Report Number : ICRR0021174

1. Project Data

Project ID	Project Name	
P101434	NE-Transport Sector Program SIM (FY08)	
Country	**Practice Area(Lead)**	**Additional Financing**
Niger	Transport & Digital Development	P131107,P131107

L/C/TF Number(s)	Closing Date (Original)	Total Project Cost (USD)
IDA-52210,IDA-H3780	15-Dec-2012	30,000,000.00
Bank Approval Date	**Closing Date (Actual)**	
29-Apr-2008	30-Jun-2016	

	IBRD/IDA (USD)	Grants (USD)
Original Commitment	30,000,000.00	0.00
Revised Commitment	49,300,410.97	0.00
Actual	47,137,378.86	0.00

Prepared by	Reviewed by	ICR Review Coordinator	Group
Maria Vanessa Corlazzoli	John R. Eriksson	Christopher David Nelson	IEGSD (Unit 4)

2. Project Objectives and Components

a. Objectives

The two objectives of the project are to: (i) improve the physical access of rural populations to market and services on selected unpaved sections of the Recipients (Niger's) national road network, and (ii) strengthen the Recipients (Niger's) institutional framework, management and implementation of road maintenance. (Financial Agreement, 2008, p. 6; and Financial Agreement 2013, p. 5).

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

No

c. Will a split evaluation be undertaken?

No

d. Components

Component 1: Periodic maintenance and spot rehabilitation of unpaved roads (Cost at appraisal was estimated at US$24.9 million, but after additional financing of US$15.95 million it came to a total estimated cost of US$40.85 million. At closing the total cost was US$40.77 million). This component aimed at improving access to market and services in densely populated areas with high economic potential. It included the following sub-components: (i) preparation of technical, economic, and environmental studies (ii) execution and supervision of civil works (iii) and monitoring and evaluation of the project (PAD, p vii and para 21.1).

Component 2: Institutional support to main transport sector players through the provision of capacity building and assistance in management and execution of road maintenance assistance. (Appraisal cost required was estimated at US$5.1 million, but after additional financing of US$3.69 million, the new total was estimated cost of US$8.79 million. At closing the total cost was US$8.22 million). This component aimed to (i) provide technical assistance and multi-level training in order to build capacity to manage the project, and (ii) provide equipment and small activities for programming and planning related to road maintenance and safety (PAD, p. vii and para 21.2).

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

Project Cost. At appraisal, the total cost of the project was estimated at US$30 million (PAD, p. vi). At closing the total project cost was US$48.99 million (ICR, p. 14).

Financing. The appraised amount of finance needed for this project was estimated at US$30 million or 18.8 million in Special Drawing Rights (PAD, p. vi, and Financial Agreement, p. 1). These funds were provided through an IDA grant in the form of a Sector Investment and Maintenance Loan (SIM). On April 15, 2013 additional financing was provided in the form of an IDA Credit of US$19.5 million or 12.7 million in Special Drawing Rights. The total financing for this project was US$49.5 million or 31.49 in Special Drawing Rights (Financial Agreement 2013, p. 1 and ICR, p.2). The actual disbursement at the end of the project was US$48.87 million or 31.31 million in SDR (ICR, p.14 and p. 55).

Borrower Contribution. The 2008 legal agreement does not stipulate that the Borrower had to make a financial contribution. The PAD states that no counterpart funds were required for the project (PAD, p. 21). The 2013 financial agreement states that the Government of Niger needs to contribute US$ 140,000 (Financial Agreement, 2013, p.12). At the end of the project, the borrower contributed US$ 120,000 (ICR, p.14).

Dates. The project was approved on 04/29/2008 and became effective on 09/10/2008. It underwent a midterm review on 01/28/2011. A 12-month extension was granted in November 2012 to move the closing date from 12/15/2012 to 12/15/2013. On April 15, 2013 the project received additional financing and the project end date was extended from 12/15/2013 to 12/15/2015. An additional six-months extension was granted to allow for the reallocation of credits and the closing date was moved from 12/15/2015 to 06/30/2016.

3. Relevance of Objectives & Design

a. Relevance of Objectives

Country Context. Niger is the second poorest country in the world, ranking 187 out of 188 countries in the 2016 Human Development Index. It is a land-locked country, where more than 80% of the population lives in rural areas. It is estimated that two thirds of the rural population are isolated from markets and basic services. At appraisal, only 25% of its 10,697km of roads were paved.

In 1999, Niger set up an Autonomous Road Maintenance Fund (CAFER: Caisse Autonome de Financement de lEntretier Routier), which is responsible for financing maintenance of national road networks and rural roads. In 2004, Niger developed a National Transportation Strategy and prioritized increasing road capital. In 2006, the government created an Action Plan for Niger's Rural Development Strategy which emphasized the relationship between rural roads and marketing agricultural products. The 2011 Niger Strategy for Development and Security in the Sahel-Sahara Areas of Niger also highlighted the need to improve transportation to improve economic and production outcomes.

Despite these strategies and the government's commitments, at appraisal, CAFER was unable to meet organizational expectations and funding needs (PAD, para 4). The PAD reported that the government had accumulated a backlog of US$ 105 million for periodic maintenance of priority level roads (PAD, para 3). At appraisal, CAFER was only able to mobilize US$ 4.9 million (PAD, para 4).

Alignment with Country Strategy. The objectives of the project support Niger's Country Assistant Strategy (CAS) of 2008-2011. The CAS had the following three objectives: (i) accelerate sustainable growth that is equitably shared, (ii) develop human capital through equal access to quality social services, and (iii) cross-cutting themes of governance. The project objectives supported outcomes related to the: (i) strengthening of economic infrastructure to promote growth, access to services and regional integration and (ii) improving access of rural population to basic health and nutrition services.

The objective of the project also supported the current Niger Country Partnership Strategy (CPS) 2013-2016. The current CPS has the following three objectives: (i) promote resilient growth, (ii) reduce vulnerability and (iii) mainstream gender and strengthen governance capacity for public service delivery (CPS 2013-2016). Specifically, the objective of the project supported outcomes related to increasing agricultural productivity and improving economic infrastructure.

Both the CAS 2008-2011 and the CPS 2013-2018 identified as key development challenges the lack of economic infrastructure, including transport corridors to market (CAS, para 27) and high transportation costs

(CPS, para 48). Therefore, achieving the project's objective would support outcomes of the Country Partnership Strategy and also address a key economic and development challenge.

Rating
Substantial

b. Relevance of Design

When it came to the first objective, the results framework had clear linkages between the activities, expected outcomes, and objective. There were also sufficient activities designed and included in the project in order to achieve the project's second objective of strengthening Niger's institutional framework, management and implementation of road maintenance .

Rating
Substantial

4. Achievement of Objectives (Efficacy)

Objective 1
Objective
To improve the physical access of rural populations to market and services on selected unpaved sections of the Recipient's (Niger's) national road network

Rationale
Output
The project maintained or rehabilitated a total of 1,058km of rural roads (Original Target 1,056 km, Target Met) (ICR, p. 12) and 477,822 people were direct beneficiaries of the project.

Outcomes
As a result of the road rehabilitation, it was estimated that an additional 477,822 rural residents had access to all-season roads, of which 245,868 were female (Target: 416,153; Female Target: 213,855 ,Target Met, ICR p.11). The Niger road accessibility index also increased from 33.4% to 39.5% (Baseline 33.4%, Target 40.9%, ICR, p. 11).

According to the ICR, rural residents gained access to 55 markets and overall market participation increased as a result of more people having access to connecting roads. (ICR, p. 3 and Bank Staff Interview 2018). Access to services, in particular to 65 health centers and 239 schools, also improved. Famine-prone zones and low agricultural productivity areas became accessible for food distribution by NGOs or by the

Government (ICR, p. 3).

The project also produced economic benefits. For instance, average travel times on the three road sections targeted by the project decreased. Results included: (i) from Balleyara to Banibangou travel time decreased from 9 hours to 5 hours (Target 5 hours), (ii) from Kollo to Kirtachi it decreased from 2.45 hours to 1.5 hours (Target 1.5 hours), and (iii) from Tessaoua to Gabaouri-Khorgom it decreased from 3 hours to 1 hour (Target 2.5 hours) (Targets Met, ICR p.3). Therefore, the project improved transportation efficiency, reduced fuel related costs and increased overall efficiency. A total of 1,097 people were employed through short-term opportunities throughout the life of the project (Target 778, Target met, ICR pg. 12).

Rating

Substantial

Objective 2

Objective

To strengthen the Recipient’s (Niger’s) institutional framework, management and implementation of road maintenance.

Rationale

Outputs

The project financed a series of trainings, including:

- 32 staff trained in procurement, road asset management, appraisal and monitoring of projects, social and environmental aspect of projects, HDM-4, and contract management.
- Workshop for 396 staffs on mitigation measures of social and environmental impact of civil works, road fund resource mobilization thru toll fees and overload fines, new driving codes, and road safety.
- Training of inspectors of driver licenses.
- Training of trainers of CFTTR in transport facilitation, management of transport company.
- Training in Geotechnical Engineering of roads.
- Training of law enforcement officers on road safety.
- 147 staff trainers trained in improving truck drivers driving skills, data collection, management of transport and logistic, economy of transport, and contract management.
- 12 staff trained in webmaster, M&E of the project, Safeguards, travel to Benin to learn road fund management, risk management of contractors, road asset management, and advanced procurement. (Bank Staff Interview, 2018)

The project also acquired equipment, including one truck and minibus, to reinforce the capacity of the National Directorate of Road Maintenance and identify road maintenance needs. The project provided computers, printers, and software for the management and digitization of transport documents

(Bank Staff Interview, 2018).

Finally, the project financed sector studies such as: the National Transport Strategy and the Niger River Navigability Study, Study to Establish Virtual Freight Exchange for the Nigerien Council of Transport Users (ICR, p. 5). The studies helped the government of Niger plan for future transportation projects. For instance, the Niger River Navigability Study aimed to inform future design of river transport (Bank Staff Interview, 2018). The study on Virtual Freight Exchange was created to inform how to establish a virtual exchange mechanism between shippers and transporters (Bank Staff Interview, 2018).

Outcomes

In May 2013, parliament approved legislation to convert CAFER into a second generation Road Fund. This action earmarked revenue from petrol levy for road maintenance. The revenue would be transferred directly to the Road Fund, as opposed to funneled through the Treasury.

The ICR reported an increased revenue mobilized by CAFER from US$3.5 million in 2008 to US$10.36 billion in 2016 (Target US$7.5 million, Target Met, ICR, pg. 12). The annual national road budget maintenance absorption rate increased from 80% in 2007 to 97.6% at the end of the project in 2016. (Target 95%, Target Met, ICR, p. 12).

However, the ICR also reported that the government of Niger has shown a chronic lack of commitment to closing the funding gap of the CAFER. (ICR, p.9). It reported that while there was continued provision of funding for the Road Funds in the budget, the allocation was lower than forecasted and the release of funds was irregular (ICR, p. 9). Therefore, while there were efforts to improve institutional framework related to the financing of road maintenance, the application of these was inconsistent.

The project also aimed at strengthening the capacity of the implementing agency in order to strengthen management and implementation of road maintenance. A total of 589 people received training through this project. According to Bank staff the trainings in asset management and acquisition of equipment helped to boost the absorption capacity of the road maintenance (Bank Staff Interview 2018). The project contributed to the percentage of roads in good or fair condition within the national road network from 69% in 2008 to 81.6% in 2016 (Target 80%, Target Met, ICR p. 11).

While training and technical assistance was provided and contract management improved over time, internal control systems were never implemented (ICR, p. 7). The ICR reports that overall high-turnover of staff led to a lack of focus and productivity with consequences related to: (i) protracted procurement processes, (ii) weak supervision of contracts by the government and lack of enforcement of contract clauses and (iii) weak quality of control of the acquisition of equipment and validation studies (ICR, p.7).

Overall, as a result of the project, a binding legal framework was created to support the mobilization of revenue for road maintenance. In spite of several delays, the project also built high quality roads and there was improvement in the absorption rate of road maintenance annual budget. While government staff received technical assistance and training to support project implementation, weak internal control systems and project management remained throughout the life of the project.

Rating
Substantial

5. Efficiency

At project closing, efficiency was determined by comparing Economic Internal Rates of Return (EIRR) before and after the project. The PAD and ICR used Road Economic Decision Model (RED) analyses to estimate the EIRR at appraisal. It used data from the following sources: project financing, kilometers of road built or improved, traffic volumes, vehicle fleet characteristics (economic unit costs and utilization and loading).

At appraisal, the estimated EIRR was 28 percent, based on an initial financial investment of US$12.6 million, which would yield a Net Present Value (NPV) of US$6.081 million (PAD, para 11). However, the project had cost overruns, which required additional financing. During the additional financing, the 5 road sections to be financed were reevaluated with an average EIRR of 16 percent, thus lowering the estimated overall EIRR of the entire project from 28 percent to 26 percent (IRC, p.16). At project closing, the EIRR was 17 percent because of higher estimated construction costs and lower traffic (ICR, p. 5).

The ICR also reported that it used efficiency analysis and cost-effectiveness approaches to assess the efficiency of road maintenance (mainly the spot improvement method). The ICR did not include analysis of actual social benefits, such as increased access to schools, health clinics, or connectivity to famine-prone zones. These social benefits were alluded to in the PAD, but not included in the ICR analysis (PAD, Annex 9 para 12).

The project also incurred additional administrative costs as it took twice as long to complete (original time estimate 4 years, completed within 8.2 years). The project experienced a delay of 5 to 6 months as a result of the 2010 coup d'état. The project experienced procurement delays as a result of the document approval and signature procedures and the government's overall slow implementation of the bank recommendation to improvement the process (Bank staff Interview, 2018).

Therefore, efficieny of this project is rated as modest as a result of the lower EIRR at project closing (17 percent) than at appraisal (28 percent). The project also experienced administrative and procurement delays. While it is likely that the project improved social benefits as a result of this project, this analysis was not included in the ICR.

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:

	Rate Available?	Point value (%)	*Coverage/Scope (%)
Appraisal		0	0 ☐Not Applicable
ICR Estimate		0	0 ☐Not Applicable

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

6. Outcome

The outcome of this project is rated moderately satisfactory. The relevance of this project's objectives is rated substantial and necessary to achieve key country priorities outlined in the CAS and Niger Country Partnership Strategy. The relevance of the design was also rated substantial and the design of the project had adequate linkages between activities and expected outcomes.

The achievement of the first and second objective is rated substantial. Evidence showed that the project built high quality roads that were being used and rural populations had increased access to markets and social services. That said, in spite of technical assistance and training, the project experienced weak internal control systems and project management..

Efficiency is rated modest for lack of sufficient justification of economic efficiency. The EIRR did not improve as a result of the project. In fact, at appraisal the EIRR was 28 percent, after additional funding at 26 percent, and at project completion at 17 percent. The project also incurred additional administrative costs as it took twice as long to complete the project than originally planned.

a. Outcome Rating

Moderately Satisfactory

7. Rationale for Risk to Development Outcome Rating

The Government - The Government of Niger has not demonstrated enough commitment to funding the Road Fund throughout the life of the project. (ICR, p.9). As a result, it is likely that the need for road maintenance will continue to outpace the disbursement and allocation of funds.

Implementing Agency - The project sought to improve the capacity of the implementing agency to manage and implement road maintenance. Despite the Bank's efforts, guidance, and recommendations, the implementing agency was slow to respond and improve. Improvements related to procurement and contracts were marginal throughout the life of the project.

Financial - The government of Niger drafted legislation that the fuel levy would be directly transferred to the CAFER for continued road maintenance. But as stated above, the allocation of funds has been inconsistent.

Security - Conflict in neighboring countries spilled over into Niger and compromised internal security. Increased insecurity may slow down the economy and therefore the government's revenues (ICR, p.9).

Donor- Road maintenance and improvement of transportation is a priority of several bilateral donors and institutions, including the European Commission as seen in their commitment to include efficiency conditions into the release of budget support for Niger in the 10th European Development Fund (EFD). Therefore, it is likely that multiple donors will continue to influence and pressure Niger into continuing to focus on infrastructure improvement, including road maintenance.

a. Risk to Development Outcome Rating

Substantial

8. Assessment of Bank Performance

a. Quality-at-Entry

The PAD reported that the Bank designed the project based on lessons learned and experiences in similar projects in Niger and Africa (PAD, para 23). It incorporated findings from the Transport Sector Review carried out in 2005 and the predecessor project - Transport and Infrastructure Rehabilitation Project (ICR, p.1). These lessons included: keeping the project design achievable and straightforward, excluding political conditionality from contracting procedures, and liaising with other donors working in the sector. As a result, the project was conceived as part of donor support to the Transport Sector Program in Niger and funded road maintenance works between the EU's 9th European Development Fund (EDF) operation and the 10th EDF.

The Bank's assessed the construction material costs in the design studies (ICR, p.6). However, the 2008-2009 economic crisis led to additional costs related to difference in exchange-rates. Future assessments of construction material should take into account unexpected exogenous factors, such as rain, fluctuation on currency exchanges, etc. While the Bank had adequate preparation of instruments and contractual clauses as related to safeguards, additional training and support could have been provided to the implementing agency (ICR, p. 10).

Quality-at-Entry Rating

Moderately Satisfactory

b. Quality of supervision

The project experienced a series of delays and cost overruns. Some of the project delays were caused by inadequate assessments of contractor's technical and managerial capacity. As a result, the Bank drafted contracts that included smaller and shorter road length requirements. Some of the delays could have been foreseen and preventable. In order to address the cost overruns, the Bank team first revised cost allocation and then proceeded with seeking additional funding (ICR, p.6).

The Bank introduced recommendations and effectiveness deadlines in order to address shortcomings by the Implementing agency. The recommendations were not adequately implemented in a timely manner. The MTR also included a detailed list on environmental and safeguard recommendations (ICR, p.8). It was only after the second phase of the civil works and additional funding was committed that the government of Niger and the implementing agency made managerial, procurement, and environmental or safeguard improvements.

Quality of Supervision Rating

Moderately Satisfactory

Overall Bank Performance Rating

Moderately Satisfactory

9. Assessment of Borrower Performance

a. Government Performance

The government demonstrated unsatisfactory commitment to the project and its objectives. According to the ICR, the government of Niger has shown a chronic lack of commitment to closing the funding gap of the CAFER. (ICR, p.9). While the project started promptly within four months of Board approval and, in 2008, the government of Niger included road maintenance resources in its budget (ICR, p.5); funding to the CAFER has not been consistently allocated to CAFER throughout the life of the project. For example, in 2010 the CAFER did not receive the funded requested. It was only after the European Union tied release of funding that resources were given to CAFER. Moreover, it was only after the Bank introduced an effectiveness condition in its additional financing of 2013 that the Government of Niger established a legal requirement to directly pay CAFER from the fuel levy and paid 5.9 billion CFA owed to CAFER (ICR, p.6). The effectiveness deadline had to be extended twice due to delays in establishing the legal texts, which became effective on January 10, 2014 and approved by the Parliament on May 23, 2014 (ICR, p. 7).

As reported in the ICR, while there continues to be a provision of funding for the Road Funds in the budget, the allocation is lower than forecasted and the release of funds is irregular (ICR, p. 9).

Government Performance Rating

Unsatisfactory

b. Implementing Agency Performance

The implementing agency was the *Cellule de Coordination du Programme Sectoriel des Transports* (CC/PST) within the Ministry of Transport. The CCPST was responsible for the implementation of their own sub-components, procurement, coordination, and assistance (PAD, Annex 6, para.5). The different components were implemented by the following agencies: DGTP (General Directorate of Public Works), DEP (Directorate of Studies and Programs), DTT (Directorate of Ground Transport), CAFER, and DAC (Directorate of Civil Aviation) (PAD, Annex 6, para.5).

During the first two years of the project implementation, the CC/PST exerted weak contract management, supervision, and control (ICR, p.7). Implementing agency shortcomings included: insufficient documentation, inadequate time planning for civil works, and reporting difficulties.. There were also non-compliance issues related to environmental and social safeguard management (ICR, p.7). The implementing agency did not implement the Bank's recommendations to address these shortcomings prior to the February 2010 coup.

In September 2011, the government of Niger addressed the weaknesses listed above and nominated two technical staff to the project. While contract management improved, internal control systems were never implemented (ICR, p. 7).

Overall high-turnover of staff led to a lack of focus and productivity with consequences related to; (i) protracted procurement processes, (ii) weak supervision of contracts by the government and lack enforcement of contract clauses; and (iii) weak quality control of the acquisition of equipment and validation studies (ICR, p.7).

Implementing Agency Performance Rating

Moderately Unsatisfactory

Overall Borrower Performance Rating

Unsatisfactory

10. M&E Design, Implementation, & Utilization

a. M&E Design

The objectives were clearly specified, but there were insufficient indicators to assess the second objective: strengthen the Recipient's (Niger's) institutional framework, management and implementation of road maintenance. There were two intermediate indicators that assessed increased revenue mobilization and annual execution rate as they related to the second objective. However, these did not provide enough guidance on expectations related to improvement of the institutional framework, management and implementation.

A baseline survey was conducted during the preparation phase, and it included a Rural Access Index (RAI), which contributed to setting targets (PAD, para 30).

b. M&E Implementation

During the additional funding process, one intermediate indicator was dropped and another one added (ICR, p. 8). The indicators changed were:

- Roads in good or fair condition as a share of the total classified network (Indicator Added)\
- Number of direct beneficiaries (Indicator Added).
- Number of people benefiting from short-term jobs (One intermediate indicator added).
- Increased daily traffic by category and sub-category of users (One intermediate indicator dropped)
-

The ICR reports that the quality of data was generally accurate but collection methods needed to be revised for two indicators (ICR, p.8). For example, the number of project beneficiaries was recalculated to take into account net increase, instead of focusing on cumulative value. The Rural Access Index was also adjusted to measure only the target areas and take into account only the road selection improved by IDA (ICR, p.8).

The ICR does not include information on who was responsible for overseeing the M&E function or data quality for decision making.

c. M&E Utilization

According to the ICR, monitoring and evaluation data related to revenue mobilized and budget executed for road maintenance was used to inform policy dialogue leading to financing frameworks (ICR, p. 9).

There were some design flaws in this project, particularly around the articulation of the second objective and linkages between activities and the second objective. Better selection of indicators could have led to improved assessment of capacity building activities as they related to the second objective. The M&E system appears to be focused on only collecting project-level impact and outcome indicators, as opposed to collecting data in order to manage the project more effectively.

M&E Quality Rating

Modest

11. Other Issues

a. Safeguards

The project was classified as Environmental Category B Partial Assessment. At appraisal, it triggered the following safeguards: Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01), and Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12) (PAD pp 16-17).

The project experienced non-compliance issues regarding the environment and safeguard management. In January 2010, the Bank General Directorate of Public mission report noted that (i) the agreements between the implementing agency (CC/PST) and the General Directorate of Public and the Office of the Environmental Assessment and Impact Evaluation (BIIIO) had not been signed ; (ii) the Environmental and Social Division of the DGTP was not engaged in the project; (iii) the majority of the first phase work had started without the approval execution plan of the ESMPs prepared by the contractor; and (iv) all the entities involved were in need of capacity building on environmental and social measures to fulfill their role in the project (ICR, pp 7-8). The environmental and social compliance audit for the first phase of the project also noted improper implementation of mitigation measures by the contractors and a lack of safeguard specialists on the team. The environmental and safeguard shortcomings listed above were resolved prior to the second phase of the civil works.

The second environmental and social audit conducted on April 2016 identified shortcomings in the two base camps managements. Some of the shortcomings included: "worker's safety and sanitation provisions, depletion and contamination of groundwater, compensation for damage to crops and other property, and site restoration due to detours during construction and the exploitation of one quarry" (ICR, p.8).

b. Fiduciary Compliance

The ICR does not include sufficient information as it relates to financial management control procedures. It does not include information on audit covenants or if there were overdue audits. Additional information was provided during the Bank Staff Interview including:

- No audit recommendations pending at the end of the project.
- All the financial audits resulted in certification of the project account and recommendations implemented.
- There were no issue of misuse of funds or corruption
- Overall financial management rated satisfactory or moderately satisfactory in the ISR (Bank Staff Interview, 2018)

The ICR does mention that there was weak supervision of contracts, lack of enforcement of contract clauses, protracted procurement delays, and weak quality control of acquisition of equipment and validation studies (ICR, p.7). During the first phase of the project there was one case of collision between two (2) bidders, which led to the rebidding of a Lot 5 (Bank Staff Interview). Overall, the procurement process was very slow due to the documentation and signature procedures and this resulted in major delays (Bank Staff Interview). The government was also slow in implementing the Bank's recommendations to improvement the process (Bank Staff Interview).

Disbursements were suspended between February and May 2010 due to a political coup d'etat. The political uncertainties contributed to weaknesses in works contract management (ICR, p.7).

c. Unintended impacts (Positive or Negative)

None

d. Other

None

12. Ratings

Ratings	ICR	IEG	Reason for Disagreements/Comment
Outcome	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	---
Risk to Development Outcome		Substantial	---
Bank Performance		Moderately Satisfactory	---
Borrower Performance		Unsatisfactory	---
Quality of ICR		Substantial	---

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.

13. Lessons

The following three lessons learned were derived from the ICR:

1 . **The size and scope of a contract should take into account local capacity and experience**. For example, at the beginning of this contract, local contractors did not have the managerial or technical skills to execute a large road works contract, which led to delays and overrun of costs. Contacts that were smaller (road lengths of 50Km) proved to be more effectively executed (ICR, p.10).

2 . **Risk assessments should take into account technical design, such as construction material costs.** For example, this project when designed did not take into account country-specific construction material costs and potential unexpected contingencies. For instance, the project experienced overrun of costs due to a heavy rainy season that took place between studies and civil works. Budgetary planning did not take into account the impact of the rainy season on construction material costs.

3 . **Use policy or effectiveness conditionality on Investment Policy Financing only if Government**

committed to make change. For example, the additional funding for this project introduced an effectiveness condition for the Government to pass a law directly transferring fuel levy revenue to the Road Fund. While this was an important accomplishment of the project, it was achieved through considerable difficulty, six years after the project's approval and under duress (i.e. with serious threat of withdrawal of Bank support to complete an unfinished investment) (ICR, p.9).

14. Assessment Recommended?

No

15. Comments on Quality of ICR

The ICR was concise and for the most part accurate (as far as it could be determined). That said, the report needed to include more specific information, detail, and data.

Sections that were candid included Key Factors Which Affected Implementation and Outcomes, Environment and Safeguards, and Lessons Learned. There were small inconsistencies between the narrative and Annex 2: Result Framework Analysis.

Qualitative information related to efficacy, in particular, related to social benefits, including to access to road and improved management, should have been included in order to adequately assess achievement of objectives. But given the fact that this was an Agile pilot ICR, IEG acknowledges that the team did a reasonable job in holding the assessment together given the reporting constraints.

a. Quality of ICR Rating

Substantial