives was rated high while relevance of design was rated substantial despite some weaknesses. Efficacy of the first sub-objective was rated substantial where the project almost met its target on increasing the export of non-traditional agricultural crops. While efficacy of the second sub-objective was non-evaluable due to the absence of relevant evidence/data to assess the impact of the project on increasing farm revenues of agricultural producers. Efficiency was rated modest due to administrative and institutional weaknesses and the cancellation of US$7.83 million of project funds.

Outcome is rated moderately unsatisfactory.

#### Revised Objectives

Relevance of objectives was rated high while relevance of design was rated substantial despite some weaknesses. Efficacy of the first sub-objective was rated modest due to the absence of relevant indicators to assess that impact of the project on improving supply chain competitiveness. Efficacy of the second sub-objectives was rated substantial where the project contributed to increasing non-traditional agricultural exports. Efficacy of the third sub-objective was rated substantial because the project activities under AF1 and AF 2 resulted in
significant increase in rice productivity in project areas. Efficiency was rated modest due to administrative and institutional weaknesses and the cancellation of US$7.83 million of project funds.

Outcome is rated moderately satisfactory.

**Weighed outcome rating**

At the time of restructuring the US$18.33 million were disbursed out of a total disbursed amount of US$58.73 (31%).

Outcome of original objectives was rated moderately unsatisfactory while outcome of the revised objectives was rated moderately satisfactory which on a scale from 1 to 6 is assigned a rating of 3 and 4, respectively.

\[
0.31 \times 3 + 0.69 \times 4 = 0.93 + 2.76 = 3.69 \text{ which rounds up to } 4
\]

Weighted outcome rating is moderately satisfactory.

---

**7. Rationale for Risk to Development Outcome Rating**

The following concerns impact the sustainability of the development outcome for both the original and revised objectives:

- In the face of a highly demanding international market with regards to the quality of exported products, small-scale farmers need to maintain adequate product quality standards and good agricultural practices. This requires continuous capacity building and monitoring of small-scale farmers in full collaboration of large agribusinesses. There is a risk that large operators might not continue with their contractual arrangements with smaller-scale farmers if adequate quality standards and good agricultural practices are not maintained.

- Land tenure issues proved problematic during implementation. Developing sustainable commercial agriculture requires securing access to land for all through an inclusive land allocation model that puts local communities at the center of the negotiation process in order to reduce the risk of reticence from local communities. A new land allocation model was promoted by the Government and the Bank, but it requires a new legislation that will secure access to land in the country by private operators.

- Rehabilitated irrigation infrastructure on the Senegal river continues to be in need of adequate arrangements for operation and maintenance (O&M) to ensure sustainability. This requires the allocation of adequate O&M budget and more efforts on fees recovery from water user associations. O&M budget for 2014 was US$2.0 million which according to the ICR (para 101) was not enough to ensure that annual O&M activities costs were fully covered.

---

**8. Assessment of Bank Performance**

a. Quality-at-Entry

- The project was the first phase of the Agricultural Markets and Agribusiness Development Program which was designed as a ten-year Adaptable Program Lending (APL). At the time of preparation, the programmatic approach of the APL appeared to be the better option compared to a one-time Specific Investment Lending (SIL) option because it allows for the management of risks associated with the participatory creation of human capital and institutional infrastructure that are necessary for the sustainable development of the agribusiness sector in Senegal. The program was also consistent with the fact that market infrastructure and irrigation development often require about a decade to fully mature.

- While the program was designed as an APL, the elaboration of the second phase with its triggers was rather general. Also, the original objectives were broad and lacked specificity.

- Project preparation started during the pilot Agricultural Export Promotion Project and benefitted from its experience. The most notable lessons reflected in the design include: a bottom-up inclusive approach, rather than a top-down approach, is key to building capacity and ensuring sustainability, foreign firms with business know-how are an effective means of providing the hands-on demonstration of the skills necessary to shift institutional business paradigms, accumulation of soft assets is critical for triggering private sector investment
and growth. Project preparation also benefitted from the technical assistance and funding from the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), complemented by a Project Preparation Facility extended by the Bank.

- Design relied on a value chain approach that emphasized Public Private Partnerships as an approach to mobilize private capital for agricultural development. It also put considerable emphasis on the introduction and promotion of new technologies (drip irrigation) and software, including for knowledge management.
- Effectiveness was delayed one year after Board approval because of delayed in the effectiveness condition regarding private management of agricultural export facilities built under the Agricultural Export Promotion Project. To avoid these delays the transfer process should have been launched during preparation and effective before project implementation. This issue continued until project closing where placing one of the export facilities (Gare de Fret - GDF), located at the Dakar airport, under private management continued to be difficult. Design also would have benefitted from a better assessment of beneficiaries financial capacity, namely small-scale farmers ability to mobilize their contribution. This would have helped in avoiding delays in the financing and establishment of irrigation sub-projects in the Senegal river valley.
- At the appraisal stage five risks were identified. Most notable of which were: concern that variations in international commodity prices resulting in changes in EU or WTO policies (high), natural disasters including agricultural pests, climatic variation, drought or floods (modest), and changes in demand in target markets (Europe) or increased competition from competitors (modest). While the proposed mitigations actions suggested at appraisal proved effective, some risks were unanticipated, for example, the long time need to place infrastructure investments under private management and land tenure issues–both caused significant delays to the project.
- M&E suffered from design shortcomings (see section 10a).

Quality-at-Entry Rating
Moderately Satisfactory

b. Quality of supervision

Supervision missions were well staffed and included specialists to supervise all fiduciary and safeguards policies. Implementation problems were identified, brought to management attention for resolution, and addressed in a timely manner. The Mid-Term Review introduced needed revisions to the Results Framework where some output/outcome indicators were either dropped or reformulated. These changes ensured that the indicators were measurable and that what was measured was attributed to the project. Supervision should have addressed weaknesses in M&E earlier. Effectiveness was delayed one year after Board approval. This delay stemmed from the long time needed to meet the effectiveness condition regarding private management of agricultural export facilities built under the Agricultural Export Promotion Project. The process of selecting a private operator was lengthy and initially unsuccessful. While most implementation delays were out the Bank’s control, significant delays stemmed from effectiveness conditions and overestimating the beneficiaries’ capacity to mobilize funds. The design for the two Additional Financings was simple and focused on irrigation rehabilitation and some livestock activities. Both were prepared in the context of the rapid response needed to address the prevailing food security crisis in the country. However, the livestock activities needed more attention to details. Bank supervision maintained close monitoring of safeguards compliance throughout implementation.

Quality of Supervision Rating
Moderately Satisfactory

Overall Bank Performance Rating
Moderately Satisfactory

9. Assessment of Borrower Performance

a. Government Performance

The Government was supportive of the project in general and addressed counterpart issues that impacted the project. However, there were two notable shortcomings, first, the Government took a significantly long time to address and decide on covenants and issues that affected project implementation, second, the project steering committee did not perform the expected role envisaged at appraisal as it only met only met once per year and attendees from the different ministries changed constantly and were not sufficiently well-informed of project activities to provide oversight and useful advice to the PCU. Effectiveness was delayed one year after Board approval. This delay stemmed from the long time needed to meet the effectiveness condition regarding private management of agricultural export facilities built under the Agricultural Export Promotion Project. The process of selecting a private operator was lengthy and initially unsuccessful. The Government
contributed 48% of the expected counterpart funding.

Government Performance Rating
Moderately Satisfactory

b. Implementing Agency Performance
The project was implemented under the guidance of the Ministry of Agriculture and Hydraulics through a dedicated Project Coordination Unit (PCU). The PCU included relevant expertise to manage different aspects of the project including: technical, fiduciary, safeguards, and monitoring. Project implementation benefitted from staff stability and limited staff turnover over the implementation period including the same PCU manager over nine years. The PCU worked closely with the Bank team to address any implementation issues and provided regular, clear, and comprehensive reporting and according to the ICR (para 109), it "adhered to all relevant Bank rules." Senegal River and Falémé Delta Management Holding Company and Senegalese Agricultural and Industrial Company implemented the irrigation rehabilitation activities. However, the National Agency for Agricultural and Rural Advisory Services in charge of technical advice to beneficiaries was overstretched. There were M&E weaknesses especially with regards to the livestock activities and there were procurement delays.

Implementing Agency Performance Rating
Moderately Satisfactory

Overall Borrower Performance Rating
Moderately Satisfactory

10. M&E Design, Implementation, & Utilization

a. M&E Design
M&E activities following the same processes developed by the Agriculture Export Promotion Pilot Project, since this was a follow-up operation. The Results Framework included two outcome indicators to assess the achievement of the original development objectives. Design also called for conducting three household surveys. These were expected to be carried out after effectiveness, around the project midterm review, and at completion, in order to measure the impact of the project in areas of focus.

b. M&E Implementation
The ICR did not provide further information on implementation of M&E. Two intermediate indicators were dropped at the first stage of additional financing when it was clear that both were no longer relevant in assessing the project's impact: (i) "the Fondation Origine Senegal – Fruits & Legumes is implemented"; and (ii) "Senegal has received EU accreditation related to EC No. 1148-200 on check on conformity to the marketing standards applicable to fresh fruits and vegetables." The first outcome indicator to assess increase in non-traditional agricultural exports was dropped because it did not distinguish between exports due to the project and overall exports of the country; while second indicator to assess revenue growth of project supported producers was dropped because it could not be measured at the outset as beneficiaries were not known yet nor could it be measured at Mid-Term Review because the results of sub-projects were not yet available. The first outcome indicator was replaced at restructuring with a more outcome-focused performance indicator to better capture the project's contribution and to differentiate increases in exports directly generated by project interventions from those resulting from private investments outside project areas. Thus it was revised to: “Nontraditional agricultural exports in project areas reach 12,000 tons by the end of the project”. The second outcome indicator was replaced with “Local production of onion and banana covers 75% and 50% of domestic consumption, respectively.” Also, an additional outcome indicator was added: “Increased annual production of rice paddy by 52,000 tons by end of the project.” after revising the PDO.
With the second AF two more outcome indicators were added: "Small ruminants productivity reach 20% in targeted farms at the end of the project" and "Swine productivity reach 40% in targeted farms at the end of the project." Design also included twelve intermediate outcome indicators that were adequate to assess the achievements under different project components except two that were latter dropped at the Level One restructuring stage. These were “the Fondation Origine Senegal – Fruits & Legumes is implemented”; and “Senegal has received EU
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accreditation related to EC No. 1148-200 on check on conformity to the marketing standards applicable to fresh fruits and vegetables.”

After revising the objective and including improving competitiveness of selected domestic supply chains, M&E design should have included a relevant indicator to assess improvement in competitiveness. For example, one way of increasing competitiveness of a value chain is producing more efficiently, and this could be captured by measuring the agriculture value added per worker. Also, productivity in terms of net value added is a crucial measure of value chain performance. However, none of these measures were used to assess competitiveness.

In a further communication during the preparation of this review the project team explained that an impact study was conducted by the project, however, it was available in hard copy only, and two rounds of household surveys were conducted.

c. M&E Utilization

M&E data collected by the PCU guided project management decisions. However, the outcome of the vaccination campaigns supported by the project were not clear. Vaccines were distributed to private veterinarians, but it was unclear how many animals were actually vaccinated. Also, the impact of the project on competitiveness was unclear due to the absence of relevant indicators.

M&E Quality Rating

Modest

11. Other Issues

a. Safeguards

The project was rated a Category B under OP/BP 4.01 Environmental Assessment. Six other safeguard policies were triggered: Natural Habitats (OP/BP 4.04), Pest Management (OP 4.09), Cultural Property (OPN 11.03), Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12), Safety of Dams (OP/BP 4.37), and Projects on International Waterways (OP/BP 7.50). No additional safeguards policies were triggered under the two AFs. The ICR (para 56) reported only six safeguard polices and Cultural Property (OPN 11.03) was not included, however, no explanation was provided for this change. In a further communication during the preparation of this Review the project team explained that one safeguard (Cultural Property - OPN 11.03) was unintentionally omitted from the ICR.

An Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) was prepared. It included the potential environmental and social impacts of small dams, a Pest and Pesticide Management Plan (PPMP). Also, a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) was prepared. The PCU included an environmental and social evaluation specialist as part of its core staff and the corresponding focal points within the executing agencies were trained. All project financed sub-projects were screened for environmental and social impacts and an additional criterion was added to ensure gender mainstreaming. The project financed small dams only. The Commissioner of the High Commission Organization for the Development of the Senegal River informed the Government of Senegal that it had no objections to the proposed irrigation in the Senegal River Delta. Wind breaker trees were planted along the horticultural irrigation perimeters as part of the environmental measures; and farmers who lost trees due to irrigation rehabilitation works were compensated. To avoid conflicts with farmers, special access routes were provided for herders to access irrigated areas. There was no incidence of resettlement during implementation.

The ICR did not provide an explicit statement that the project fully complied with the World Bank's safeguard policies. In a further communication during the preparation of this Review the project team confirmed that the project fully complied with the World Bank's safeguard policies, and Bank supervision maintained close monitoring of safeguards compliance throughout implementation.

b. Fiduciary Compliance

Financial Management. Financial management was regularly reviewed by a specialist on Bank supervision missions, and at all times met the Bank's requirements (ICR, p. 30). Independent external auditors annually examined project accounts and the audit reports were always unqualified. In 2013, the auditors recommended improvements to the internal controls that were carried out.

Procurement. Procurement benefitted from an experienced procurement staff that had full knowledge of the Bank’s procurement rules and procedures; however, procurement was generally slow. Procurement specialists with the Bank's supervision missions regularly reviewed procurement plans and procurement actions. However, a procurement issue led to cancelling a major part of a component under AF1 where a candidate firm not selected for execution of the works contested the procurement process. This triggered a long arbitration process, which
concluded in a relaunch of the bidding process. This decision, made six months before project closing, ultimately stopped the execution of the associated dam works despite completion of all detailed feasibility studies. In a further communication during the preparation of this Review the project team stated that there were no incidence of misprocurement.

c. Unintended impacts (Positive or Negative)

**Positive.** The project promoted drip irrigation which is a relatively new irrigation technology in the context of Senegal’s agriculture. Drip irrigation increases watering efficiency and optimizes input use in terms of fertilizers. This in turn leads to gains in productivity and possible utilization of more land for agriculture. It is expected this new technology will be adopted much more widely in the future and should lead to a much more productive agriculture sector.

d. Other

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk to Development Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrower Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of ICR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note
When insufficient information is provided by the Bank for IEG to arrive at a clear rating, IEG will downgrade the relevant ratings as warranted beginning July 1, 2006.
The "Reason for Disagreement/Comments" column could cross-reference other sections of the ICR Review, as appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ICR included eight lessons. The following three lessons are emphasized with some adaptation of language:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>An effective communication strategy is critical for the success of Projects seeking to introduce game-changing institutional and technical innovations.</strong> This would ensure participation and buy in of people who cannot be identified in advance. A first-class, professional, interactive communication strategy that uses all forms of media, including the internet, and from the very beginning of the project. The public must be able to easily access updated information about how to participate in the project, otherwise implementation delays are unavoidable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project steering Committee should have clear terms of reference and its members should be nominally selected to ensure institutional continuity.</strong> The project experience demonstrated that the steering committee did not play the role it was expected to as its members met very infrequently, changed constantly, and were not well prepared or informed. The link with agricultural policy making was often very weak and PCU ended up acting in a policy vacuum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To ensure efficient performance of the agriculture export organizations, institutional arrangements need to be constantly monitored and adjustments made accordingly in a timely manner.</strong> In a dynamic agriculture export environment, the relative strengths of different producer and export organizations can change rapidly. Therefore, institutional arrangements need to be adjusted accordingly to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ensure efficient performance of the agriculture export organizations.

14. Assessment Recommended?

No

15. Comments on Quality of ICR

The ICR provided good coverage of implementation activities. It included a clear explanation about the rationale behind the two additional financing that the project received. It also included eight lessons that reflected the project experience, five were project specific and three were more general. The discussion of project outcomes should have put more focus on what the project achieved against the stated objectives rather than focusing mainly on the achievement of PDO indicators.

The ICR had some shortcomings:

- For a split rating, the project is rated against both sets of objectives separately, for the whole duration of the project not just the period for which each of the objectives was in effect. This was not the case in the ICR.
- The discussion on safeguards was brief and did not clarify whether the project fully complied with Bank safeguard policies.
- The ICR was not clear on the reasons behind the cancellation of the second phase of the APL.
- The ICR (Annex 1) did not provide actual cost of components under both AF1 and AF2.
- At 50 pages main text, the ICR exceeds the recommended 15 pages as per ICR preparation guidelines.

a. Quality of ICR Rating

Modest