



<b>1. CAS/CPS Data</b>		
<b>Country:</b> The Republic of Djibouti		
<b>CAS/CPS Year:</b> FY14	<b>CAS/CPS Period:</b> FY14 – FY17 (extended to FY18)	
<b>CLR Period:</b> FY14 – FY18	<b>Date of this review:</b> August 20, 2020	
<b>2. Ratings</b>		
	<b>CLR Rating</b>	<b>IEG Rating</b>
<b>Development Outcome:</b>	<i>Moderately Satisfactory</i>	<i>Moderately Satisfactory</i>
<b>WBG Performance:</b>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Good</i>
<b>3. Executive Summary</b>		
<p>i. This review of the World Bank Group's (WBG's) Completion and Learning (CLR) Review covers the Country Partnership Strategy (CPS), FY14-17 and the Performance and Learning Review (PLR) of May 3, 2016, which extended the CPS period to FY18.</p> <p>ii. Djibouti is one of the smallest countries in Africa with a population of 1 million and a lower middle-income country with a GNI per capita of \$3,190 in 2018. Djibouti is a fragile state, with an average Country Policy and Institutional Assuagement (CPIA) rating of 2.97 in FY19.<sup>1</sup> During 2014-2018, the economy experienced strong growth, at an average annual rate of 6.5 percent, driven by large-scale public investment in infrastructure and logistics services, as well as regional trade. Absolute poverty, measured at \$1.90 per day (at 2011 purchasing power parity), dropped from 22.7 percent in 2013 to 17.1 percent in 2017; however, the poverty rate in rural areas remains high (at 57.8 percent as compared with the national poverty rate at 41.2 percent). The unemployment rate is high at 47 percent in 2018. There was a decline in the Gini index from 44.1 percent in 2014 to 41.6 percent in 2017. Djibouti's UN Human Development Index rose from 0.475 in 2014 to 0.495 in 2018 and it is ranked 171st out of 189 countries.</p> <p>iii. The CPS had two focus areas: (i) reducing vulnerability as reflected in high poverty, high unemployment, and deficits in human development indicators and social service delivery; and (ii) strengthening public and private sector capacity for service delivery; as well as a cross-cutting theme of gender equity. The CPS objectives were broadly congruent with the government's strategy Djibouti 2035 Vision, which emphasized national peace and unity, diversified and competitive economy, and consolidation of human capital, and highlighted reducing gender inequality as one of three transversal themes. At the PLR stage, several adjustments were introduced to respond to the growing refugee crisis in the country, scaling back work in areas where policy dialogue with the government lagged (e.g., telecoms reform and disaster risk management [DRM]).</p>		

<sup>1</sup> WBG defines a country which has a harmonized average CPIA country rating of 3.2 or less, as a Fragile or Conflict Affected State, FCS (WBG's Harmonized List of Fragile Situations FY19).

<b>CLR Reviewed by:</b>	<b>Panel Reviewed by:</b>	<b>CLR Review Manager/Coordinator</b>
<b>Yumeka Hirano</b> Economist, IEGEC	<b>Mauricio Carrizosa</b> IEGEC Consultant	<b>Jeff Chelsky</b> Manager, IEGEC
<b>Albert Martinez</b> IEGEC Consultant		<b>Melissa Metz</b> CLRR Coordinator, IEGEC



iv. At the beginning of the CPS period, outstanding IDA commitments were US\$51 million, comprising ten Investment Project Financing (IPF) operations, including four Additional Financing operations. During the CPS period, new IDA commitments amounted to \$108 million covering 11 IPF operations, including four Additional Financing operations and one regional operation, against planned commitments of \$78 million for nine operations under CPS/PLR. Twenty-five Advisory Services & Analytics tasks (ASAs) were approved, covering poverty, gender, governance (capacity building), and macro-fiscal issues (fiscal and debt management). Ten trust-fund-financed projects were approved amounting to \$ 27 million, supporting various sectors, including power, health, education, and social safety nets. The International Finance Cooperation (IFC) did not make any new investments during the CPS period but provided advisory services. Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA) approved guarantees amounting to \$24 million for a real estate project.

v. IEG rates the CPS development outcome as Moderately Satisfactory. Of the seven objectives, two were achieved, two were mostly achieved, two were partially achieved, and one was not achieved. On Focus Area I, there was progress on increasing access to short-term employment opportunities for the poor and vulnerable and strengthening management of the education system. There was limited progress on DRM reforms. On Focus Area II, access to affordable electricity improved and the business environment was enhanced in some ways, but there was limited progress in some key business environment reforms.

vi. IEG rates WBG performance as Good. The CPS design addressed the country's critical development challenges and was congruent with Djibouti 2035 Vision and the WBG's twin goals. The program was generally an appropriate blend of financing and complementary ASA. Nevertheless, greater emphasis on policy-level and institutional support would have been desirable and would have brought about better outcomes in some areas, such as telecoms and DRM. There was division of labor and good collaboration with development partners. The CPS results framework was generally adequate, albeit with some shortcomings, notably that some outcome indicators were inadequate to measure the related objectives. One area where the CPS fell short is selectivity. The small program financed by IDA and trust funds was spread across a relatively large number of sectors. The PLR effectively adjusted the program, scaling back work in telecoms reforms and DRM. Bank implementation performance was good: all IDA projects, except one telecoms project envisaged in the CPS were delivered. Supervision by the WBG was proactive, and portfolio-level results improved over the CPS period. Djibouti's portfolio at exit performed less well than averages for the MENA region and Bank-wide, nevertheless 100 percent of the active portfolio for which ISR ratings were available were rated Moderately Satisfactory or better. The WBG was agile and flexible in responding the growing refugee crisis in the country and changes in the government priorities.

vii. During the CPS period, WBG made a substantial contribution to addressing critical development challenges in Djibouti. The CPS focus areas were congruent with the government's strategy Djibouti 2035 Vision. WBG provided support through lending and complementary ASA as well as IFC advisory services and MIGA guarantees. Particularly notable outcomes of the WBG program include: (i) over 500,000 person-days of short-term employment opportunities were provided for members of poor and vulnerable households and (ii) the share of children who were fully immunized before their first birthday increased from 32 percent in 2013 to 79 percent in 2017. Furthermore, WBG facilitated the establishment of a social registry to identify poor and vulnerable households and built capacity to improve targeting in social safety net programs going forward. WBG was flexible and effectively adjusted the program to respond to the growing refugee crisis in the country and scale back work in some areas. Areas where there is room for improvement are the results framework (adequate selection of outcome indicators) and selectivity.



viii. The CLR highlighted seven lessons: (i) In a small state with low capacity such as Djibouti, it is important to have a well-prioritized program in a few sectors where there is political buy-in; (ii) applying a mix of instruments (e.g. Development Policy Financing [DPF] and Program for Results financing [PforR]) in a country such as Djibouti, which faces difficulties to move forward policy reforms, would be helpful in addressing key developmental challenges; (iii) Bank presence on the ground is crucial in implementing the CPS program; (iv) the CPS program should be flexible to allow for changing country circumstances; (v) during project preparation, the Bank needs to proactively engage with project implementation entities to ensure implementation readiness; (vi) low state and institutional capacity can also pose serious risks to the private sector, where WBG de-risking instruments can play an important role; and (vii) the need to more actively engage the private sector will require greater collaboration between IFC and IDA.

ix. IEG adds the following lessons:

- Increasing selectivity is critical for ensuring realism and greater impact in small country programs. The Djibouti CPS sought to be selective by choosing a moderate number of objectives based on the previous experience, analytical work, and a WBG's comparative advantage. However, the small program financed by IDA, ASA, and trust funds was spread across a relatively large number of sectors and tasks.
- Strong alignment between outcome indicators, planned interventions, and intended outcomes is a key to achieve good outcomes. In the case of WBG's support to private sector development in Djibouti, there was a disconnect between the breadth of IDA's project activities and the limited CPS outcome indicators. As a result, these indicators did not enable an adequate appraisal of the extent to which the CPS achieved its broad objective.

#### **4. Strategic Focus**

##### Relevance of the WBG Strategy:

1. Congruence with Country Context and Country Program. The CPS was congruent with the country context. It sought to reduce vulnerability and strengthen public and private sector capacity for service delivery (the latter focusing on the electricity sector and investment climate). The country was facing vulnerability with a high poverty rate,<sup>2</sup> high unemployment rate, high risks of natural disasters (flood, drought, and earthquakes), deficits in human development indicators and social service delivery, and limited access to basic infrastructure. The economic model was dependent on substantial inflows of foreign investment that financed the construction of infrastructure, and on the public sector through public enterprises in key sectors such as electricity, transport, real estate, and telecommunications. Private sector development was undermined by a weak enabling environment and limited private sector capacity. In these regards, Djibouti faced the need to improve social protection, enhance institutional capacity to deliver education and health services, improve access to basic infrastructure, and diversify the economy through private sector development to create jobs. The CPS objectives were also congruent with the government's strategy, Djibouti 2035 Vision, which emphasizes national peace and unity; good governance; a diversified and competitive economy; consolidation of human capital by encompassing working, well educated, and health citizens; and regional integration, while also aiming to support cross-cutting areas, including reducing gender inequality. The PLR maintained relevance by adjusting the program to respond to the growing

---

<sup>2</sup> Poverty has been exacerbated by drought conditions since 2007, particularly in rural areas. Djibouti is highly vulnerable to multiyear droughts that result in water scarcity for livestock, irrigation, and domestic uses, as well as to frequent flash floods that follow extended drought periods. Over one-third of Djibouti's economy is vulnerable to flood and drought.



refugee crisis in the country<sup>3</sup> and scaling back areas where policy dialogue with the government lagged (e.g., telecoms reform and DRM). Institutional strengthening, one of the CPS cross-cutting themes, was particularly important to implement key reforms in an FCS with an average CPIA of 2.97 in FY19.

2. **Relevance of Design.** The proposed World Bank Group (WBG) interventions could reasonably have been expected to contribute towards CPS objectives and the country's development goals. The World Bank used primarily Investment Project Financing (IPF) operations and knowledge products to support the CPS objectives. For example, CPS design combined investments through a series of social safety net projects with two ASA activities, to help the government reach the poorest and most vulnerable. The CPS used lending operations alone in some of the other objectives (e.g., develop capacity on education management), and ASA alone in one (disaster risk management). Much of the ASA focused on issues not directly related to CPS objectives, notably fiscal and debt management.<sup>4</sup> The CPS design envisaged that the Bank, IFC, and MIGA would undertake joint complementary programs on investment climate reforms and private sector development. However, the contribution of IFC was limited with no investment projects. MIGA made contributions to the country program, particularly through the Doraleh Container Terminal, but this was not captured well in the CPS results framework.

#### Selectivity

3. Although most objectives were underpinned by adequate diagnostics, the number of areas covered by the WBG program may have been excessive. The selectivity of the CPS was mixed: it had seven objectives with 16 associated outcome indicators and six new IDA projects (excluding four additional financings [AF] approved during the CPS period). Intended outcomes covered areas where the Bank has a comparative advantage. The areas of focus were selected based on lessons learned from the previous CAS, past success (particularly positive outcomes in the education and health sectors), adequate analytical work (e.g. New Growth Model study, gender and poverty analytical work), and stakeholder consultations, including a preparation workshop and the first client survey done by the WBG in the country. Selectivity was also informed by the division of labor with other development partners, although no formal donor coordination mechanism was in place. In addition, the CPS identified capacity constraints as an implementation risk and argued that low capacity requires a highly selective program. However, the broad scope of the objectives made the original program less selective in terms of coverage. The WBG covered various sectors including social protection, gender, macroeconomics and governance, private sector development, and urban development. The small program financed by IDA, ASA, and trust funds was spread across a relatively large number of sectors and tasks. For example, the new IDA projects covered social protection (responding to displacement impacts), urban development, public administration, and private sector development, while the existing portfolio also included a series of power/electrification projects and a health project. At the PLR stage, the WBG scaled back support in some areas (e.g. telecoms and DRM) to reflect lack of government interest; however, it did not significantly increase selectivity, as many of the operations and activities were ongoing.

#### Alignment

4. The CPS objectives were aligned with the 2013 twin goals of eliminating extreme poverty and boosting shared prosperity. Focus Area 1 sought to reduce vulnerability through improving institutional capacity to reach the poorest and most vulnerable and increase their access to short-

<sup>3</sup> Djibouti was affected by regional instability, hosting refugees and asylum seekers from Somalia, Ethiopia, Eritrea, and Yemen. An increased refugee population required an enhancement of social services, economic opportunities, and environmental sustainability in communities hosting refugees in the Horn of Africa.

<sup>4</sup> Djibouti saw rapid and strong growth during the CPS period, while macroeconomic risks remained high with accumulating debt (from 34 percent of GDP in 2013 to 71 percent in 2018). Macroeconomic risk was identified as a substantial implementation risk in the PLR (while it was not identified in the CPS). In light of the country's high debt repayment costs, the WBG, in collaboration with IMF, provided technical on tax reform.



term employment opportunities and key infrastructure. For example, the community works for employment targeted female beneficiaries, who are the most vulnerable, facing particular challenges given deep-rooted gender inequalities in access to services, opportunities, and voice. Focus Area II focused on strengthening public and private sector capacity for service delivery through making selected improvements in the investment climate, which if targeted appropriately could further private sector development, increase growth, and benefit the bottom 40 percent of the population. At the PLR stage, due to the changes of the country conditions and government's priorities, the WBG scaled back support for telecoms reform and DRM. One planned IDA project in the telecoms sector was dropped and the results indicator was eliminated. However, the DRM objective was kept with some adjustments in its associated results indicators (one was eliminated, and one was revised). The misalignment between the DRM objective and WBG interventions resulted in poor achievement of the associated indicator target in the Results Framework.

## 5. Development Outcome

### Overview of Achievement by Objective:

5. This assessment follows the IEG-WBG Shared Approach on Country Engagement and considers the degree to which CPS objectives (designated as outcomes in the CPS results matrix) were achieved.

### **Focus Area I: Reduce Vulnerability.**

6. Focus Area I had five objectives: (i) improve institutional capacity to reach the poorest and most vulnerable and increase their access to short-term employment opportunities; (ii) strengthen management of the education system; (iii) improve utilization of maternal and child health care services and communicable disease control programs; (iv) increase access to basic infrastructure in disadvantaged rural and urban areas; and (v) improve assessment of natural disaster risk and vulnerability.

7. **Objective 1: Improve institutional capacity to reach the poorest and most vulnerable and increase their access to short-term employment opportunities.** IDA supported this objective through the Crisis Response Social Safety Net Project (FY12), its additional financing (FY15), and the Human Capital Social Safety Net Project (FY10), financed through a Japan Social Development Fund (JSDF) grant. Two ASA products supported the objective: Poverty and Social Impact Analysis: Strengthening Safety Nets in Djibouti (FY15) and Gender and Poverty ESW (FY15). Objective 1 had two indicators:

- Employment in labor-intensive community works and services increased (person-days). Baseline: 15,000 (2013); Target: 400,000 (2018). The January 2015 ISR of the Human Capital Social Safety Net Project (FY10) reports that there were 223,200 person-days of labor-intensive community work generated as of September 2014. In addition, the ISR reports that at least 20 percent of beneficiaries would have fallen into extreme poverty if they had not participated in the program.<sup>5</sup> The May 2018 ISR of the Crisis Response Social Safety Net Project (FY12) reports that the number of person-days of labor-intensive community works provided to able-bodied members of poor/vulnerable households were 501,250 as of March 2018. *Achieved.*
- Female employment in labor intensive community works and services increased (person-days). Baseline: 7,500 (2013); Target: 200,000 (2018). This indicator relates to the female share of the indicator above. The associated projects do not monitor directly the number of person-days associated with female beneficiaries. However, given that the

<sup>5</sup> The project supported the piloting of an innovative integrated safety net focusing on poor and vulnerable households though generating short-term job opportunities.



ISR of the Crisis Response Social Safety Net Project reports the 90 percent of the beneficiaries from the work program provided to able-bodied members of poor/vulnerable households were female (7,120 of 7,890), it is highly likely that the target of 200,000 person-days has been met. *Achieved.*

The Bank's intervention (part of which was funded by JSDF) supported substantial progress in enhancing access to short-term employment opportunities. In addition, the intervention supported reaching the poor: Percentage of workfare beneficiaries who are poor were 73.3 percent as of June 2019, exceeding the original target at 65 percent. Regarding institutional capacity, the Crisis Response Social Safety Net Project (FY12-19) facilitated the establishment of a social registry to identify poor and vulnerable households and built the capacity of the Secrétariat d'Etat chargé des Affaires Sociales (State Secretariat for Social Affairs, SEAS) to use it for targeting. This facilitated the establishment of a national social safety net system. SEAS's institutional capacity for the social registry has been demonstrated by using it in nine government programs. The indicators reflect capacity to implement workfare programs. IEG rates Objective 1 as **Achieved**.

8. **Objective 2: Strengthen management of the education system.** IDA supported this objective through the Strengthening Institutional Capacity and Management of the Education System project (FY12). Objective 2 had one indicator:

- Annual education statistical reports produced with key national indicators, including gender disaggregated data, to support education management (cumulative number). Baseline: 1 (2013); Target: 5 (2018). The September 2018 ISR of the project reports that there were five annual statistical reports with key indicators produced as of August 2018. *Achieved.*

Production of statistical reports on a frequent and regular basis does not measure the quality of education system management. However, IEG's ICR Review of the associated project found that there was substantial progress in most of other indicators that could be associated with enhanced institutional capacity and performance of the education system.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, the CPIA rating for "building human resources" improved from 3.5 in 2013 to 4.0 in 2018.<sup>7</sup> On balance, IEG rates Objective 2 as **Mostly Achieved**.

9. **Objective 3: Improve utilization of maternal and child health care services and communicable disease control programs.** IDA supported this objective through the Improving Health Sector Performance Project (FY13). Objective 3 had three indicators.

- Share of women giving birth in a facility assisted by qualified personnel in rural areas (%). Baseline: 25% (2013); Target: 50% (2018). The project does not monitor the share of women in rural areas as per the indicator. The latest information from Ministry of Health reports that 79.35 percent of women nationally gave birth in a facility assisted by qualified personnel. The April 2019 ISR of the project reports that 24,023 women nationally gave birth in a contracted facility assisted by qualified personnel as of June 2018. However, no data is available on women in rural areas. *Not Verified.*

<sup>6</sup> IEG's Implementation Completion Report (ICR) Review on "Strengthening Institutional Capacity and Management of the Education System project (FY12-19)." The project aimed to strengthen the institutional capacity of the Ministry of National Education and Vocational Training (MENFOP) for improved management of the education system. The two PDO indicators - percentage of departments have Annual Work Plan (AWP) developed and agreed and approved; and, percentage of AWP implemented – as well as six out of eight intermediate indicators were achieved.

<sup>7</sup> The CPIA indicator on building human resources assesses the national policies and public and private sector service delivery that affect the access to and quality of health and education services.



- Share of children fully immunized before their first birthday (%). Baseline: 32% (2013); Target: 52% (2018). The April 2019 ISR of the project reports that 78.58 percent of children were fully immunized before their first birthday as of December 2017. *Achieved*.
- Share of HIV-positive pregnant women receiving antiretroviral therapy according to protocol (%). Baseline: 12% (2013); Target: 63% (2018). The April 2019 ISR of the project reports that 342 HIV-positive pregnant women receiving antiretroviral therapy according to protocol as of June 2018. The project does not monitor the share of women as per the indicator. However, the WB World Development Indicators (WDI) report that the % of pregnant women living with HIV receiving antiretroviral therapy coverage for prevention of mother-to-child transmission (PMTCT) increased from 13 percent to 30 percent in 2018.<sup>8</sup> *Partially Achieved*.

Utilization of maternal health care services was improved with increasing share of women giving birth in a facility assisted by qualified personnel in rural areas and share of HIV-positive pregnant women receiving antiretroviral therapy. Utilization of communicable disease control programs was improved with a significant increase in the share of children fully immunized before their first birthday and the share of HIV-positive pregnant women receiving antiretroviral therapy. The second target was achieved, while the third one was only partially achieved. The achievement of the first target was not verified by IEG, while the aggregate information suggests there was progress nationally. On balance, IEG rates Objective 3 as **Partially Achieved**.

10. **Objective 4: Increase access to basic infrastructure in disadvantaged rural and urban areas.** IDA supported this objective through the Rural Community Development and Water Mobilization Project (PRODERMO) (FY11),<sup>9</sup> its additional financing (FY16), the Second Urban Poverty Reduction Project (FY14), and the Development Response to Displacement Impacts in the Horn of Africa Project (DRDIP) (FY16, IDA regional project). Objective 4 had five indicators.

- Number of rural households with more secure access to drinking water within a reasonable travel time (two hours round-trip) in project areas (number). Baseline: 2,160 (2013); Target: 7,099 (2018). The July 2018 ISR of the PRODERMO project reports that 8,087 rural households had more secure access<sup>10</sup> to drinking water within a reasonable travel time (two hours round-trip) in project areas as of June 2018. *Achieved*.
- Share of income-generating activities financed by the PRODERMO project for women (%). Baseline: 0% (2013); Target: 39% (2018). This project focuses on rural areas. The July 2018 ISR of the PRODERMO project reports that 53% income-generating activities financed by the project were for women as of June 2018. *Achieved*.
- Number of people within 150m of rehabilitated and new urban roads, drains, and street lighting (number). Baseline: 0 (2013); Target: 10,000 (2018). The December 2018 ISR of the Second Urban Poverty Reduction Project reports that there were 8,160 people within 50m of rehabilitated and new urban roads, drains, and street lighting as of October 2018. The project monitors a smaller radius (50m) compared to the indicator (150m) in Quartier 7. *Mostly Achieved*.
- Share of subproject beneficiaries in Quartier 7 (%) who have increased access to services and are women. Baseline: 0% (2013); Target: 50% (2018). The December 2018 ISR of the Second Urban Poverty Reduction Project reports that 55% of the beneficiaries

<sup>8</sup> The data in the WDI is based on the UNAIDS modelled estimates.

<sup>9</sup> The project focused on two disadvantaged areas in two geographical regions: (i) the *Khor Angar-Obock* area in the northern region of Obock; and (ii) the *Cheiketi-Hanlé* area, in the southern region of Dikhil (PAD, paras 15 & 16).

<sup>10</sup> "More secure access" is defined as an adequate quantity (50 L/person/day) and acceptable quality ensured through water monitoring, during the dry period.



of infrastructure services (rehabilitated and new urban roads, drains, and street lighting) were women as of October 2018. The gender composition of the beneficiaries was based on estimates by implementing agency. *Achieved.*

- Beneficiaries of DRDIP with access to social and economic services and infrastructure. Baseline: 0 (2015); Target: 40,000 (2018). The October 2019 Aide Memoire of DRDIP<sup>11</sup> reports that there were 33,097 direct beneficiaries of the project with access to social and economic services and infrastructure as of August 2019. *Mostly Achieved.*

There was a significant achievement in increasing access to drinking water in disadvantaged rural areas and rehabilitated/new basic infrastructure in disadvantaged urban areas. Two out of four indicators that measure access to infrastructure exceeded their targets, and two indicators measuring infrastructure were mostly achieved. The share of income-generating activities financed by the PRODERMO did not measure access to infrastructure. IEG rates Objective 4 as **Mostly Achieved.**

11. **Objective 5: Improve assessment of natural disaster risk and vulnerability.** This objective was supported by the ASAs: Disaster Risk Management Phase III (FY16) and Natural Disaster Risk Assessment and Monitoring System (FY10). Objective 5 had one indicator:

- Implementation of Comprehensive Approach to Risk Assessment in Djibouti. Baseline: No (2013); Target: Yes (2018). The PLR reported that the Comprehensive Approach to Risk Assessment in Djibouti (CARAD) was delivered but waiting for approval by the Council of Ministers. The CLR reports that the Government's ORSEC plan ("Plan d'Organisation des Secours en cas de Catastrophes"; emergency management plan) was not adopted. *Not Achieved.*

The program supported interventions to carry out risk assessment work in Djibouti and produced outputs, including 'cartography of Djibouti-ville seismic and flood risk areas', 'diagnostic of housing vulnerability to earthquakes and floods', 'support for the national housing strategy' as well as a 'preliminary earthquake and flood hazard risk assessment in Djibouti-ville'. However, the CARAD and ORSEC plan, which were key to support this objective, were not adopted. Furthermore, adoption of a plan does not necessarily imply implementation, and the project primarily focused on producing outputs. IEG rates Objective 5 as **Not Achieved.**

12. Focus Area I is rated **Moderately Satisfactory.** Of the five objectives, one was achieved, two were mostly achieved, one was partially achieved, and one was not achieved. There was progress on strengthening management of education system, on institutional capacity to reach poor and vulnerable populations, and on access to basic infrastructure in rural and urban areas. There was limited progress on improving utilization of healthcare services. The objective of improving assessment of natural disaster risk and vulnerability was not achieved.

#### **Focus Area II: Strengthen Public and Private Sector Capacity for Service Delivery.**

13. Focus Area II had two objectives: (i) improve access to affordable electricity; and (ii) improve services for the private sector.

14. **Objective 6: Improve access to affordable electricity.** IDA supported this objective through the Power Access and Diversification Project (FY06) and the Geothermal Power Production project (FY14). Objective 6 had one indicator.

- People provided with access to electricity by household connections. Baseline: 14,800 (2013); Target: 22,800 (2018). The IEG ICRR of the Power Access and Diversification Project reports that 26,796 people were provided with access to electricity by household connections as of December 2014. *Achieved.*

<sup>11</sup> DRDIP sought to complement PRODERMO, which focused on rural areas. DRDIP focused on two regions, two sub prefectures, and one town with surrounding areas.



Increase in the population with access to electricity by household connections suggests improved access to affordable electricity. In particular, the project expanded access to electricity in targeted poor areas of Balbala and PK12.<sup>12</sup> These connections were made at Electricity of Djibouti's 'social tariff' (the lowest tariff category), which was put in place to make electricity affordable to the poorest customers. The Geothermal Power Production project sought to assist the government in assessing the commercial viability of the geothermal resource, which could lead to unlocking Djibouti's geothermal potential – something that the WBG and government expected would help reduce domestic electricity generation costs, increase the country's energy security of supply and foster private sector participation in the energy sector. However, the Geothermal Power Production project did not monitor affordability. IEG rates Objective 6 as **Achieved**.

15. **Objective 7: Improve services for the private sector.** This objective was supported by the IDA Governance for Private Sector Development and Finance Project (FY14), Support for Entrepreneurship (FY18), IFC Djibouti PPP Framework (FY17), and MIGA Guarantee for Doraleh Container Terminal / Mezz Tower project. Objective 7 had three indicators.

- Business start-up procedures streamlined (number of days). Baseline: 37 days (2013); Target: 10 days (2018). The 2019 Doing Business report indicates that it took 13 days to start a business in 2018. *Mostly Achieved*.
- Issuance of construction permits streamlined (number of days). Baseline: 167 days (2013); Target: 90 days (2018). The 2019 Doing Business report indicates that it took 148 days to issue a construction permit in 2018. *Partially Achieved*.
- Publication of commercial and civil court cases on Ministry of Justice website expanded (%). Baseline: 0% (2013); Target: 95% (2018). The November 2018 ISR of the Government for Private Sector Development and Finance Project reports that 0% of the Commercial Chamber's decisions were published on the website as of March 2018. *Not Achieved*.

The stated objective is broad and unclearly articulated. The objective refers to services provided to the private sector, while the indicators measure certain aspects of business procedures based primarily on legislation and regulation on the books, not the quality of their implementation.

Overall, Djibouti made significant progress in enhancing the business environment and was among the 10 economies that improved the most across three or more areas measured by Doing Business in 2018. The Doing Business distance to frontier (DTF) has improved by 16.3 percentage points from 2015 to 2019.<sup>13</sup> In addition, IFC helped develop a public-private participation framework.

However, the first two indicators were narrowly focused on selected Doing Business reform indicators, and it is not clear why these areas were prioritized. The 2013 Enterprise Survey showed that by far the largest constraint to the private sector was reliable access to electricity (nearly 50% of firms cited this as an issue), followed by corruption (13%) and tax rates (12%). The indicators on business start-up and construction permits saw progress, but neither reached its target. There was no progress on publication of the decisions of the Commercial Chamber, although the WBG program did provide training in the area of commercial justice. In sum, one indicator was mostly achieved, and one was partially achieved, and one was not achieved; additionally, progress on "improved service to the private sector" is difficult to measure as the objective is unclear. On balance, IEG rates Objective 7 as **Partially Achieved**.

16. Focus Area II is rated as **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. Of the two objectives, one was achieved and one was partially achieved. IDA had substantial engagement in the energy sector

<sup>12</sup> This was one of the outcomes of the Power Access and Diversification Project (ICR, para 72).

<sup>13</sup> Distance to frontier score illustrates the distance of an economy to the "frontier," which represents the best performance observed on each Doing Business topic across all economies and years. An economy's distance to frontier is indicated on a scale from 0 to 100, where 0 represents the lowest performance and 100 the frontier.



throughout the CPS period. There was notable progress on improving access to affordable electricity. There was some progress on specific aspects of the business environment through the IDA, IFC, and MIGA projects, but progress in the specific reforms defined by outcome indicators was slow or limited, and “services to the private sector” was not well-defined. IFC helped develop the PPP framework and supported investment climate reforms and MIGA provided coverage for the development of a container terminal to support the development of port sector. In addition, IEG notes that the reference to “strengthening public and private sector capacity for service delivery”, as the title of Focus Area II, is unclear as it does not specify the relevant services. As written, it also implies broader and deeper work on the delivery of public services. The two supporting objectives are clearer and limit the scope substantially – affordable electricity and business regulations/ procedures. While this does not impact IEG’s rating of the focus area, it is noted to improve clarity of the theory of change in future strategic country documents.

Overall Assessment and Rating

17. IEG rates the CPS development outcome as **Moderately Satisfactory**. Of the seven objectives, two were achieved, two were mostly achieved, two were partially achieved, and one was not achieved. On Focus Area I, there was progress on institutional capacity to reach poor and vulnerable populations and increase their access to short-term employment opportunities, strengthening management of the education system, and improving access to basic infrastructure. There was limited progress on DRM reforms. On Focus Area II, access to affordable electricity enhanced, and the business environment improved, albeit in limited ways.

Objectives	CLR Rating	IEG Rating
<b>Focus Area I: Reduce vulnerability</b>	<b><i>Mostly Achieved</i></b>	<b><i>Moderately Satisfactory</i></b>
<i>Objective 1: Improve institutional capacity to reach the poorest and most vulnerable and increase their access to short-term employment opportunities</i>	<i>Achieved</i>	<i>Achieved</i>
<i>Objective 2: Strengthen management of the education system</i>	<i>Achieved</i>	<i>Mostly Achieved</i>
<i>Objective 3: Improve utilization of maternal and child health care services and communicable disease control programs</i>	<i>Mostly Achieved</i>	<i>Partially Achieved</i>
<i>Objective 4: Increase access to basic infrastructure in disadvantaged rural and urban areas</i>	<i>Mostly Achieved</i>	<i>Mostly Achieved</i>
<i>Objective 5: Improve assessment of natural disaster risk and vulnerability</i>	<i>Not Achieved</i>	<i>Not Achieved</i>
<b>Focus Area II: Strengthen public and private sector capacity for service delivery</b>	<b><i>Mostly Achieved</i></b>	<b><i>Moderately Unsatisfactory</i></b>
<i>Objective 6: Improve access to affordable electricity</i>	<i>Achieved</i>	<i>Achieved</i>
<i>Objective 7: Improve services for the private sector</i>	<i>Partially Achieved</i>	<i>Partially Achieved</i>

**6. WBG Performance**

Lending and Investments

18. At the beginning of the CPS period, outstanding IDA commitments were \$51 million, comprising ten IPF operations, including four Additional Financing (AF) operations, implemented during FY06-13. During the CPS period, new IDA commitments amounted to \$108 million covering 11 IPF operations, including four AF operations and one regional operation, against plans of \$78 million in commitments through nine operations articulated in the CPS/PLR. Fifty seven percent of commitments supported Focus Area I (reducing vulnerability) for urban development, social protection, and health, and 43 percent of commitment supported Focus Area II (strengthening public and private sector capacity for service delivery). The largest sector was power sector, which had five



operations (\$48 million), including two AF. WB had long engagement in social protection and urban sectors through a series of social safety net projects (\$ 14 million) and a series of urban poverty reduction projects (\$12 million). There were two unplanned projects in response to the government's need to respond to refugee and migration shocks and the heightened priority of enhancing public services and economic opportunities for women and youth. Notably, the average size of IDA-funded operations approved during the latter half of the CPS period was significantly larger than the ones approved before and during the first half of the CPS period.<sup>14</sup> For example, three-quarters of the projects approved during FY17-18 had commitment amounts of US\$15 million or more. This was substantially higher compared to previous projects, which averaged about \$6 million. Ten trust-fund-financed projects were approved amounting to \$ 27 million, supporting various sectors, including power, health, education, social safety net, and statistics. They complemented IDA lending projects. The largest project was Geothermal Power Generation Project financed by Global Environment Fund (\$7 million).

19. During the CPS period, two operations were closed, both of which were reviewed by IEG. Djibouti's performance at exit, measured by outcomes rated Moderately Satisfactory or better by IEG, was significantly lower (0 percent of projects and 0 percent weighted by commitments rated MS or better) when compared to the Middle East and North Africa (MNA) region FCS (64 percent of projects and 86 percent weighted by commitments) and World Bank (75 percent of projects and 84 percent weighted by commitments) averages. The Power Access and Diversification Project and Urban Poverty Reduction Project were rated Moderately Unsatisfactory. The CLR reports that it was due to poor implementation readiness of the projects and incentives to contracted PIU consultants to extend implementation time by stretching activities over several years.

20. Djibouti's active IDA portfolio performance as measured by the latest development outcome ratings in Implementation Status and Results Reports (ISRs) performed well. All of the projects (13 projects) were rated Moderately Satisfactory or better by the operational teams. In addition, the active IDA portfolio performance as measured by percentage of projects at risk performed relatively well. The share of projects at risk (by number of projects) averaged 39 percent, compared with 53 percent of projects at risk in MNA FCS, and 37 percent of projects at risk Bank-wide FCS. The share of projects at risk in Djibouti declined from 33 percent (by number of projects) in 2014 to 30 percent in 2018 (Table 7). The CLR reports that Bank actively worked to improve performance by conducting joint quarterly portfolio reviews with the client. In addition, the opening of the country office, increasingly frequent missions, regular videoconferencing with PIUs, and the recruitment of local STCs contributed to improve performance.

21. During the CPS period, IFC did not have any active investment project in Djibouti.

22. IEG did not validate any Expanded Project Supervision Report (XPSR).

23. At the start of the CPS period, MIGA had an outstanding guarantee amounting to US\$427 million for a transport project. The project was MIGA's first in Djibouti and the guarantee supported a 30-year concession for a new container terminal which is now operational. IEG recognizes the importance of the Doraleh Container Terminal, which was the first MIGA project providing coverage to Islamic financing. IEG rated the project Satisfactory for DO and Excellent for MIGA Effectiveness. The MIGA guarantee was for \$450 million – it was a large project in an important sector (port) given Djibouti's strategic location. During the CPS period, MIGA approved one guarantee amounting to US\$24 million for a real estate project. The project aims to address the lack of office facilities and services supporting new businesses and foreign investors.

#### Analytic and Advisory Activities and Services

24. During the CPS period, 25 Advisory Services & Analytics (ASA) were completed, two-thirds of which were Technical Assistance (TA). The ASA primarily supported governance (capacity building in the judicial and in the public enterprise sectors) and macro-fiscal issues (tax reform, national accounts, and debt management) as well as various other areas, including a poverty and gender

<sup>14</sup> The PLR has an indicative envelope of US\$31 million following the IDA-17 (FY15-17) replenishment.



study, an impact evaluation on Djibouti's social safety net, and TA on telecoms sector reform. ASA on poverty and gender supported the design and focus of operations in social protection, health, education, and rural and urban development. Lending was complemented by capacity building measures, which helped improve project implementation.

25. During the CPS period, IFC approved two advisory services (AS) projects amounting to \$0.6 million. One project reviewed the legal and institutional framework for public-private partnerships (PPPs) and developed a strategy for a PPP policy and framework based on international best practices. In addition, the project delivered pre-feasibility studies on PPP options for rural electrification of 19 villages and urban bus transport concessions in the capital. The work on PPPs for rural electrification complemented the WB Sustainable Electrification Program. The other AS project was a scoping and diagnostic study for a potential IFC project in the areas of financial infrastructure, secured transactions, and credit information. This AS project did not result in further engagement by IFC.

26. IFC provided support (commitment amount \$0.15 million) to complement the WB Governance for Private Sector Development Project through the regional advisory services. IFC provided technical assistance for investment climate reforms including support for the establishment of a one-stop shop for business registration, updating of Doing Business reforms in selected areas, and enhancement of structured public-private dialogue mechanism.

#### Results Framework

27. The CPS results framework was generally adequate; however, there were some deficiencies. The objectives addressed some of the critical constraints facing the country. There was a plausible link in most cases between the interventions designed to be supported by the projects and the expected attainment of the outcomes. Most of the indicators were clearly defined and measurable, with baselines, targets, and associated dates. Nevertheless, some outcome indicators were not consistently adequate measures of objectives. For example, under objective 6 – improving access to affordable electricity, there was only one outcome indicator, which measured access to electricity, but did not explicitly measure affordability. The outcome indicator under objective 2 did not sufficiently measure a stronger management of the education system. The outcome indicator of objective 5 – improving assessment of natural disaster risk and vulnerability – was not clearly defined.<sup>15</sup> The project and the indicator primarily focused on producing outputs, not an outcome such as improving DRM.

28. In other cases, there were shortcomings in targeting outcomes that the Bank Group could influence through the interventions it undertook. At the PLR stage, WBG scaled back its support in telecoms sector and DRM due to the absence of a clear government commitment to reform and a worsening refugee crisis in Djibouti. The WBG removed the corresponding outcome in telecoms sector, while they kept the outcome and indicator on DRM considering the importance of engaging with the government. The Bank could have better reflected the changes in the results framework. As to the Geothermal Power Production, the project focused on supporting the government to conduct a feasibility assessment. Without the geothermal power production, there are limitations on assessing the outcome of this project in providing affordable electricity and enhancing access to it.

29. There were some shortcomings in measuring aspects related to private sector development. The stated objective was unclear (“services to the private sector”). The indicators were narrowly focused on certain aspects of the business environment, without making the case that these were the most binding constraints. The indicators did not measure overall services to the private sector. The results of other operations IFC and MIGA contributions were not captured in the results matrix. ASA in this focus area were weakly linked to the outcome indicators in the results framework.

---

<sup>15</sup> The PLR reported the status of the Comprehensive Approach to Risk Assessment in Djibouti (CARAD), while CLR reported the status of the Government's ORSEC plan.

#### Partnerships and Development Partner Coordination

30. Although Djibouti lacks a formal over-arching donor coordination framework, the Bank closely collaborated with development partners, mainly at the sectoral level.<sup>16</sup> For example, the Bank, UNICEF, and other education sector actors cooperated closely in preparing the 2014–2016 Education Action Plan. The Bank and IMF closely collaborated to support the Directorate of Statistics and Demographic Studies (DISED). The CLR reported that there was close collaboration with other development partners, including Agence Francaise de Development (AFD), United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), European Union (EU), Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), International Food and Development (IFAD), and African Development Bank (AFDB).

#### Safeguards and Fiduciary Issues

31. Some environmental and social safeguard policies were implemented in the two projects that were closed and validated by IEG during the CPS, in the energy and the urban development sectors. The CLR does not address safeguards compliance in the portfolio. The project ICRRs and ICRs report satisfactory compliance and appropriate risk mitigation measures. However, it is not clear what the actual implementation challenges were. Also, in urban development, the ICRR remarks that by the project completion, the implementation of a temporary relocation agreement with vendors was still pending. No Inspection Panel investigation was recorded during the CPS.

#### Ownership and Flexibility

32. Although government ownership of the CPS was strong, government commitment declined in certain areas during the CPS period. To prepare the CPS, consultations were carried out through a workshop, which was guided by the New Growth Model study, as well as by a client survey with the government and key stakeholders, including civil society, media, bilateral and multilateral agencies, the private sector, and academia. During implementation, however, weak government commitment resulted in delays, for example in the energy sector. Implementation of the Geothermal Project was delayed during the first two years because the project was not ready at effectiveness and faced staffing constraints. The WBG was flexible to respond to the changes in country conditions. For example, the WBG engagement responded to the growing refugee crisis in the country by increasing support for social safety nets program as well as women and youth entrepreneurship and financing an IDA regional project to support refugee populations at the PLR stage. Furthermore, the PLR scaled back work in some areas where policy dialogue with the government lagged (e.g. telecommunications reform and DRM).

#### WBG Internal Cooperation

33. The CPS envisioned that the Bank, IFC, and MIGA would support joint or complementary programs in improving investment climate to attract foreign investors, enhancing financial infrastructure, and exploring investment opportunities in growth sectors. There is, however, little if any substantive evidence of cooperation with IFC. For example, it is unclear how WB and IFC cooperated in developing the financial infrastructure, an area in which both institutions worked. In addition, IFC had previously completed an assessment of credit market and credit information including recommendations on implementing a credit reporting system. It is unclear how the WB project built on or complemented the IFC work on credit information and what role IFC played. In the electricity sector, there was strong complementarity in the work of WB (Sustainable Electrification Program) and IFC (Djibouti PPP). IEG notes that the MIGA guarantee to the Ghoubet Djibouti Windfarm Project approved in FY20 was also complementary to these activities, although it fell outside the review period. Nonetheless, the CLR did not describe how the three institutions coordinated their work.

#### Risk Identification and Mitigation

---

<sup>16</sup> At the CPS stage, a formal framework for donor coordination was not yet in place in Djibouti and the government was planning to establish a donor coordination mechanism. There was some division of labor among development partners by sector (CPS Annex 4).



34. The CPS identified four risks to program implementation: capacity constraints, governance challenges, the slow pace of behavioral change, and nascent donor coordination mechanisms. The CPS stated that low capacity in Project Implementation Units (PIUs) and fluid governance environment with frequent changes in leadership were critical challenges. Planned mitigation strategies included continued dialogue with key sector counterparts at all levels, hands-on support through regular supervision and workshops on project management, and close management of the portfolio. For example, performance was affected by high turnover in the Ministry of Education and the unit in charge of education projects. This initially resulted in weak project ownership. To cope with these weaknesses, the Bank increased field presence (the country office opened in 2012 with a Resident Representative and the recruitment of local STCs) for closer monitoring. This helped follow up on issues affecting IDA-funded projects and necessary implementation support to the government. The Bank provided intensive supervision, including day-to-day support to the Ministry by a local education team member and regular thematic meetings, increasingly frequent missions, and regular videoconferencing with PIUs. According to CLR, the Bank conducted joint quarterly portfolio reviews with the client, which focused from fiduciary issues to program results to allow for close follow-up by the authorities on the project implementation and removal of bottlenecks.

#### Overall Assessment and Rating

35. IEG rates WBG performance as **Good**. The CPS design addressed the country's main development challenges and benefited from alignment with Djibouti 2035 Vision and with the twin corporate goals. The planned use of instruments was generally appropriate to address the program's objectives. There was planned division of labor with development partners. One area where the CPS fell short is selectivity. The small program was spread across a relatively large number of sectors and tasks. The CPS correctly identified risks, notably capacity constraints, and took mitigation measures and enhanced engagements with the increased field-based presence and more proactive follow-ups. The PLR effectively adjusted the program, by responding to the growing refugee crisis in the country and scaling back work in some areas. The Bank implemented all the projects, except one, committed in the CPS. Djibouti's lending portfolio performance improved over the CPS period.

#### Design

36. The CPS design addressed the country's main development challenges and was congruent with Djibouti 2035 Vision. On the whole, the program has a focus on reducing poverty and enhancing shared prosperity. The program was generally an appropriate blend of financing and complementary ASA. There was a plausible link in most cases between the interventions and the expected attainment of outcomes. Financing operations were informed by good-quality analytical work, as illustrated *inter alia* by the Bank's analytical work on poverty and gender. Nevertheless, greater emphasis on policy-level and institutional support would have been desirable and could have brought about greater outcomes in some areas, such as telecoms and DRM, where policy reforms are needed to move forward. The CPS results framework was generally adequate, albeit with some shortcomings, notably inadequate outcome indicators. The selectivity was mixed. There was planned division of labor with development partners. However, a relatively large number of sectors and tasks made the original program less selective in terms of coverage. The risks to the program, notably capacity constraints, were well identified and managed with the increased in-country presence and closer follow-up. The PLR effectively adjusted the program, by addressing the growing refugee crisis in the country and reducing activities in some areas, caveats notwithstanding. The PLR scaled back work in areas, telecoms reforms and DRM, where policy dialogue with the government lagged.

#### Implementation

37. Bank implementation performance was good, while the WBG program would have benefitted from further adjustments during the PLR stage. All IDA projects, except one telecoms project, envisaged in the CPS were delivered. IFC's business development efforts articulated at the PLR stage did not result in any investment project, and only two AS products – of which one was scoping for a potential credit infrastructure project – were delivered compared to at least three envisioned at the PLR stage. ASA covered various topics for the country. Notably, ASA on gender and poverty was influential. As envisioned in the CPS, two MIGA guarantees (one ongoing, one new) supported



private sector development. The WBG was agile and flexible in responding to the growing refugee crisis in the country and made some adjustments in the program, scaling back involvement in telecoms reform and DRM, at the PLR stage.

38. WBG supervision and portfolio-level results improved over the CPS period. The WBG increased field-based presence and conducted regular portfolio reviews to provide necessary implementation support to the government. Djibouti's portfolio at exit (only two projects closed in 2015 were rated by IEG) performed less well than averages for the MENA region and Bank-wide. As for the active portfolio, however, all projects whose ISR ratings were available, were rated Moderately Satisfactory or better. The share of projects at risk was 39 percent, much lower than MNA FCS and Bank-wide FCS averages. Compliance with safeguards requirements was satisfactory with the proper risk mitigation measures. There was no Inspection Panel investigation during the CPS period.

39. There is little concrete evidence of coordination between the World Bank, IFC, and MIGA. The CLR did not provide a sufficient description of how IFC, MIGA, and World Bank coordinated their work in areas where they had complementary activities, such as investment climate and energy. The WBG closely collaborated with other development partners present in its areas of engagement.

## **7. Assessment of CLR Completion Report**

40. The CLR is concise and provides an assessment of the CAS development outcomes and Bank performance, but the evidence and analysis provided was uneven. It contains cogent analysis of the WBG's success and challenges in implementing the program in FCS. However, the CLR does not provide verifiable evidence for one indicator and it is not sufficiently analytical on the adequacy of the indicators to measure achievement of the objectives. The CLR could have discussed or elaborated the contributions of ASA under some objectives. The CLR did not provide a sufficient description of how IFC, MIGA, and World Bank coordinated their work in areas where they had complementary activities, such as investment climate and energy. The discussion of factors limiting IFC engagement during the CPS period was not adequately detailed. The CLR did not use the correct ratings to determine the Focus Area Rating (Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Moderately Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, or Highly Unsatisfactory, not Mostly Achieved), following the Bank guidelines.

## **8. Findings and Lessons**

41. During the CPS period, WBG made a substantial contribution to addressing critical development challenges in Djibouti. The CPS focus areas were congruent with the government's strategy Djibouti 2035 Vision. WBG provided support through lending and complementary ASA as well as IFC advisory services and MIGA guarantees. Particularly notable outcomes of the WBG program include: (i) over 500,000 person-days of short-term employment opportunities were provided for members of poor and vulnerable households and (ii) the share of children who were fully immunized before their first birthday increased from 32 percent in 2013 to 79 percent in 2017. Furthermore, WBG facilitated the establishment of a social registry to identify poor and vulnerable households and built capacity to improve targeting in social safety net programs going forward. WBG was flexible and effectively adjusted the program to respond to the growing refugee crisis in the country and scale back work in some areas. The areas where there is room for improvement are the results framework (adequate selection of outcome indicators) and selectivity.

42. The CLR highlighted seven lessons: (i) In a small state with low-capacity country such as Djibouti, it is important to have a well-prioritized program in a few sectors where there is political buy-in; (ii) applying a mix of instruments (e.g. Development Policy Financing [DPF] and Program for Results financing [PforR]) in a country such as Djibouti, which faces difficulties to move forward policy reforms, would be helpful in addressing key developmental challenges; (iii) Bank presence on the ground is crucial in implementing the CPS program; (iv) the CPS program should be flexible to allow for changing country circumstances; (v) During project preparation, the Bank needs to



proactively engage with project implementation entities to ensure implementation readiness; (vi) low state and institutional capacity can also pose serious risks to the private sector, where WBG de-risking instruments can play an important role; and (vii) the need to more actively engage the private sector will require greater collaboration between IFC and IDA.

43. IEG provides the following lessons complementing those of the CLR:

- Increasing selectivity is critical for ensuring realism and greater impact in small country programs. The Djibouti CPS sought to be selective by choosing a moderate number of objectives based on the previous experience, analytical work, and a WBG's comparative advantage. However, the small program financed by IDA, ASA, and trust funds was spread across a relatively large number of sectors and tasks.
- Strong alignment between outcome indicators, planned interventions, and intended outcomes is a key to monitor outcomes. In the case of WBG's support to improving private sector development in Djibouti, there was a disconnect between the breadth of IDA's project activities and the limited CPS outcome indicators. As a result, these indicators did not enable an adequate appraisal of the extent to which the CPS achieved its broad objective.

**Annex Table 1: Summary of Achievements of CPS Objectives – Djibouti**

**Annex Table 2: Djibouti Planned and Actual Lending, FY14-FY18 (US\$, millions)**

**Annex Table 3: Advisory Services & Analytics for Djibouti, FY14-18**

**Annex Table 4: Djibouti Active Trust Funds in FY14-18 (US\$, millions)**

**Annex Table 5: IEG Project Ratings for Djibouti, FY14-18 (US\$, millions)**

**Annex Table 6: IEG Project Ratings for Djibouti and Comparators, FY14-18**

**Annex Table 7: Portfolio Status for Djibouti and Comparators, FY14-18**

**Annex Table 8: Total Net Disbursements of Official Development Assistance and Official Aid for Djibouti (US\$, millions)**

**Annex Table 9: Economic and Social Indicators for Djibouti, FY14-18**

**Annex Table 10: List of IFC Investments in Djibouti (US\$, millions)**

**Annex Table 11: List of IFC Advisory Services in Djibouti (US\$, millions)**

**Annex Table 12: List of MIGA Projects Active in Djibouti, FY14-18 (US\$, millions)**





**Annex Table 1: Summary of Achievements of CPS Objectives – Djibouti**

	CPS FY14-FY18: Focus Area I: Reducing Vulnerability	Actual Results	IEG Comments
<u>Major Outcome Measures</u>	<p><b>1. CPS Objective: Improved institutional capacity to reach the poorest and most vulnerable and increase their access to short-term employment opportunities</b></p> <p><b>Indicator 1:</b> Employment in labor-intensive community works and services increased (person-days)</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 15,000 (2013) <b>Target:</b> 400,000 (2018)</p>	<p>The CLR reports that 538,450 person-days were generated as of 2018. IEG could not verify this information.</p> <p>The May 2018 <a href="#">ISR: S</a> of P130328 reports that the number of person-days of labor intensive community works provided to able-bodied members of poor/vulnerable households were 501,250 as of March 2018.</p> <p>The January 2015 <a href="#">ISR: S</a> of P120588 reports that there were 223,200 person-days of labor intensive community works generated as of September 2014.</p> <p><b>Achieved</b></p>	<p>The objective was supported by the Crisis Response Social Safety Net Project (P130328, FY12) and its additional financing (P149621, FY15), Human Capital Social Safety Net Project (P120588, FY10) and the following ASAs: Poverty and Social Impact Analysis: Strengthening Safety Nets in Djibouti (P148622, FY15) and Gender and Poverty ESW (P148978, FY15).</p> <p>At the PLR stage, the indicator target was modified from the original: 2017.</p>
	<p><b>Indicator 2:</b> Female employment in labor intensive community works and services increased (person-days)</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 7,500 (2013) <b>Target:</b> 200,000 (2018)</p>	<p>The CLR reports that over 480,00 person-days were generated from female employment as of 2018 by applying the share of female beneficiaries (90%) to the total number of person-days generated (538,450).</p> <p>The May 2018 <a href="#">ISR: S</a> of P130328 reports that 501,250 person-days of labor-intensive community works provided to able-bodied members of poor/vulnerable households were generated as of March 2018. However, the project does not monitor directly the number of person-days associated with female beneficiaries. Given that the 90% of the beneficiaries from the work program were female (7,120 of 7,890), it is highly likely that the target of 200,000 person-days has been met. That is, 452,332 person days (or 90% of 501,250) is a good approximation for the share of female person-days generated from the public works program.</p>	<p>The objective was supported by the Crisis Response Social Safety Net Project (P130328, FY12) and its additional financing (P149621, FY15) and Human Capital Social Safety Net Project (P120588, FY10).</p> <p>At the PLR stage, the indicator target was modified from the original: 2017.</p>



CPS FY14-FY18: Focus Area I: Reducing Vulnerability	Actual Results	IEG Comments
	<p>The January 2015 <a href="#">ISR: S</a> of P120588 reports that 233,300 person-days were generated as of September 2014. However, the project does not monitor directly the number of person-days associated with female beneficiaries. The ISR also reports that 77% of the beneficiaries of the public works program were women.</p> <p><b>Achieved</b></p>	
<b>2. CPS Objective: Strengthened management of the education system</b>		
<p><b>Indicator 1:</b> Annual education statistical reports produced with key national indicators, including gender disaggregated data, to support education management (cumulative number)</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 1 (2013) <b>Target:</b> 5 (2018)</p>	<p>The CLR reports that 6 annual reports were produced as of 2018. IEG could not verify this information.</p> <p>The September 2018 <a href="#">ISR: MS</a> of P123315 reports that there were 5 annual statistical reports with key indicators produced as of August 2018.</p> <p><b>Achieved</b></p>	<p>The objective was supported by the Strengthening Institutional Capacity and Management of the Education System (P123315, FY12).</p> <p>At the PLR stage, the indicator target was updated from the original: <i>Target: 3 (2017)</i></p>
<b>3. CPS Objective: Improved utilization of maternal and child health care services and communicable disease control programs</b>		
<p><b>Indicator 1:</b> Share of women giving birth in a facility assisted by qualified personnel in rural areas (%)</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 25% (2013) <b>Target:</b> 50% (2018)</p>	<p>The CLR reports that 79.35% of women gave birth in a facility assisted by qualified personnel (Ministry of Health). However, this percentage applies to both rural and urban areas.</p> <p>The latest information from Ministry of Health reports that 79.35 percent of women nationally gave birth in a facility assisted by qualified personnel. The April 2019 <a href="#">ISR: MS</a> of P131194 reports that 24,023 women gave birth in a contracted facility assisted by qualified personnel as of June 2018. However, no data is available on women in rural areas.</p> <p><b>Not Verified</b></p>	<p>The objective was supported by the Improving Health Sector Performance Project (P131194, FY13).</p> <p>At the PLR stage, the indicator was modified from the original to include rural areas only.</p>
<p><b>Indicator 2:</b> Share of children fully immunized before their first birthday (%)</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 32% (2013) <b>Target:</b> 52% (2018)</p>	<p>The CLR reports that 52% of children were immunized before their first birthday in 2018. IEG could not verify this information.</p> <p>The April 2019 <a href="#">ISR: MS</a> of P131194 reports that 78.58% of children were fully</p>	<p>The objective was supported by the Improving Health Sector Performance Project (P131194, FY13).</p>



CPS FY14-FY18: Focus Area I: Reducing Vulnerability	Actual Results	IEG Comments
<p><b>Indicator 3:</b> Share of HIV-positive pregnant women receiving antiretroviral therapy according to protocol (%)</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 12% (2013) <b>Target:</b> 63% (2018)</p>	<p>immunized before their first birthday as of December 2017. The December 2019 <a href="#">ISR: MS</a> reports that the 2018 numbers were still being finalized.</p> <p><b>Achieved</b></p> <p>The CLR reports that 26.9% of HIV-positive pregnant women receiving antiretroviral therapy according to protocol in 2018 (Ministry of Health). The WB WDI reports that the % of pregnant women living with HIV receiving antiretroviral therapy coverage for PMTCT was 30% in 2018.</p> <p>The April 2019 <a href="#">ISR: MS</a> of P131194 reports that 342 HIV-positive pregnant women receiving antiretroviral therapy according to protocol as of June 2018. The project does not monitor the share of women as per the indicator. However, the WB World Development Indicators (WDI) report that the % of pregnant women living with HIV receiving antiretroviral therapy coverage for PMTCT was 30% in 2018.</p> <p><b>Partially Achieved</b></p>	<p>At the PLR stage, the indicator baseline and target were modified from the original: <i>Baseline: 83% (2013)</i> <i>Target: 89% (2017)</i></p> <p>The objective was supported by the Improving Health Sector Performance Project (P131194, FY13).</p> <p>At the PLR stage, the indicator target was modified from the original: 2017.</p>
<p><b>4. CPS Objective: Increased access to basic infrastructure in disadvantaged rural and urban areas</b></p>		
<p><b>Indicator 1:</b> Number of rural households with more secure access to drinking water within a reasonable travel time (two hours round-trip) in project areas (number)</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 2,160 (2013) <b>Target:</b> 7,099 (2018)</p>	<p>The July 2018 <a href="#">ISR: S</a> of P117355 reports that 8,087 rural households had more secure access to drinking water within a reasonable travel time (two hours round-trip) in project areas as of June 2018.</p> <p><b>Achieved</b></p>	<p>The objective was supported by the Rural Community Development and Water Mobilization Project (PRODERMO) (P117355, FY11) and its additional financing (P157282, FY16).</p> <p>At the PLR stage, the indicator baseline and target were modified from the original: <i>Baseline: 1,026 (2013)</i> <i>Target: 2,350 (2017)</i></p>
<p><b>Indicator 2:</b> Share of income-generating activities financed by the PRODERMO project for women (%)</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 0% (2013) <b>Target:</b> 39% (2018)</p>	<p>The July 2018 <a href="#">ISR: S</a> of P117355 reports that 53% income-generating activities financed by the PRODERMO project were for women as of June 2018.</p> <p><b>Achieved</b></p>	<p>The objective was supported by the Rural Community Development and Water Mobilization Project (PRODERMO) (P117355, FY11) and</p>



	CPS FY14-FY18: Focus Area I: Reducing Vulnerability	Actual Results	IEG Comments
			<p>its additional financing (P157282, FY16).</p> <p>At the PLR stage, the indicator was modified from the original: <i>Number of income-generating activities financed by the project for women</i> Baseline: 0 (2013) Target: 30 (2017)</p>
	<p><b>Indicator 3:</b> Number of people within 150m of rehabilitated and new urban roads, drains, and street lighting (number)</p> <p>Baseline: 0 (2013) Target: 10,000 (2018)</p>	<p>The December 2018 <a href="#">ISR: S</a> of P145848 reports that there were 8,160 people within 50m of rehabilitated and new urban roads, drains, and street lighting as of October 2018. The project monitors a smaller radius (50m) compared to the indicator (150m).</p> <p><b>Mostly Achieved</b></p>	<p>The objective was supported by the Second Urban Poverty Reduction Project (P145848, FY14).</p> <p>At the PLR stage, the indicator was modified from the original: <i>Share of properties in Quartier 7 within 50m of surfaced roads (including drainage and street lighting) increased (%)</i> Baseline: 50% (2013) Target: 80% (2017)</p>
	<p><b>Indicator 4:</b> Share of subproject beneficiaries in Quartier 7 (%) who have increased access to services and are women</p> <p>Baseline: 0% (2013) Target: 50% (2018)</p>	<p>The December 2018 <a href="#">ISR: S</a> of P145848 reports that 55% of the beneficiaries of infrastructure services (rehabilitated and new urban roads, drains, and street lighting) were women as of October 2018.</p> <p><b>Achieved</b></p>	<p>The objective was supported by the Second Urban Poverty Reduction Project (P145848).</p> <p>At the PLR stage, the indicator was modified from the original: <i>Share of Quartier 7 residents of all age groups benefiting from improved community development subprojects and services increased (%)</i> Baseline: 10% (2013) Target: 30% (2017)</p>
	<p><b>Indicator 5:</b> Beneficiaries of DRDIP with access to social and economic services and infrastructure</p>	<p>The CLR reports that there were an estimated 33,480 beneficiaries with access to social and economic services and infrastructure. The October 2019 Aide Memoire of P152822 reports that there</p>	<p>The objective was supported by the Development Response to Displacement Impacts</p>



CPS FY14-FY18: Focus Area I: Reducing Vulnerability	Actual Results	IEG Comments
<p>Baseline: 0 (2015) Target: 40,000 (2018)</p>	<p>were 33,097 direct beneficiaries of the project as of August 2019.</p> <p>The November 2019 <a href="#">ISR: S</a> of P152822 reports that there were 0 beneficiaries of DRDIP with access to social and economic services and infrastructure as of March 2018.</p> <p><b>Mostly Achieved</b></p>	<p>in the Horn of Africa Project (DRDIP) (P152822, FY16).</p> <p>At the PLR stage, the indicator was modified from the original: <i>Share of women among subproject beneficiaries in Quartier 7 (%)</i> Baseline: 0% (2013) Target: 50% (2017)</p>
<p><b>5. CPS Objective: Improved assessment of natural disaster risk and vulnerability</b></p>		
<p>Indicator 1: Implementation of Comprehensive Approach to Risk Assessment in Djibouti</p> <p>Baseline: No (2013) Target: Yes (2018)</p>	<p>The PLR reported that the Comprehensive Approach to Risk Assessment in Djibouti (CARAD) was delivered but waiting for approval by Council of Ministers. The CLR reports that the Government's ORSEC plan was not adopted.</p> <p><b>Not Achieved</b></p>	<p>The objective was supported by the ASAs Disaster Risk Management Phase III (P149978, FY16) and Natural Disaster Risk Assessment and Monitoring System (P119878, FY10).</p> <p>At the PLR stage, the indicator was modified from the original: <i>Implementation of Comprehensive Approach to Risk Assessment in Djibouti and risk assessment platform in place</i> Baseline: No (2013) Target: Yes (2017)</p>



	CPS FY14-FY18: Focus Area II: Strengthening Public and Private Sector Capacity for Service Delivery	Actual Results	IEG Comments
<u>Major Outcome Measures</u>	<b>6. CPS Objective: Improved access to affordable electricity</b>		
	<p><b>Indicator 1:</b> People provided with access to electricity by household connections</p> <p>Baseline: 14,800 (2013) Target: 22,800 (2018)</p>	<p>The IEG <a href="#">ICRR: MU</a> of P086379 reports that 26,796 people were provided with access to electricity by household connections as of December 2014.</p> <p><b>Achieved</b></p>	<p>The objective was supported by the Power Access and Diversification Project (P086379, FY06).</p> <p>At the PLR stage, the indicator target year was modified from the original: (2014)</p>
	<b>7. CPS Objective: Improved services for the private sector</b>		
	<p><b>Indicator 1:</b> Business start-up procedures streamlined (number of days)</p> <p>Baseline: 37 days (2013) Target: 10 days (2018)</p>	<p>The CLR reports that it takes 14 days to start-up a business in 2018. IEG could not verify this information.</p> <p>The <a href="#">2019</a> Doing Business report indicates that it took 13 days to start a business in 2018.</p> <p><b>Mostly Achieved</b></p>	<p>The objective was supported by the Government for Private Sector Development and Finance Project (P146250, FY14).</p> <p>At the PLR stage, the indicator target year was modified from the original: (2017)</p>
<p><b>Indicator 2:</b> Issuance of construction permits streamlined (number of days)</p> <p>Baseline: 167 days (2013) Target: 90 days (2018)</p>	<p>The CLR reports that it takes 111 days to issue a construction permit in 2018. However, this information is from the DB2017 <a href="#">report</a>.</p> <p>The <a href="#">2019</a> Doing Business report indicates that it took 148 days to issue a construction permit in 2018.</p> <p><b>Partially Achieved</b></p>	<p>The objective was supported by the Government for Private Sector Development and Finance Project (P146250, FY14).</p>	
<p><b>Indicator 3:</b> Publication of commercial and civil court cases on Ministry of Justice website expanded (%)</p> <p>Baseline: 0% (2013) Target: 95% (2018)</p>	<p>The November 2018 <a href="#">ISR: MS</a> of P146250 reports that 0% of the Commercial Chamber's decisions were published on the website as of March 2018.</p> <p><b>Not Achieved</b></p>	<p>The objective was supported by the Government for Private Sector Development and Finance Project (P146250, FY14).</p>	



**Annex Table 2: Djibouti Planned and Actual Lending, FY14-FY18 (US\$, millions)**

Project ID	Project name	Proposed FY	Approval FY	Closing FY	Proposed Amount	Proposed Amount	Approved IDA Amount
<b>Project Planned Under CPS/PLRFY14-19</b>					CPF	PLR	
P127143	Geothermal Power Production	2014	2014	2020		6	6.0
P146250	Governance for Private Sector Development	2014	2014	2021	2	2	2.0
P145848	Urban Poverty Reduction Project II	2014	2014	2019	5.6	5.6	5.6
P149621	Social Safety Net Project - AF	2015			5	5	5.0
DROPPED	Telecoms Project	2015					
<b>P152822***</b>	<b>HOA: Support to FD Impacts</b>	2016	2016	2024			20.0
P158696	DJ Social Safety Net AF-2		2016				4.0
P157282	DJ-Second Additional Financing Rural Com		2016				7.0
P158952	Governance for Private Sector & Finance AF		2017				5.1
P158505	DJ: Sustainable Electrification Program		2017	2024			23.3
<b>Total Planned</b>					<b>13</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>78.0</b>
<b>Unplanned Projects during the CPS Period</b>			<b>Approval FY</b>	<b>Closing FY</b>	<b>Proposed Amount</b>	<b>Proposed Amount</b>	<b>Approved IDA Amount</b>
P162904	DJ Public Admin. Modernization Project		2018	2023			15.0
P165558	DJI Support for Entrepreneurship		2018	2024			15.0
<b>Total Unplanned</b>							<b>30.0</b>
<b>On-going Projects during the CPS/PLR Period</b>			<b>Approval FY</b>	<b>Closing FY</b>			<b>Approved IDA Amount</b>
P131194	DJ Improving Health Sector Performance		2013	2021			7.0
P130328	DJ Crisis Response-SSN project		2012	2019			5.0
P130493	<i>DJ-Power Access &amp; Diversification AF II</i> **		2012	2015			5.2
P130515	DJ-Rural CDD & Water Mobilization AF		2012	2020			3.0
P123315	Strengthening Institutional Capacity and		2012	2019			6.0
P117355	DJ-Rural CDD & Water Mobilization		2011	2020			5.8
P112253	<i>DJ-Power Access &amp; Diversification AF</i> **		2010	2015			6.0
P120190	DJ-Urban Poverty Reduction Add Financing **		2010	2015			2.9
P088876	DJ-URBAN POVERTY REDUCTION PROJECT		2008	2015			3.0
P086379	DJ-Power Access and Diversification Proj		2006	2015			7.0
<b>Total On-going</b>							<b>50.9</b>

Source: Djibouti CPS, WB Business Intelligence Table 2a.1, 2a.4 and 2a.7 as of 2/14-/20

\*LIR: Latest internal rating. MU: Moderately Unsatisfactory. MS: Moderately Satisfactory. S: Satisfactory. HS: Highly Satisfactory.

\*\* Rating from Parent Project

\*\*\* Regional Project



**Annex Table 3: Advisory Services & Analytics for Djibouti, FY14-18**

Proj ID	ASA	Fiscal year	Practice	Product Line
P156794	DJ Poverty TA	2018	Poverty and Equity	TA
P159859	Support to Parliament in Djibouti	2018	Governance	AA
P160534	Djibouti #D025 Strengthening the Legal Framework for Accounting and Auditing	2018	Governance	AA
P163522	Djibouti Debt Management Performance Assessment (DeMPA) 2017	2018	Macroeconomics, Trade and Investment	AA
P165511	Djibouti Debt Management	2018	Macroeconomics, Trade and Investment	AA
P160091	Djibouti Tax Reform and National Account	2017	Macroeconomics, Trade and Investment	TA
P144188	Evaluating the nutrition/workfare SSN	2016	Social Protection & Jobs	IE
P145913	DJIBOUTI HOUSING REVIEW AND SLUM STRATEGY	2016	Social, Urban, Rural and Resilience Global Practice	TA
P149392	Djibouti #A047 Operationalization of MSME Credit Guarantee Fund	2016	Finance, Competitiveness and Innovation	TA
P149978	Disaster Risk Management Country Program Phase III	2016	Social, Urban, Rural and Resilience Global Practice	TA
P150911	DJ South-South Technical Assistance	2016	Other	TA
P151141	DJ Governance TA	2016	Governance	TA
P155495	Improving Youth well-being and opportunities in Djibouti by reducing Qat consumption	2016	Social, Urban, Rural and Resilience Global Practice	TA
P157187	Djibouti Governance Capacity Building	2016	Governance	EW
P144127	Options for Telecoms Sector Opening in Djibouti (Phase II)	2015	Transport	TA
P146635	Support to Governance Reforms TA	2015	Governance	TA
P147240	Djibouti MTDS	2015	Macroeconomics, Trade and Investment	TA
P147405	Djibouti #A034 Modernization of the payments system and credit reporting infrastructures	2015	Finance, Competitiveness and Innovation	TA
P148622	Poverty and Social Impact Analysis: Strengthening Safety Nets in Djibouti	2015	Social Protection & Jobs	TA
P148978	Poverty and Gender ESW: Assessing Gender and the Incidence of Growth on Poverty	2015	Poverty and Equity	EW
P128870	DJ CPI and National Accounts	2014	Poverty and Equity	TA
P130590	Telecom Sector Reform	2014	Transport	TA
P130809	DJ HRITF Knowledge and Learning	2014	Health, Nutrition & Population	TA
P132803	Governance	2014	Governance	TA
P149727	Djibouti Light Manufacturing report	2014	Macroeconomics, Trade and Investment	TA

Source: WB BI Reporting and ASA Standard Report Monitoring as of 1/22/2020



**Annex Table 4: Djibouti Active Trust Funds in FY14-18 (US\$, millions)**

Project ID	Project name	TF ID	Approval FY	Closing FY	Approved Amount	Approved Amount (\$M)
P163609	Djibouti: National Strategy for Development of Statistics (NSDS) and Strengthening of National Account Production	TF A5394	2018	2020	0.4	420,510.0
P162743	Djibouti Household Survey 2017	TF A4568	2017	2019	0.5	500,000.0
P148586	Enhancing income opportunities in DJ	TF A0350	2015	2019	2.7	2,730,000.0
P149046	Strengthening Accountability for Efficient and Transparent Public Expenditure Implementation	TF 16479	2014	2017	0.3	330,000.0
P127143	DJ Geothermal Power Generation Project	TF 14765	2014	2019	1.1	1,100,000.0
		TF 14757	2014	2020	6.0	6,036,364.0
P149152	Professionalization and capacity buildg of public proc. in Djibouti	TF 16478	2014	2017	0.4	350,000.0
P145323	Access to Quality Education Project	TF 16473	2014	2018	3.8	3,800,000.0
P131194	DJ Improving Health Sector Performance	TF 19258	2015	2021	7.0	7,000,000.0
P119878	DJ-Natural Disaster Risk Assessment and Monitoring System	TF 96839	2011	2014	0.9	900,000.0
P120588	CRISIS RESPONSE: EMPLOYMENT AND HUMAN CAPITAL SOCIAL SAFETY NET	TF 97217	2011	2015	3.6	3,640,000.0
<b>Total</b>					<b>26.8</b>	<b>26,806,874</b>

**Annex Table 5: IEG Project Ratings for Djibouti, FY14-18 (US\$, millions)**

Exit FY	Proj ID	Project name	Total Evaluated	IEG Outcome	IEG Risk to DO
2015	P086379	DJ-Power Access and Diversification Proj	17.9	MODERATELY UNSATISFACTORY	SIGNIFICANT
2015	P088876	DJ-URBAN POVERTY REDUCTION PROJECT	5.8	MODERATELY UNSATISFACTORY	SIGNIFICANT
<b>Total</b>			<b>23.7</b>		

Source: AO Key IEG Ratings as of 1/23/2020

Note: IEG Risk to DO rating was dropped in July 2017 following the reform of the simplified ICRs but a narrative evaluation for Risk to Development Outcome was kept.



**Annex Table 6: IEG Project Ratings for Djibouti and Comparators, FY14-18**

Region	Total Evaluated (\$M)	Total Evaluated (No)	Outcome % Sat (\$)	Outcome % Sat (No)	RDO % Moderate or Lower Sat (\$)	RDO % Moderate or Lower Sat (No)
Djibouti	23.7	2	-	-	-	-
MNA - FCS*	2,179.3	28	86.0	64.3	-	-
FCS**	7,217.4	180	76.1	67.2	6.1	16.5
MNA	7,288.8	105	90.0	75.2	28.8	19.5
World Bank	111,434.9	1,201	83.9	75.0	45.6	40.5

Source: WB AO as of 2/13/2020

**Annex Table 7: Portfolio Status for Djibouti and Comparators, FY14-18**

Fiscal year	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Ave FY14-18
<b>Djibouti</b>						
# Proj	9	7	7	8	10	8
# Proj At Risk	3	3	3	4	3	3
% Proj At Risk	33.3	42.9	42.9	50.0	30.0	39.0
Net Comm Amt (\$M)	64.5	45.4	56.4	84.8	114.8	73.2
Comm At Risk (\$M)	29.2	17.6	19.0	33.0	27.0	25.2
% Commit at Risk	45.3	38.7	33.7	38.9	23.5	34.4
<b>MNA</b>						
# Proj	89	80	76	68	74	77
# Proj At Risk	28	38	26	25	12	26
% Proj At Risk	31.5	47.5	34.2	36.8	16.2	33.3
Net Comm Amt (\$M)	10,606.2	11,668.5	14,459.5	15,243.3	16,994.8	13,794
Comm At Risk (\$M)	2,224.6	2,787.2	1,826.9	3,416.9	1,393.5	2,330
% Commit at Risk	21.0	23.9	12.6	22.4	8.2	16.9
<b>MNA - FCS*</b>						
# Proj	43	37	32	26	31	34
# Proj At Risk	18	28	21	15	8	18
% Proj At Risk	41.9	75.7	65.6	57.7	25.8	53.3
Net Comm Amt (\$M)	2,112.4	2,430.7	3,528.7	4,293.5	4,966.8	3,466
Comm At Risk (\$M)	865.2	1,345.7	1,437.7	1,804.0	682.4	1,227
% Commit at Risk	41.0	55.4	40.7	42.0	13.7	35.4
<b>FCS**</b>						
# Proj	224	225	221	236	258	233
# Proj At Risk	80	88	86	94	87	87
% Proj At Risk	35.7	39.1	38.9	39.8	33.7	37.4
Net Comm Amt (\$M)	10,752.90	11,996.4	14,071.6	17,776.2	19,441.8	14,808
Comm At Risk (\$M)	4,009.20	4,690.0	5,396.4	7,734.4	5,839.7	5,534
% Commit at Risk	37.3	39.1	38.3	43.5	30.0	37.4
<b>World</b>						
# Proj	1,386	1,402	1,398	1,459	1,497	1,428
# Proj At Risk	329	339	336	344	348	339
% Proj At Risk	23.7	24.2	24.0	23.6	23.2	23.7
Net Comm Amt (\$M)	183,153.9	191,907.8	207,350.0	212,502.9	229,965.6	204,976
Comm At Risk (\$M)	39,748.6	44,430.7	42,715.1	50,837.9	48,148.8	45,176
% Commit at Risk	21.7	23.2	20.6	23.9	20.9	22.0

Source: WB AO as of 2/13/2020

Agreement type: IBRD/IDA Only



**Annex Table 8: Total Net Disbursements of Official Development Assistance and Official Aid for Djibouti (US\$, millions)**

Development Partners	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
<b>All Donors, Total</b>	<b>166.11</b>	<b>173.39</b>	<b>185.35</b>	<b>142.49</b>	<b>177.33</b>
<b>DAC Countries, Total</b>	<b>82.58</b>	<b>87.74</b>	<b>69.54</b>	<b>73.39</b>	<b>67.27</b>
Australia	0.06	0.03	0.01	0.03	0
Austria	..	..	0	0.01	0.01
Canada	1.56	0.78	0.85	1.44	1.24
Czech Republic	0.03	0.02	..	..	..
Finland	0.01	0.01	..	..	0.01
France	40.8	56.29	49.06	41.29	44.53
Germany	1.1	1.43	1.14	0.54	0.36
Greece	0.01	0	..	..	..
Iceland	0.18	0.11	0.04	..	0.06
Ireland	0.21	4.26	0.87	0.15	..
Italy	26.46	17.84	9.13	16.92	0.63
Japan	..	0.08	..	0.19	9.38
Korea	..	..	..	0.23	..
Luxembourg	1.33	..	..	..	..
Netherlands	0.48	0.25	..	..	..
Norway	2.19	0.8	1.46	0.93	..
Sweden	0.01	0.14	0.22	..	1.37
Switzerland	..	0.03	..	0.05	..
United Kingdom	8.15	5.65	6.75	11.61	0.07
United States					9.62
<b>Multilaterals, Total</b>	<b>67.99</b>	<b>53.9</b>	<b>58.68</b>	<b>42.27</b>	<b>78.17</b>
EU Institutions	31.64	9.48	13.17	14.69	32.45
International Monetary Fund, Total	-1.4	-1.49	-1.89	-4.44	-6.3
IMF (Concessional Trust Funds)	-1.4	-1.49	-1.89	-4.44	-6.3
Regional Development Banks, Total	-0.01	7.66	2.48	2.12	-1.55
African Development Bank, Total	-1.93	2.24	-1.04	0.68	-1.24
African Development Bank [AfDB]	0.06	..	..	..	..
African Development Fund [AfDF]	-1.99	2.24	-1.04	0.68	-1.24
Islamic Development Bank [IsDB]	1.92	5.42	3.52	1.44	-0.31
United Nations, Total	7.62	6.66	5.75	6.79	7.5
International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA]	..	..	0.07	0.05	0.33
IFAD	0.7	1.02	0.86	1.65	0.03
International Labour Organisation [ILO]	0.07	0.12	0.11	0.08	2.34
UNAIDS	0.42	0.43	0.38	0.32	0.06
UNDP	1.07	0.77	0.83	0.6	0.02



Development Partners	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
UNFPA	0.81	1.03	0.73	0.55	0.52
UNICEF	1.05	1.25	1.09	1.25	0.51
WFP	3.08	0.79	0.98	1.44	1.1
World Health Organisation [WHO]	0.43	1.25	0.7	0.84	1.51
World Bank Group, Total	9.32	6.48	4.6	10.37	1.05
World Bank, Total	9.32	6.48	4.6	10.37	13.1
International Development Association [IDA]	9.32	6.48	4.6	10.37	13.1
Other Multilateral, Total	20.81	25.1	34.57	12.75	13.1
Adaptation Fund	1.38	..	1.84	..	32.97
Arab Fund (AFESD)	11.99	21.42	19.86	6.24	0.39
Central Emergency Response Fund [CERF]	..	..	..	..	18.04
Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization [GAVI]	0.25	1.55	0.52	1.2	1.2
Global Environment Facility [GEF]	3.76	3.76	3.86	2.12	1.13
Global Fund	1.45	-0.43	8.23	4.54	0.05
OPEC Fund for International Development [OFID]	1.99	-1.2	0.26	-1.35	1.88
					10.28
<b>Non-DAC Countries, Total</b>	<b>15.54</b>	<b>31.76</b>	<b>57.13</b>	<b>26.83</b>	<b>31.89</b>
Azerbaijan	..	..	..	0.12	..
Israel	..	0	..	..	0.03
Kuwait	12.23	11.37	55.22	13.57	..
Turkey	2.97	3.94	1.78	3.47	14.68
United Arab Emirates	0.35	12.61	-0.11	0.22	0.04
<b>Private Donors, Total</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.16</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.16</b>
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	0.01	0.16	0.01	0.4	0.16

Source: OECD Stat. DAC2a as of 2/13/2020

Annex Table 9: Economic and Social Indicators for Djibouti, FY14-18

Series Name						Djibouti	MNA	World
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Average 2014-2018		
<b>Growth and Inflation</b>								
GDP growth (annual %)	7.1	7.7	6.9	5.1	5.5	6.5	3.4	2.8
GDP per capita growth (annual %)	5.2	5.9	5.2	3.4	3.8	4.7	1.6	1.7
GNI per capita, PPP (current international \$)	..	..	..	..	..		13,046.8	16,497.1
GNI per capita, Atlas method (current US\$)	..	2,740.0	2,890.0	3,000.0	3,190.0	2,955.0	4,216.6	10,722.8
Inflation, consumer prices (annual %)	1.3	(0.8)	2.7	0.6	0.1	0.8	3.2	1.9
<b>Composition of GDP (%)</b>								
Agriculture, value added (% of GDP)	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.4		9.5	3.5
Industry, value added (% of GDP)	11.5	11.5	11.2	11.8	12.4		35.5	25.6
Services, value added (% of GDP)	80.5	80.1	80.5	79.7	79.1		51.9	64.8
Gross fixed capital formation (% of GDP)	27.9	29.7	27.3	25.9	..		24.0	23.5
<b>External Accounts</b>								
Exports of goods and services (% of GDP)	158.3	140.6	100.0	147.0	148.8	138.9	26.3	29.5
Imports of goods and services (% of GDP)	161.5	139.5	124.4	178.4	178.9	156.5	32.7	28.8
Current account balance (% of GDP)	(10.4)	(12.3)	(6.5)	(10.6)	..	-10.0		
External debt stocks (% of GNI)	137.7	147.4	157.9	171.7	157.6	154.5		
Total debt service (% of GNI)	7.0	7.0	6.8	12.2	21.8	11.0	2.7	
Total reserves in months of imports	5.4	3.9	5.2	6.4	..	5.2	21.4	12.4
<b>Fiscal Accounts <sup>1</sup></b>								
General government revenue (% of GDP)	22.2	26.3	24.2	23.6	23.9	24.0		
General government total expenditure (% of GDP)	29.0	41.6	32.5	28.1	26.7	31.6		
General government net lending/borrowing (% of GDP)	(6.9)	(15.3)	(8.3)	(4.5)	(2.9)	-7.6		
General government gross debt (% of GDP)	26.9	39.9	45.7	47.9	48.0	41.7		
<b>Health</b>								
Life expectancy at birth, total (years)	63.2	64.1	65.1	65.9	..	64.6	73.1	72.1
Immunization, DPT (% of children ages 12-23 months)	78.0	84.0	68.0	76.0	84.0	78.0	88.4	85.7
People using safely managed sanitation services (% of pop)	34.0	34.8	35.6	36.4	..			43.3
People using at least basic drinking water services (% of pop)	75.6	75.6	75.6	75.6	..	75.6	92.8	89.0
Mortality rate, infant (per 1,000 live births)	55.8	54.2	52.6	51.2	49.8	52.7	20.8	30.6
<b>Education</b>								
School enrollment, preprimary (% gross)	..	5.2	5.8	7.0	7.8		27.8	49.1
School enrollment, primary (% gross)	71.0	70.1	69.4	69.6	70.3		104.2	103.4

Series Name						Djibouti	MNA	World
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Average 2014-2018		
School enrollment, secondary (% gross)	46.2	46.8	48.1	47.8	51.5		76.2	75.5
School enrollment, tertiary (% gross)	..	..	..	..	..		38.3	37.2
<b>pop</b>								
population, total	898,696	913,993	929,112	944,097	958,920	928,964	365,899,670	7,425,513,221
population growth (annual %)	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.2
Urban population (% of total)	77.3	77.4	77.5	77.6	77.8	77.5	60.8	54.4
Rural population (% of total pop)	22.7	22.6	22.5	22.4	22.2		39.2	45.6
<b>Poverty</b>								
Poverty headcount ratio at \$1.90 a day (2011 PPP) (% of pop)	..	..	..	17.1	..			10.0
Poverty headcount ratio at national poverty lines (% of pop)	..	..	..	21.1	..			
Rural poverty headcount ratio at national poverty lines (% of rural pop)	..	..	..	..	..			
Urban poverty headcount ratio at national poverty lines (% of urban pop)	..	..	..	..	..			
GINI index (World Bank estimate)	..	..	..	41.6	..			

Source: WB Databank World Development Indicators 1/23/2020

\*International Monetary Fund, World Economic Outlook Database, October 2019

**Annex Table 10: List of IFC Investments in Djibouti (US\$, millions)**
**Investments Committed in FY14-FY18**

Project ID	Project Short Name	Institution Number	Cmt FY	Project Status	Primary Sector Name	Orig Cmt-IFC Bal	Net Commitment (LN)	Net Commitment (EQ)	Total Net Commitment (LN+EQ)
	None								
					Sub-Total	-	-	-	-

Source: IFC-MIS Extract as of 1/10/2020

**Annex Table 11: List of IFC Advisory Services in Djibouti (US\$, millions)**
**Advisory Services Approved in FY14-18**

Project ID	Project Name	Impl Start FY	Impl End FY	Project Status	Primary Business Line	Total Funds Managed by IFC
602619	Djibouti Credit	2018	2018	CLOSED	EFI	0.05
601164	Djibouti PPP Framework	2017	2017	CLOSED	CPC	0.50
599156*	Indicator-Based Reform in Sub-Saharan Africa	2014	2017	CLOSED	TAC	2.07
	Sub-Total					2.62

**Advisory Services Approved pre-FY14 but active during FY14-19**

Project ID	Project Name	Impl Start FY	Impl End FY	Project Status	Primary Business Line	Total Funds Managed by IFC
	None					-
	Sub-Total					-
	TOTAL					2.62

Source: IFC AS Portal Data as of 1/13/2020

\* Regional AS Project Total funds managed = \$2,067,938

**Annex Table 12: List of MIGA Projects Active in Djibouti, FY14-18 (US\$, millions)**

Project ID	Project Title	Project Status	Fiscal Year	Sector	Investor Country	Max Gross Issuance
13129	Mezz Tower and Djibouti International Business Centre	Active	2017	Services	Switzerland	24.3
7049	Doraleh Container Terminal S.A.R.L.	Active	2008	Transportation	Germany, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom	427.0
	Total					451.3

Source: MIGA with Project Brief as of 1/23/2020