2. Project Objectives and Components:

a. Objectives:

According to the PAD (para. 12), the objective of the Nepal Zoonoses Control Project (NZCP) is "to enhance the country capacity for the prevention and control of infectious diseases that transmit between animals and human (zoonoses) under a One Health approach". It was noted that the NZCP was designed to expand the foundations built by the earlier Bank-financed Avian Influenza Control Project (AICP).

The Grant Agreement for the NZCP (p.5) states that the Project is "to enhance the Recipient’s capacity for the prevention and control of infectious diseases that transmit between animals and humans (zoonoses ) under a One Health (OH) approach".

The OH is an international framework developed to foster a broader understanding of how disease prevention and control require a comprehensive approach that embraces all aspects of animal, human, and ecosystem health (PAD, Annex 6, p. 31).

Clearly, the objectives in the PAD and the Grant Agreement are identical. This review is based on the development objective stated in the Grant Agreement.

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

No

c. Components:

The NZCP had four components. A summary of the activities in each component is given below.

Component A: Animal Health (appraisal US$5.40 million; actual US$4.80 million)

The objective of this component was to control avian influenza and broaden the scope to control a wider set of
It has the following four sub-components:

- Enhancing institutional capacity in the development of veterinary legislation, developing a One Health Strategy and action plan, and identifying key infectious diseases involving climate change.
- Building capacity for surveillance and diagnosis through refurbishment of laboratories, provision of equipment, and staff training.
- Strengthening and modernizing live animal markets, increasing awareness about bio-security, and upgrading quarantine facilities.
- Supporting project management through the recruitment of consultants to assist the Department of Livestock Services which was responsible for overall implementation of the project including financial management, procurement, and monitoring.

This component was implemented by the Department of Livestock Services and it facilitated the development of a One Health strategy and action plan.

**Component B: Climate Sensitive Disease Risk Mitigation** (appraisal US$ 2.00 million; actual US$1.70 million).

This component aimed to enhance livestock climate resilience by benchmarking priority climate sensitive infectious diseases under the One Health approach. The activities of this component included improvements in climate impact assessment on diseases and concrete interventions to mitigate climate risk. Some of the interventions included the following:

- Building livestock climate resilience by benchmarking priority climate sensitive diseases and their impact on production.
- Collecting information on climate vulnerability.
- Designing and implementing early warning mechanisms to mitigate livestock diseases risk induced by climate change.

This component was implemented by the National Agricultural Research Council.

**Component C: Human Health** (appraisal US$2.00 million; actual US$1.45 million).

Activities in this component covered improvements in the support for surveillance, diagnosis and case management of priority zoonotic diseases in humans.

The component aimed to:

- Strengthen sentinel sites by equipping them with adequate facilities and training public health workers on the prevention and control of zoonotic diseases.
- Assess the prevalence of such diseases in humans.

Though this sub-component was implemented by the Department of Health Services, collaboration between these Departments and the Department of Livestock Services was critical. This was especially the case with the linking of the Animal Health Information System in the Department of Livestock Services and the Early Warning Alert and Response System in the Department of Health Services.

**Component D: Communication** (appraisal US$0.6 million; actual US$0.5 million).

The activities under this component focused on communication issues including the following:

- Strengthening the AI communication strategy to encompass priority diseases and raising awareness on those diseases and preventive practices.
- Building institutional capacity.
- Providing technical assistance to two of the collaborating Departments: the Department of Livestock Services
and the Department of Health Services.

- Undertaking Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice (KAP) surveys.

According to the ICR (page 2), the revision of the Avian Influenza communications strategy to include priority zoonotic diseases was supported by this component.

This component was implemented by the Department of Livestock Services and it was designed to support communication activities for zoonotic diseases control.

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

Project Costs: The total project cost estimated at appraisal was US$10.0 million. The actual total project cost at closure was US$8.46 million. The actual total cost at closure represents 84.6 percent of the total estimated cost at appraisal. According to the ICR (para. 16), the difference of US$1.54 million between the total project cost at appraisal and the actual cost at closure was attributed to the appreciation of the US dollar against Nepali Rupee. The savings of US$1.54 million were cancelled at project closure.

Financing: The project was financed by a grant from the Avian Human Influenza Facility (AHIF). The AHIF was established with contributions from several bilateral and multilateral donors including the European Commission (EC). It was managed by the World Bank. According to the PAD (p. 6) all the contributions were made by the EC. There was no other co-financing for the project.

Borrower Contribution: Neither the PAD nor the ICR mentioned government contributions to the project cost.

Restructuring: A level 2 restructuring was carried out on December 9, 2013. The restructuring involved only the reallocation of funds from training to culling operations and the accompanying payment of compensation to farmers. In other words, the original development objectives were not changed.

Dates: Restructuring was approved on December 9, 2013 but was retroactive to April 4, 2013. The original closing date was December 31, 2013. The closing date was extended to March 31, 2014 to allow for the project's activities to be completed.

3. Relevance of Objectives & Design:

a. Relevance of Objectives:

Substantial

The livestock sub-sector contributes about 26 percent to agricultural GDP. According to the ICR (para. 2), there are 24.5 million poultry, 4.8 million cattle and buffaloes, and 9.3 million goats and sheep in Nepal. However, the livestock sub-sector suffers from a high incidence of infectious diseases many of which are zoonotic and thus affect not only the lives and productivity of livestock but also the well-being and productivity of humans. The potential beneficiaries from the project include commercial poultry farmers and consumers of livestock products. Climate change (including rising temperatures) and extreme weather events which Nepal has experienced have been linked to disease risks that undermine the productivity of livestock. Therefore, the objectives of the NZCP were relevant for Nepal's economic, socio-economic and environmental challenges.

This project's objectives were substantially relevant to Nepal Government's development objectives. First, the objectives were consistent with the Government's efforts to raise incomes of the rural poor, enhance food security, and reduce gender and ethnicity based inequality by improving the productivity of the livestock sub-sector. Second, the project objectives were consistent with the Government’s own strategy to prevent and control zoonotic diseases through the implementation of the One Health approach to disease control.

With respect to the World Bank's assistance strategy, first, the project built on the Bank-financed Avian Influenza Control Project (AICP) which was implemented between 2007 and 2011. Second, as indicated in the ICR (para. 4), the project complemented the IDA-financed Poverty Alleviation Fund (PAF) and the proposed Agriculture and Food Security Project which was expected to be financed by Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP). Third, the project's objective complements the ongoing IDA-financed National Health Sector Program (para. 11) thus contributing to the collaboration between the Department of Livestock Services and the Department of Health Services. Fourth, the ICR noted that “The project would also support ISN's second cross cutting theme, fostering gender equality and social inclusion, given that about 50 percent of rural households keep poultry and other livestock in their backyard. Approximately, 30 percent rural households with backyard poultry belong to Dalits and Janajati,
which are the most disadvantaged social groups” (ICR, para. 4). Finally, the objectives continued to be in line with the second pillar of the Bank’s Interim Strategy Note for Nepal for FY 12-13 namely the “reducing of vulnerabilities and improving resilience” by building the government’s capacity to prevent and control zoonotic diseases.

b. Relevance of Design:
Substantial

The results framework in the PAD (Annex 1) provided the major features of the NZCP’s design, namely national capacity building for the more effective identification, prevention, and control of zoonotic diseases. In addition, sharing of information on zoonotic diseases among the collaborating agencies (i.e. Department of Livestock Services, Department of Health Services, and National Agricultural Research Council) and communication of information to the public on mitigating outbreaks of zoonotic diseases are important features of the design of this project. The communication aspect focused on the revision of the Avian Influenza Communication Strategy to include priority zoonotic diseases and implement awareness raising campaigns.

NZCP’s activities were consistent with the design in the results matrix namely (a) focused on the institutionalization of capacity building and strengthening of the collaborative arrangements between the Departments of Health Services and Department of Livestock Services, and with the Nepal Agricultural Research Council in the prevention and control of zoonotic diseases. Accordingly, the activities in each of the four components (activities) were linked systematically to the corresponding output and outcome targets set by the implementing agencies.

Institution building focused on training of animal and human health personnel, provision and refurbishment of laboratory equipment, upgrading of quarantine facilities, and development of innovative climate change mitigation instruments under the One Health approach. Moreover, it included the modernization of live bird markets and enhancement of the awareness of farmers about bio-security.

The design of these activities was substantially relevant to achieving the project’s objectives.

4. Achievement of Objectives (Efficacy): 

According to the Grant Agreement, the objective of the project was “to enhance the Recipient’s capacity for the prevention and control of infectious diseases that transmit between animals and humans under the One Health approach”.

For the purpose of this evaluation, the above objective is divided into two sub-objectives covering prevention and control of zoonotic diseases, separately. The two sub-objectives and the corresponding project outputs and outcomes are presented below.

Sub-objective A: Enhance the Recipient’s capacity to prevent infectious diseases that are transmitted between animals and humans under the One Health approach - Substantial

Outputs

According to the ICR (pp. iii-v) the outputs related to the above sub-objective include the following:

- Formation of District level Avian Influenza Technical committees to survey and report avian flu and zoonotic diseases.
- Strengthening of the One Health approach which started with AICP.
- Redefinition of the National Avian Influenza Information Committee. The committee now includes the Nepal Agricultural Research Council, the Department of Livestock Services, the Department of Human Services, and FAO. Its activities cover all zoonotic diseases.
- Inspection of 14,506 livestock at model service centers and quarantine offices which exceeded the target in the PAD of 7,000 animals.
- Training of 1,243 Poverty Alleviation Fund (PAF) farmers in bio-security compared with a target in the PAD of 1,000 farmers.
- Monitoring the incidence of priority zoonotic diseases in animals in Nepal in 2014 (intermediate indicator 3.1) as
follows which exceeded the target of monitoring six zoonotic diseases.

- Avian influenza..............64.00 percent
- Brucellosis......................0.56 percent
- Leptospirosis.....................9.51 percent
- Toxoplasmosis.............24.31 percent
- Cysticercosis..............5.20 percent
- Hydatidosis.................0.00 percent
- Rabies ................................57.4 percent

- Developed a national Animal Health Policy and Surveillance Plan.
- Enhanced the institutional capacity of national veterinary services through the construction of a Veterinary Standard and Drug Administration Laboratory and a new model quarantine facility.
- Provided training for professionals and laboratory assistants. According to the ICR (para. 62), during the two years of project implementation, a total of 10,261 staff were trained on issues related to zoonosis, quarantine management, bio-security, meat hygiene, and disease surveillance.
- Implemented surveillance plans for the eight most important zoonotic diseases.
- Completed the construction of a Bio-security Laboratory Level 2 Plus at the Department of Health Services which was commissioned during the implementation of AICP. This laboratory allows the diagnosis of zoonotic diseases in Nepal.
- Ensured that 100 percent of the national disease surveillance sites report to the Epidemiology and Diseases Control Division of the Department of Health Services. Nevertheless, it is not clear from the ICR how the information obtained was utilized.
- Increased awareness of methods for the prevention of priority zoonotic diseases among health workers and the general public. The target of 50 percent of health workers and the general public was almost achieved. However, this information is based on an Attitude and Practice Survey (KAP) that was carried out in only 6 districts where the NZCP was implemented at the end of the project. Due to time constraints, a full-fledged beneficiary survey covering more districts was not conducted and analyzed.
- Trained 54,129 farmers in 75 districts. Of these farmers, 9,717 were women. The target in the PAD was 24,000 farmers. However, the ICR does not provide evidence on the quality and effectiveness of the training.

Outcomes

- Identified 8 zoonotic diseases which was two above the target.
- Identified seven climate sensitive diseases (four zoonotic diseases and 3 non-zoonotic diseases) compared with a target of 10.
- Institutionalized the One Health approach. For instance, the One Health approach has been adopted both by the Department of Health Services and Department of Livestock Services.

Sub-objective B: Enhance the Recipient’s capacity to control infectious diseases that are transmitted between animals and humans under the One Health approach - Substantial

Outputs

- Culled 1.7 million birds in 2013 to control outbreaks of avian influenza - the dominant zoonotic disease in Nepal.
  - According to the ICR, in 2013 the poultry inventory loss had a domestic market value of US$9 million and the accumulated decline in the value of production over a 49 weeks period which was the estimated average time
before the culled birds were replaced and productive was $119.1 million. This meant a total loss to the industry of $128.1 million in 2013.

Poultry farmers were paid a total of US$886,000 as compensation for the culled birds in 2013. Compensation rates varied between 9 and 67 percent depending on their productive value. The ICR reports (para. 33) that there are plans to improve and sustain the culling and compensation aspects of the project.

The evidence for control-specific outputs in the ICR was limited to avian influenza.

Outcomes

- 216 avian influenza (one of the zoonotic main diseases) outbreaks in poultry were contained during the two years of project implementation.
- No human transmission of any zoonoses was observed during the two years of project implementation.

5. Efficiency:

On the basis of the experiences in other countries which had adopted the One Health approach, the PAD highlighted that the potential benefits of the NZCP by reducing the burden of animal diseases, the risk of the incidence of human diseases and preventing the possible occurrence of a pandemic are high (page 36). The NZCP, therefore, was expected to reduce economic, financial, and human losses due to the incidence of zoonotic diseases. However, the PAD noted that at the time of the preparation of the project, the pooled impact of the zoonoses on animals and human beings could not be estimated due to lack of adequate information (page 36).

Nevertheless, the ICR undertook an economic analysis for a specific Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI), one of the six priority zoonotic diseases covered in this project. This disease was selected due to the large number of outbreaks and the effort needed to control it. In addition, as reported in the ICR (page 22), “the NZCP project costs contributed about 97 percent of all HPAI control and prevention funds from the development partners”. This was another justification for the selection of HPAI as the basis for the economic analysis. The economic analyses assessed the net losses avoided with and without the project in the stock of commercial poultry and the subsequent reduction in poultry production because of HPAI outbreaks had limited impact on native poultry production (ICR, Annex 3, page 19).

As summarized in the ICR (pp. 21-23), the economic rate of return calculated for commercial poultry production under different mortality scenarios (because of HPAI) for poultry parent layer and broiler stock ranged from 15% and 40% with the project to 30% and 80% without the project. The economic rates of return varied from 747 percent to 1,362 percent. The net present values ranged from US$53.98 million to US$98.41 million, respectively.

However, information collected for the rate of return analysis through the Knowledge, Attitude and Practice (KAP) surveys was from only 6 districts (out of 75 districts) with an undisclosed sampling methodology. The difference in the timing of the two surveys between the “baseline” and “post exposure” was only two months and hence the measurements of levels of awareness, knowledge, attitude, and practices are questioned on page 26 of the ICR.

Nevertheless, the brief report of the stakeholders’ workshop in Annex 6 suggests that the project provided “value for money”.

On the basis of the estimated economic rates of return for HPAI control based on questionable data, together with the conclusions from the stakeholders’ workshop, the efficiency of this project was rated modest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Available?</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Coverage/Scope*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICR estimate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>747%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

   The relevance of the objective is rated substantial. The relevance of the design is also rated substantial. Despite the abbreviated implementation period of 15 months (instead of two years), the project achieved most of its objectives and its efficacy was rated substantial. The efficiency of the project was, however, rated as modest because of the weakness of the data used for the project's rate of return analysis. Overall, the project's performance had moderate shortcomings. Therefore, the outcome is rated as moderately satisfactory.

   **a. Outcome Rating:** Moderately Satisfactory

---

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

   The PAD stated that the risk to development outcomes was high. One source of risk was the short two year implementation period. Additional sources of risk identified during appraisal included institutional risk associated with possible problems of coordination across the three implementation agencies. This risk was mitigated by actions taken during implementation of the AICP. For instance, the establishment of a single Planning and Monitoring Unit facilitated the collaboration across the three agencies. In addition, the maintenance of the Technical and Steering Committees ensured the sustained effectiveness of the collaboration.

   In general, the institutional capacity of the Department of Livestock Services and the Department of Health Services has been strengthened, resources for compensation of culling operations were made available in 2013-2014 and 2014-2015, a One Health Hub Committee (with 25 members from the Department of Health Services and the Department of Livestock Services) was formed, a Committee to draft One Health Guidelines has been designated (ICR, para. 26), and a concept note for a larger livestock project that will scale up the interventions were developed. This indicates the commitment of the government to enhance the objectives of the NZCP even further.

   The financial risks were mitigated by the financial advances made by the Government. This was the case for financing the recruitment of competent consultants to cover financial management, monitoring and evaluation, and procurement issues.

   In terms of diseases risks, 216 outbreaks were effectively contained due to the strengthened capacity in the Department of Livestock Services and the Department of Health Services. Moreover, as highlighted in the ICR (page 30), the Government of Nepal has made available NPR 95,551,000 Crores (US $100,000) to Bird Flu Control Project for FY 2014/15 in order to support and internalize the gains made by the AICP and NZCP. However, if adequate resource are not provided in a sustainable manner, if the leadership does not continue to be strong, and if the recurrence of outbreaks declines, there is a risk that attention to the prevention of zoonosis may weaken.

   **a. Risk to Development Outcome Rating:** Moderate

---

8. **Assessment of Bank Performance:**

   **a. Quality at entry:**

   The ICR noted that the achievements, organization, and structure of the earlier Avian Influenza Control Project (AICP) informed several aspects of the design of NZCP (para 14). For instance, government officials from the implementing agencies who were involved in the AICP continued to work on the NZCP. In addition, the Technical Committee and Steering Committee structures established for the AICP were kept.

   On the other hand, the project needed restructuring in order to re-balance the allocation of project funds from training to the costs of culling (including compensation). In this regard, the ICR reported (para 46) that the Bank was responsive to changing needs. For instance, it supported the reallocation of AICP funds to support the Government's culling operations as recommended by the FAO study.

   **Quality-at-Entry Rating:** Satisfactory

   **b. Quality of supervision:**

   The Bank supported the implementation of the project by regularly deploying public health and animal health specialists to supervise the project. In addition, the ICR states that the task team leader (TTL) in the Nepal Country Office provided valuable support. The Bank's support for implementation included commissioning a study on the avian flu outbreak in January 2014. This study carried out by the FAO Investment Center recommended culling operations. The FAO study also recommended continuation of support for the One Health approach and compensation for culled birds according to their market value.

   The ICR recognized the contributions of the establishment of a cross-cutting Planning and Monitoring unit, a
Steering Committee, and a Technical Committee to facilitate the coordination of activities in the three implementing agencies under the leadership of the Department of Livestock Services (DOLS).

**Quality of Supervision Rating:** Satisfactory  
**Overall Bank Performance Rating:** Satisfactory

### 9. Assessment of Borrower Performance:

**a. Government Performance:**
Since the EC Trust Fund proposed for the financing this project had to be closed on June 30, 2014, the Government worked rapidly to prepare the project proposal in two months. However, the project experienced considerable delays in disbursement. For instance, the first Government disbursement was not made until a year after the project was approved. According to the TTL, the delays were attributed primarily to the Government's disbursement-related inaction for several months. The main reason for the inaction was its focus on the elections in 2012. However, in order to minimize the adverse impact of the delays in disbursement, the government made advances to finance project start-ups.

The Government's decision to keep the personnel previously involved in the AICP also strengthened its ownership of the project. In addition, the government's recognition of the importance of keeping the Technical and Steering Committees (established as part of the implementation of the AICP) facilitated the implementation of the NZCP. It also reflected the Government's commitment to institutionalize the One Health approach as it relates to zoonotic diseases. In this regard, according to the ICR (para. 25), the Government established a permanent coordination body for the AI Control program and allocated 200 million Nepali Rupees in 2013-2014 and 100 million Nepali Rupees for 2014-2015 to finance its function.

**Government Performance Rating** Moderately Satisfactory

**b. Implementing Agency Performance:**
The Department of Livestock Services, the Department of Health Services, and National Agricultural Research Council were involved in the implementation of the project. The implementation activities of the three agencies were coordinated by the Department of Livestock Services (DOLS). DOLS carried out its responsibilities by addressing financial management, procurement, monitoring and evaluation issues relatively effectively and in a timely fashion. This was attributed partly to the dedication of the Project Manager in DOLS who stayed in his position throughout the project and after its completion.

According to the ICR (para 49), the National Agricultural Research Council was proactive in implementation activities during the first six months of the project. For instance, it started planning and implementation despite lack of funds during the first six months of the project. Of the three agencies, the role of the Department of Health Services in the implementation of the project was the most limited. For example, though it focused on procurement of diagnostic equipment and upgrading of the central veterinary laboratory to a higher bio-security standard, there were considerable delays in completing these aspects of the project.

Nevertheless, the Department of Health Services was fully engaged in the institutionalization of the One Health approach and the activities it was responsible for were completed before the end of the project. However, the ICR did not provide information on the factors that led to the delays in carrying out its responsibilities throughout the project.

**Implementing Agency Performance Rating:** Satisfactory  
**Overall Borrower Performance Rating:** Moderately Satisfactory

### 10. M&E Design, Implementation, & Utilization:

**a. M&E Design:**
The PAD (and the Grant Agreement) specified that the Department of Livestock Services would be strengthened to undertake the Monitoring and Evaluation (M & E) system developed for the AICP. The Department of Livestock Services would be responsible for carrying out the M&E system for the project. The Department of Livestock Services would be responsible for developing and implementing the M&E system, which would include the establishment of a monitoring and evaluation committee, the development of monitoring and evaluation plans, and the collection and analysis of data on the project's performance.

**Implementing Agency Performance Rating:** Satisfactory  
**Overall Borrower Performance Rating:** Moderately Satisfactory
Services, the Department of Health Services, and the National Agricultural Research Council were responsible for the collection, reporting, and utilization of data. According to the TTL, an M&E team was set up (through the recruitment of consultants) within the Planning and Monitoring Unit (PMU) which was based in DOLS. The team reported directly to the Technical Committee on progress in implementation. In particular, the team was designed to provide technical support and training for the three implementation agencies and to identify bottlenecks in implementation and disbursement.

b. M&E Implementation:

The ICR reports that 725 monitoring activities were completed. However, it does not elaborate on what these activities were in a prioritized and persuasive manner.

c. M&E Utilization:

The ICR does not discuss how information from the M&E Unit was utilized. Indeed, the ICR reports that the M&E Unit identified bottlenecks in disbursement and implementation and supported the Project Steering Committee as well as the Project Technical Committee through sharing of information and providing technical support and administrative advice. Nevertheless, the ICR does not present the details of the disbursement and implementation bottlenecks identified and how they were resolved (using information provided by the M&E Unit), the nature of the technical support and administrative advice provided, nor the types of the information shared.

M&E Quality Rating: Modest

11. Other Issues

a. Safeguards:

According to the PAD, (para. 70) since the project focused on national capacity building, it was not expected to generate irrevocable negative environment impact. In this regard, the PAD highlighted that similar to the AICP, the NZCP was also assessed as a category B project. As a result, only the Environment Assessment OP/BP 4.02 was triggered. The PAD stated that the limited environmental consequences involved the construction of live-bird/meat markets and the collection of samples/specimen all of which were expected to be managed by an updated Environmental Management Plan (EMP).

The information in the ICR on the actual environmental consequences of the projects and the implementation of the updated EMP was limited.

b. Fiduciary Compliance:

There were considerable delays in disbursement. The ICR does not explain adequately why the government took a long time to make the first disbursement. On the other hand, the TTL explained that the delay was primarily due to the focus of the Government on the elections in 2012. The limited grace period for disbursement of only one month after the project closing date also presented additional challenges for the project. The Financial Management capacity improved over time partly due to the recruitment of consultants to work on procurement, financial management, and monitoring and evaluation.

In addition, the establishment of a single and well-coordinated Financial Management System and advances of some financial resources from Government Units to finance project start-ups facilitated the timely resolutions of some problems created by the delays. At the end of the project, a total of US$8.46 million was disbursed. This represents 84.5 percent of the original project cost of US$10.00 million. The savings amounting to US$1.54 million were due to the appreciation of the US Dollar during the two year period.

c. Unintended Impacts (positive or negative):

None

d. Other:

12. Ratings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICR</th>
<th>IEG Review</th>
<th>Reason for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Disagreement/Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Moderately Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk to Development Outcome</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank Performance</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrower Performance</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of ICR</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
- 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.

### Lessons:

The ICR identified seven key lessons learnt. Of these, the following lessons are noteworthy despite the fact that they repeat similar lessons from other projects:

- **The competence and commitment of the project management team is an important factor in the success of any project.** This is not a new lesson. However it was a particularly relevant lesson in this project because the dedication of project management and staff and their effective collaboration with the World Bank was crucial in ensuring that the project's objectives were achieved despite the long delays in releasing funds. This reinforces lessons from many other projects, namely the importance of committed high quality leadership for successful implementation.

- **A strong Monitoring and Evaluation system is critical for coordinating activities across implementing agencies but this does not ensure comprehensive data collection.** Again this is not a new lesson. The decision to centralize the monitoring, evaluation, and planning unit (in the Department of Livestock Services designated as the key implementing agency) promoted accountability, reduced transaction costs, and strengthened collaboration across the three implementing agencies thus enhancing the implementation of the One Health approach. However, data collected were not sufficiently comprehensive.

- **Project-related surveys should be timely and systematic.** The Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice surveys were not carried out in a timely and systematic manner. As a result, it was not possible to use the survey to assess the views of the potential beneficiaries on the performance of the project.

### Assessment Recommended?

- Yes
- No

### Comments on Quality of ICR:

The ICR is well written and covered the most important issues. However, the analysis and presentation in the ICR was not guided by the results framework and monitoring provided in page 14 of the PAD. Accordingly, the evidence presented in the ICR was primarily descriptive. For instance, the linkages between inputs, outputs, and outcomes in each component were not well developed. In addition, the ICR should have explained the reasons for the
considerable delays in Government disbursement and provided specific evidence that explained the success of the project despite the delays.

a. Quality of ICR Rating: Satisfactory