



| | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| 1. Project Data : | | | |
| OEDID: | C2468 | | |
| Project ID: | P010415 | | |
| Project Name : | 1992 Flood Damage Restoration Project | | |
| Country: | Pakistan | | |
| Sector: | Other Industry | | |
| L/C Number: | C2468 | | |
| Partners involved : | Asian Development Bank | | |
| Prepared by : | David Greene (consultant), OEDCR | | |
| Reviewed by : | Roger Robinson | | |
| Group Manager : | Rene Vandendries, Acting Manager | | |
| Date Posted : | 08/21/1998 | | |

2. Project Objectives, Financing, Costs and Components :

The IDA credit, approved in early 1993, provided US\$ 100 million to assist the Government restore infrastructure destroyed or damaged by floods in the second half 1992. This marked the fourth time IDA has provided emergency assistance to Pakistan to repair flood damage. The project was part of a package of assistance that also included US\$ 100 million from the ADB and US\$ 50 million from ongoing Bank/IDA projects that financed activities similar to those included in this project. Estimated project costs were US\$ 483 million. Part I of the project, with an estimated cost of US\$ 379 million, covered a three-year time slice of the program to repair roads and bridges, irrigation, drainage and flood protection works, primary education and basic health facilities. Part II included the cost of repair of infrastructure provided by government enterprises. The cost of this part was to be borne by the enterprises themselves. A flood monitoring system, essential for the sustained operation of restored structures, was financed under an ADB Flood Protection Sector Project. The Federal Flood Commission was responsible for overall coordination of the project. The planning, design and implementation of the projects was in the hands of provincial agencies. Even after added expenditures resulting from a flood in 1994, assignment of part of the rehabilitation to KfW, and devaluation of the rupee resulted in canceling about US\$ 10 million of the IDA credit.

3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives :

The main objective of the project, restoration of vital infrastructure, was largely achieved. The quality of work compared favorably with similar works carried out by implementing agencies under other programs. Irrigation works were repaired; damaged roads and bridges were opened to traffic.

4. Significant Achievements :

The project was executed satisfactorily, and vital economic infrastructure was restored.

5. Significant Shortcomings :

The project got off to a slow start. The flood caused widespread damage over much of the country. The project involved 13 implementing agencies, many of which were unfamiliar with bank procedures. The agencies suffered from high staff turnover. Preparation of subprojects was generally poor and monitoring of implementation was deficient. Disbursements were delayed by slow filing of documentation and approval.

| 6. Ratings : | ICR | OED Review | Reason for Disagreement /Comments |
|-----------------------------|--------------|-------------------|--|
| Outcome : | Satisfactory | Satisfactory | |
| Institutional Dev. : | Partial | Modest | |
| Sustainability : | Likely | Likely | |
| Bank Performance : | Satisfactory | Satisfactory | |
| Borrower Perf. : | Satisfactory | Satisfactory | |
| Quality of ICR : | | Satisfactory | |

7. Lessons of Broad Applicability :

Simple, performance-based eligibility criteria can expedite selection of subprojects to be financed . In this case, projects with adverse environmental impact were excluded . Priority was given to irrigation and drainage repairs for which beneficiaries were willing to make supplementary contributions .

8. Audit Recommended? ☐ Yes ☒ No

9. Comments on Quality of ICR :

The ICR is satisfactory .