

Report Number: ICRR10673

1. Project Data:	Date Posted: 07/27/2000				
PROJ ID: P001512	OEDID: C2117		Appraisal	Actual	
Project Name : Antanan Develop	arivo Plain ment Project	t Costs (US\$M)	68.6	63.3	
Country: Madagas	scar Loar	/Credit (US\$M)	30.5	23.5	
Sector, Major Sect .: Sewerag Supply &	re, Water Cofir	ancing (US\$M)	22.3	13.6	
L/C Number: C2117					
	Board	d Approval (FY)		90	
Partners involved : Agence Dévelop		Closing Date	06/30/1997	09/30/1999	
	,		•	-	
Prepared by: Reviewe	d by: Group M	lanager:	Group:		
Klas B. Ringskog Roy Gilb	ert Ridley N	elson	OEDST		

2. Project Objectives and Components

a. Objectives

Overall objective: to improve the living conditions of the low-income population in the low-lying areas of the city of Antananarivo and on the Antananarivo Plain. Specific objectives were:

- (1) to create a favorable environment for private investment and economic growth in the Antananarivo zone;
- (2) to consolidate the financial and administrative development of the municipalities:
- (3) to establish institutions to ensure efficient operations and maintenance of works; and
- (4) to ensure integrated rural and urban development in the Antananarivo Plain.

The above broad objectives were supplanted by three physical objectives :

- (i) To provide a 100-year flood protection to the suburbs of Antananarivo, as well as an efficient flood warning system;
-)ii) To improve , rehabilitate and expand the drainage and sewerage facilities to evacuate surface runoff and sewage from the Plain;
- (iii) To rehabilitate and expand the irrigation system of the Ikopa Right Bank (3000 ha).

b. Components

- (1) Rehabilitation and construction of dikes and a warning system to provide protection against 100-year flood, and implementation of a flood warning system, comprising hydrometric stations and communications equipment;
- (2) Rehabilitation and construction of drainage canals and construction of a pumping station to remove excess water from the Plain;
- (3) Irrigation improvements of about 2,900 hectares in the Antananarivo Plain;
- (4) Rehabilitation and extensions of the Antananarivo sewerage system and rehabilitation of its solid waste composting plant;
- (5) Improvements of two out of five drainage areas in the southern part of the plain to allow urban development; and (6) Institutional strengthening including updating and improving the cadastre and the land tax system, creating an institution to manage hydraulic works in the Plain, creating a user association of the irrigation system; and assisting public agencies responsible for sewerage and solid waste management.

c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates

The IDA credit was approved on March 29, 1990. Its closing date was extended from June 30, 1997 to September 30, 1999 at which time \$ 7.0 million was canceled from the original \$ 30.5 million. The actual project cost of \$ 63.5 million was financed by the IDA credit of \$ 23.5 million (37%), by Agence Française de Développement with \$ 13.6 million (22%) and by the Government with \$ 26.2 million (41%). The shares of financing of the originally estimated project cost of \$ 68.6 million were 44% (IDA), 33% (AFD), and 23% (the Government).

3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:

The so called specific bjectives, as originally stated, were so broad that it proved impractical to judge whether they had been achieved. In contrast, the achievement of the physical objectives and components of the project could be reported as follows:

(1) The flood protection works were commissioned although the flood warning system was not completed at project closing;;

- (2) The drainage system and pumping station were rehabilitated and commissioned;
- (3) A new irrigation canal has reduced pollution of rice paddies but the expansion of irrigated land had not been achieved at closing;
- (4) The sewerage system was partially rehabilitated although the collected sewage receives no treatment . Solid wastes receptables have been rehabilitated and solid waste is now managed by a private contractor;
- (5) The improvements of the two out of five southern drainage areas is not well documented; and
- (6) The institutional strengthening has been limited and its sustainability is not assured .

4. Significant Outcomes /Impacts:

The successful completion of the complex set of physical works is a significant achievement in the face of late institutional decisions, suspended AFD financing from 1994-1997, late Government counterpart funding, and political meddling

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

The project was appraised one year before OD 4.30 on involuntary resettlement was issued. Even so, the involuntary resettlement of 2,341 households caused considerable difficulties and suffering and more than 60% of the resettled household were unsatisfied with resettlement. Only three out of 2,341 households resettled in the three designated resettlement sites.

6. Ratings:	ICR	OED Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
Outcome:	Satisfactory	Marginally Satisfactory	Two out of the four specific objectives, the administrative and financial development of the municipalities, and the institutional strengthening to operate and maintain works efficiently, were not achieved. The unfavorable outcome of the involuntary resettlement is an added negative.
Institutional Dev .:	Negligible	Negligible	
Sustainability:	Unlikely	Unlikely	
Bank Performance :	Deficient	Unsatisfactory	
Borrower Perf .:	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Quality of ICR:		Satisfactory	

7. Lessons of Broad Applicability:

- (1) One project should not try to address a large number of diverse issues such as agricultural development, flood control, institutional strengthening, taxation reform, urban development, and wastewater collection. This type of "Christmas tree project" is bound to fall well short of expectations.
- (2) Co-financing should be targeted at discrete and physically unlinked project components to minimize disruptions of the type that followed AFD's suspension of disbursements from 1994-1997;
- (3) The institutional and financial resource mobilization arrangements should be defined before implementation to increase the chances of sustainability, rather than late during implementation as was the case for the project.

8. Audit Recommended? • Yes O No

Why? The adequacy and success of the flood control measures should be analyzed a few years after the IDA credit has closed together with a number of other flood control projects recommended for audits (the Lagos Drainage and Sanitation Project, Credit 2517-UNI is one of these). Such a thematic cluster audit would provide valuable learning lessons for flood control projects that appear to be a growth area for Bank assistance and where the Bank is still on a steep learning curve.

9. Comments on Quality of ICR:

The ICR discusses the general issues and problems from the point of both the general and the specific objectives. It states correctly that these objectives were so broad that their achievement is hard to monitor. The Staff Appraisal Report shares this shortcoming with too general objectives that make a rigorous evaluation difficult without a good system of monitoring indicators established at project inception. The ICR might have focused more on the achievement of the project's physical objectives.