

# PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT (PCR)

## A. PROJECT DATA AND KEY DATES

### I. BASIC INFORMATION

Project Number: P-BJ-ABO-004	Project Name: Mono and Couffo Rural Development Support Project (PADMOC)	Country: Republic of Benin	
Lending Instrument(s): Loan No. 2100150000101		Sector: Rural Development	Environmental Classification II
Original Commitment Amount UA 9 130 000.00	Amount Cancelled UA 4 301 234.54	Amount Disbursed ADF: UA 4 828 765.46	% Disbursed ADF: 52.88%
Borrower: Republic of Benin			
Executing Agency(ies): Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries / CeRPA-Mono-Couffo / Project Management Unit Main Partners Involved: ABE, ONASA, DRH			
Co-financers and other External Partners: Government of Benin: UA 1.09 million                      Beneficiaries: UA 0.33 million			

### II. KEY DATES

Project Concept Note Cleared by Ops. Com. Not applicable	Appraisal Report Cleared by Ops. Com. Not applicable	Board Approval: 18 April 2001	
Restructuring(s): Not applicable			
	<b>Original Date</b>	<b>Actual Date</b>	<b>Difference in Months [actual date-original date]</b>
EFFECTIVENESS	4/7/2003	13/11/2003	4
MID-TERM REVIEW	October 2005	June 2008	41
CLOSING	December 2009	December 2010	12

### III. RATINGS SUMMARY

CRITERIA	SUB-CRITERIA	RATING
PROJECT OUTCOME	Achievement of Outputs	1.71
	Achievement of Outcomes	1.30
	Timeliness	3
	<b>OVERALL PROJECT OUTCOME</b>	<b>2</b>
BANK PERFORMANCE	Design and Readiness	2.43
	Supervision	2.83
	<b>OVERALL BANK PERFORMANCE</b>	<b>2.63</b>
BORROWER PERFORMANCE	Design and Readiness	1.75
	Implementation	1.4
	<b>OVERALL BORROWER PERFORMANCE</b>	<b>1.58</b>

#### IV. RESPONSIBLE BANK STAFF

POSITIONS	AT APPROVAL	AT COMPLETION
Regional Director		J. K. LITSE
Sector Director	E.G. TAYLOR-LEWIS	A. BEILEH
Task Manager	N. KALALA	H. FELLAH (OSAN.2)
PCR Team Leader		H. FELLAH (Agricultural Engineer)
PCR Team Members		A.DJIRO (MLFO), M.H. SNANE (Consultant)

#### B. PROJECT CONTEXT (300 words)

Although Benin's agricultural production is diversified and helps to meet the needs of the people in a normal year, pockets of food insecurity still exist in some areas of the country. Against this backdrop, the Mono Integrated Rural Development Project (PDRIM), designed to secure agricultural production, was implemented from 1991 to 1999 with ADF and European Union funding. Overall, the project's objectives were achieved, but the use of some outputs was not optimized. To attain food security, preserve and develop natural resources, restructure farmers' organizations and diversify production and sources of income for people in the project area, the Government of Benin requested the Bank's assistance in financing the Mono and Couffo Rural Development Support Project (PADMOC) to consolidate the achievements in Mono and extend them to Couffo. In response, two Bank missions visited Benin in November 1998 and November 2000 to appraise PADMOC.

PADMOC is consistent with the National Rural Development Policy and fleshes out the Government's strategy as formalized in the Rural Development Policy Letter (RDPL) in 1991. The strategy underscores the diversification of agricultural production and emphasizes the State's role in its key functions (design, coordination, monitoring and evaluation of development activities), the production and marketing functions henceforth falling under the non-state sector (farmers' organizations). Multi-sector activities included in the project (fish farming, fisheries, market gardening, and food production, infrastructure and natural resources), including those under the support to farmers' organizations and credit component, are in line with project objectives.

The Bank's portfolio in 2011 comprises eleven on-going projects for a total commitment of UA 74.4 million in the following key areas: agriculture, roads, electrification, forestry, fisheries, water and finance. Four projects (NERICA, APRA / INRAB, PAFICOT and PAFILAV) are currently being implemented in the agricultural sector.

Projects under the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MAEP) financed by other donors: IFAD is financing PADER for CFAF 6 443 million, Belgian Cooperation FAFAMA/CM for CFAF 3 608 million and the WADB the PSAIA for CFAF 2 739 million. In fish farming and fisheries, PADPPA is co-financed by IFAD for CFAF 5 495 million and the ADF for CFAF 5 117 million.

#### C. PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

The project sector objective is to contribute to consolidating the country's food security.

The project specific objective is to diversify and increase agricultural production.

The project comprises three components:

Component A: Strengthening Rural Infrastructure: it helps to open up the Tchis Depression, which holds some of Benin's largest water and soil resources, and to curb the deterioration of some infrastructure vital for the development of fish farming

in Mono and Couffo. Lastly, the rehabilitation of rural promotion centres (RPC) and training centres (TC) contributes to improving the implementation of the farmers' cooperative and training promotion sub-components under Component B.

Component B: Support to Farmers: the credit sub-component is a key element for providing institutional support to farmers' organizations and rationalizing the infrastructure built under Component A.

Component C: Project Management, to coordinate activities implemented and provide institutional support to the other two components.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES DIMENSIONS		ASSESSMENT	RATING
RELEVANT	(a) Relevant to the country's development priorities.	Benin enjoys overall food self-sufficiency in normal years. The existing potential enables the country to diversify and generate excess agricultural production. The agrological and socio-economic conditions of Mono-Couffo are conducive to the attainment of this goal.	3
ACHIEVABLE	(b) Objectives could in principle be achieved with the project inputs and in the expected timeframe.	PADMOC is a natural follow-up to PDRIM that preceded it. PADMOC design based on the outputs of PDRIM (ADF) and PAMR-Mono (Belgium) makes it possible to achieve its objectives in the expected timeframe. However, the conduct of studies during the project implementation phase led to the extension of the timeframe for completing infrastructure works.	3
CONSISTENT	(c) Consistent with the Bank's country or regional strategy.	The Project is in line with the Bank Group's intervention strategy, which seeks to contribute to economic growth to reduce poverty. The strategy focuses primarily on the development of rural infrastructure and fisheries, and intensification of agriculture and fish farming.	3
	(d) Consistent with the Bank's corporate priorities.	Project objectives are in keeping with the Bank's priorities concerning the diversification and enhancement of agricultural production, development of human resources and improvement of the living and sanitation conditions of rural dwellers and the fight against environmental degradation.	3

*Comment: Given the shortcomings of the original Project matrix, there was a need to reformulate the logical framework presented in the table below, which includes elements of the appraisal report restructured by component to improve their coherence and facilitate their use.*

OBJECTIVES	ACTIVITY	EXPECTED OUTPUTS	EXPECTED OUTCOMES	INDICATORS TO BE MEASURED
Sector objectives	Strengthening the country's food security.	Increase in maize and rice production from 55 978 tons and 525 tons in 2000 to 73 728 tons and 1 353 tons in 2010 respectively in Mono-Couffo.	Additional production of staple foodstuffs and animal protein to guarantee food security, and market garden produce and fish for export.	Statistics on agricultural produce, livestock and fish imports and exports.
Specific objectives: Increase and diversify	Diversifying and increasing farmers' production. (12	Increase in the production of food, market garden produce and tree plantations.	Export of some agricultural produce (tomato). Improvement in farmers' income in 2010.	MAEP statistics on agricultural, livestock and fisheries production.

production	000 beneficiaries in 12 municipal councils).	Increase in yields from 0.9 to 1.75 t/ha for maize, 1.5 to 2.7 t/ha for rice and 10 to 20 t/ha for cassava.		
	Diversifying and increasing the production of stockbreeders, fishermen and fish farmers.	Additional meat production from backyard flock and ruminants, freshwater and sea fish production.	Food self-sufficiency in meat and fish. Improvement and diversification of sources of income.	MAEP statistics on livestock and fisheries production.
<b>COMPONENT</b>	<b>ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>EXPECTED OUTPUTS</b>	<b>EXPECTED IMPACTS/OUTCOMES</b>	<b>INDICATORS TO BE MEASURED</b>
<u>Component A:</u> <u>Rural Infrastructure</u>	Consolidation of rural roads and opening up of the Tchis Depression	The lengths of rural roads to be constructed, rehabilitated and improved are 40 km, 13 km and 60 km, respectively. Construction of a bridge over the Couffo.	All-season access to 12 municipal councils in Mono-Couffo is improved. Increase in road traffic and volume of produce sold.	Length of rural road sections constructed or rehabilitated. Number and dimensions of structures constructed according to the final design and BD.
		15 Rural Road Maintenance Committees (RRMC) are set up for 40 km of new rural roads. RRMCs for the 13 km of rural roads to be rehabilitated are mobilized. Involvement of RRMCs in the 60 km of rural roads to be improved.	RRMCs operate as viable community entities thanks to adequate human, material and financial resources at their disposal. The sustainability of rural roads is ensured by municipal council budgets.	Number of RRMCs that are functional. Length of rural roads in good condition. Municipal Council Development Plan updated to ensure rural road maintenance.
	Rural water supply and sanitation.	Construction of 30 boreholes equipped with hand pumps and 28 latrines in the Bopa (Mono) and Lalo (Couffo) municipal councils and drinking water supply in Kogbétohoué and Kpétou rural promotion centres (RPC).	Supply of drinking water to 36 villages and construction of latrines in 28 villages. Improved quality of life of the population and housing conditions for the 2 RPCs.	Number of boreholes completed and equipped. Number of latrines built. Connection of RPCs to the existing drinking water and electricity networks.
		Rural mobilization by setting up Water Point Management Committees (WPMC). The population's financial contributions (10%) are paid.	WPMCs are financially viable, helping to ensure the sustainability of water points and latrines.	Number of functional WPMCs. Number of WPMCs involved in the management of boreholes and latrines.

	ESMP implementation.	Night-soil used as manure. Faecal contamination and waterborne diseases are reduced.	Disease statistics in health centres. WPMC revenue derived from the sale of manure.
Development of irrigation schemes.	300 ha of marshland developed by the project. Access by farmers to credit for the construction of creels.	Increase in areas under off-season cropping system and in food production, particularly rice.	Area of marshland developed. Amount of credit used for the construction of creels.
	Development of 45 ha of irrigated areas around artesian wells for market gardening.	Increase in market garden crop yields and production. Increase in farmers' income.	Number of boreholes drilled and equipped. Area equipped with an irrigation system. Amount of credit used for market gardening.
	200 m <sup>2</sup> of drying yards constructed/ developed.	Improved quality of agricultural produce; Reduction in post-harvest losses.	Number/area of drying yards constructed.
Construction of fish ponds and fish holes (40 ha in Tchis).	Increase in area of fish ponds from 23 ha to 63 ha and intensification of fish farming systems.	Self-sufficiency in fish. Increase in productivity from 1.2 t/ha/yr to 5 t/ha/yr, resulting in an increase in fish production from 27 t/yr in 2000 to 315 t/yr in 2010.	Number/area of fish ponds and fish holes constructed. Amount of credit granted for fish farming. Quantity of fish produced.
Rehabilitation of the Tohouou Fry Rearing Centre in Mono and the Kpétou RPC (thirty 500 m <sup>2</sup> ponds).	Increase in fry and feed-grade production in Tohouou in 2010 from 32 000 to 900 000 and 3 tons to 180 tons, respectively. 7.5 tons/year of fish produced in Kpétou.	Resumption of supply by the Tohouou Fry Rearing Centre of tilapia and catfish fingerlings to old and new ponds. Resumption of training in fish farming by Kpétou RPC.	Number/area of tanks, ponds and buildings rehabilitated and/or built. Equipment installed. Quantities of fry and fish produced. Number of youths trained in fish farming.
Construction of the Dakomey Fish Farm hatchery at Aplahoué.	Construction of a 100 m <sup>2</sup> building, 10 hatching troughs and 6 fish ponds. The production of fingerlings and fish will attain 1 million and 2 tons, respectively.	Ponds and the water supply network already built in this centre will become functional and contribute to reducing the country's deficit in fry and fish.	Number/dimensions of buildings, tanks and troughs built. Number/area of ponds rehabilitated. Equipment installed. Quantities of fry and fish produced.
Construction of a 200 m <sup>2</sup> fishing base and a 100 m <sup>2</sup> smoking centre at Ayiguinou.	Reduction in losses from overfishing by processing. Improvement in the working conditions of fishermen.	Improvement and adjustment of income of fishermen.	Dimensions of the fishing base and smoking centre constructed. Equipment installed. Quantities of smoked fish sold.
Agricultural Training Centre and promotion of	Rehabilitation of the 4 RPCs in Kogbéhoué, Agnavo, Grand Popo	Training of 400 out-of-school youths and 3 400 farmers. Improvement in	Type/area of buildings and other infrastructure rehabilitated. Equipment

	farmers' organizations (FOs).	and Kpétou and Dogbé Training Centre.	living and teaching conditions.	installed. Number of youths and farmers trained in the centres.
		Construction of 7 multi-purpose halls for apex farmers' organizations.	Improvement of the supervision of producers by council and district unions.	Type/area of buildings constructed. Equipment installed. Level of use of infrastructure.
<u>Component B</u> Support to Farmers.	Food crisis: CFAF 1 400 million of credit reallocated to PUASA.	Production of selected seeds. Use of pesticides, inputs, farm implements and fishing equipment by producers.	Enhanced food and fish production. Food self-sufficiency.	Number of beneficiaries. Area affected. Amount of UA 2 million credit used.
	Promotion of grassroots farmers' organizations (GF, village groups) and apex organizations (PCU, UCGF, UDP, UDFG).	300 farmers' organizations (25 producer organizations/municipal councils) are diagnosed and their members trained in the 12 municipal councils covered by the project.	Members of the 300 farmers' organizations selected are taught literacy and trained in many technical and financial domains.	Increase in percentage of FOs with at most 5 illiterate members. Number of FOs that have guaranteed loans for their members.
		Training of 159 members of apex FOs, of which 58 in Mono, 66 in Couffo and 35 at regional level.	Improvement of the maize, cassava, rice and tomato sub-sectors. Building of capacity in the design of micro-projects.	Increase in percentage of FOs with processing /marketing activities in these sub-sectors.
	Training	Training plan prepared. Eleven-month training for out-of-school youths (400) and short-term training for farmers (3 200).	Access to land by youths. Improvement in existing production systems and techniques. Reduction in rural-urban migration.	Number of youths and farmers trained. Number of youths installed in farms. Number of trained farmers that have obtained credit.
		Training of technicians and CeCPA extension workers (RCPA, TSIEC, TSAGRN and TSPA).	Preparation of plant, animal and fishery production micro-project documents (32 RCPA and PADPPA extension workers).	Increase in the number of micro-projects per sub-sector financed through loans.
		Seed growers are trained and supervised in the production of improved rice and maize seeds.	Decline in the shortage of improved seeds. Increased maize and rice yields.	Increase in the number of seed growers and area under improved seed production.
	Training of CeCPA producers and technicians in tomato cultivation.	Technicians (50 TSPV, CPV, ACIPV, DPFSA technicians) and pilot farmers are well trained on irrigated crop control	Improvement in the production of fruits and tomato seeds. Continuation of the collection of tomato	Increase in tomato yield and areas under cultivation. Quantities of tomato seeds produced.

		systems.	cultivars.	
Research and Development		90 ha of hedge plants and 6 190 rare plant species planted.	Protection of farm plots and improvement of biodiversity.	Percentage of success of planting. Area of plots protected by tree hedges.
		Establishment of a marketing observatory in 8 markets.	Producers are informed on time about price trends. Improvement in income of producers and traders.	Number/duration of radio programmes on price lists. Number of information slots in LISA-SAR.
		Monitoring and analysis of data from 240 farms.	Monitoring of project impact on promoters and producers (12 000 farmers).	Number/size of farms monitored annually. Volume and quality of data entered in the monitoring and evaluation software.
		Installation and equipment of 20 phytosanitary brigades.	Functional Phytosanitary Warning System. Improved crop yields.	Number of functional brigades. Areas covered by these brigades. Number of dealers and quantities of pesticides sold.
		Planting of <i>mucuna</i> (1 680 ha), <i>choc acacia</i> (250 ha) and vetiver (400 ha).	Sustainable use of soil and improvement of soil fertility.	Planted acreage by species. Number of beneficiaries. Amount of loans used in this component.
Credit: the ADB's original line of credit was CFAF 2 551.2 million of which CFAF 1 400 million was reallocated to PUASA.	Loan amount granted under ADF's line of credit (UA 0.63 million). Continuation of the line of credit (high repayment rate). Promotion of growth sectors (maize, rice, cassava) with short-term loans and increase in the value of production with long-term loans.	Increased profitability of food crops. Improvement in the value of agricultural production through processing and conservation. High repayment rate.	Annual amount of medium- and short-term loans granted and number of beneficiaries by type and purpose of loan. Repayment rate. Rate of use and repayment of PADMOC loans compared to other loan sources in the participating MFIs.	
<u>Component C</u> Project Management	Establishment of the PMU	The PMU team consists of 1 coordinator, 3 experts and 1 accountant.	Services provided by the PMU team are consistent with its terms of reference.	Number/Attendance (HM) by specialty of staff; Materials and equipment purchased.
		The capacity of project staff is strengthened.	The volume and quality of services and performance of PMU senior officers and CeRPA staff are improved.	Number/duration by training session theme; number of study trips and internships carried out. Number of participants per grade.
		Financial management, monitoring/evaluation and control tools put in place and functional; 3 finance, credit and	Project management is in line with Bank and Borrower procedures. Adherence to schedule. Activities and outputs are	Remarks on audits; Steering Committee and CDCP meeting reports; TA and PMU periodic reports and mid-term review report.

		monitoring/evaluation Technical Assistants (TA) recruited for a one-year term.	regularly monitored.	
	Collaboration with partners.	The directorates of MAEP and other ministries participate as Project Owner Delegate and Project Supervisor in project activities, against logistic support from the project (allowances, equipment and materials).	The Project is implemented by the permanent entities of MAEP and MMEE. The sustained impact of various project activities on beneficiaries is guaranteed.	Protocols/specifications between PMU and CeRPA; directorates of MAEP, MMEE and other ministries; list and allocation of equipment and goods procured. Reports of PMU and service providers.
		Signing of agreements with semi-public bodies (ABE, ONASA) and NGOs.	Project performance is enhanced by the contribution of specialized bodies in some areas.	Reports by service providers and PMU. Agreements prepared.
	Preparation of the ESMP.	Updating and implementation of ESMP environmental mitigative measures.	Borrow pits are restored and trees planted on road sides. Reduction in waterborne and faecal diseases. Elimination of phytosanitary accidents.	State of borrow pits and trees planted. Medical care statistics in health centres.
<b>LOG. FRAME DIMENSIONS</b>		<b>ASSESSMENT</b>		<b>RATING</b>
<b>LOGICAL</b>	(a) Presents a logical causal chain for achieving the project development objectives	In its current form, the logical framework does not present a logical causal chain for achieving project objectives. It was prepared according to the old format.		2
<b>MEASURABLE</b>	(b) Expresses objectives and outcomes in a way that is measurable and quantifiable	The impact of most project activities, both for fish farming and agriculture (area, yields and income of beneficiaries) are not quantified. The baseline case by municipal council and even by district is not presented.		2
<b>THOROUGH</b>	(c) States the risks and key assumptions	The logical framework states the key assumptions for the success of the project. Risks external to the Project Owner (high inflation, capacity of service providers) are serious.		2

## D. OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES

### I. ACHIEVEMENT OF OUTPUTS

MAJOR ACTIVITIES		Working Score (1 to 4)	Share of Project Costs in percentage (as calculated at completion)	Weighted Score
Expected Outputs	Actual Outputs			
Component A: Rural Infrastructure				
Rural Roads				
The lengths of rural roads constructed, rehabilitated and improved are 40 km, 13 km and 60 km, respectively. Construction of a bridge over the Couffo.	The construction of 40 km of rural roads, which started in November 2007 for a contractual period of six months, was completed at the end of the project (August 2010). The first section constructed in 2007 has deteriorated. Studies on the rehabilitation of 13 km of rural roads and on the bridge began in 2010 and 2008, respectively, but there has been no output. Mobilization for the improvement of 60 km of rural roads began at end-2009 but there has been no output. The time allotted for reviewing costs and constructing the bridge and 13 km and 60 km of rural roads was very short.	1	28	0.28
Setting up of 15 RRMCs for 40 km of new rural roads. Mobilization of RRMCs for 13 km of rural roads to be rehabilitated. Involvement of RRMCs in the 60 km of rural roads to be improved.	Fifteen RRMCs were set up for the 40 km of rural roads, but did not carry out work on the damaged section. RRMCs for the 13 km of rural roads to be rehabilitated were not mobilized. Technical assistance provided to beneficiaries by the NGO for the improvement of 60 km of rural roads started at the end of the project (November 2010) but there was no output.	2	0.6306	0.01261
Rural Water Supply and Sanitation				
Construction of 30 boreholes equipped with hand pumps and 28 latrines in the Bopa (Mono) and Lalo (Couffo) municipal councils, and supply of drinking water to Kogbétohoué and Kpétou RPCs.	Layout studies were completed in November 2008, allowing for social mobilization. Contracts for the construction of boreholes and latrines as well as the procurement of pumps were approved at the end of the project (September 2010) without giving time for the execution of this activity. The PMU was incapable of accelerating the procurement process.	2	0.4268	0.008536

Mobilization of rural dwellers through the setting up of Water Point Management Committees (WPMC). The financial contributions of the population (10%) are paid.	The WPMCs were set up by the NGO. Contributions were collected. The WPMCs are demobilized due to non-implementation of activities under this component.	2	0.185	0.0037
Development of Irrigation Schemes				
Location, study and control of 300 ha of marshland and development of 45 ha of irrigation schemes around artesian wells in 2006.	Bid invitation for studies on 150 ha was issued in December 2008, but the studies were not carried out due to overshooting of the budget allocated and insufficient time for executing the works before project closure.	NA	NA	NA
Development of 300 ha of marshland and 45 ha of irrigation schemes under the project. Granting of credit to beneficiaries for the construction of creels within the irrigation schemes.	Delay in the processing of this file and the high cost of studies compared to estimates hindered the development of marshland and irrigation schemes.	NA	NA	NA
200 m <sup>2</sup> of drying yards constructed/developed.	No work carried out as this activity is attached to the previous one.	NA	NA	NA
Fisheries and Fish Farming				
Construction of fish ponds and fish holes (40 ha in Tchis). Increase in area under fish ponds from 23 ha to 63 ha due to intensification of fish farming systems with the line of credit	No activity was carried out under this component. In contrast, the line of credit helped to finance the improvement of existing private fish farms. Three beneficiaries received CFAF 10 235 000 (1.22% of the total amount).	1	0.202	0.00404
Rehabilitation of Tohounou Fry Rearing Centre in Mono and Kpétou RPC (thirty 500 m <sup>2</sup> fish ponds). Increase in fry production from 32 000 to 900 000 and in feed-grade production from 3 tons to 180 tons in 2010 in Tohounou. Production of 7.5 tons/year of fish in Kpétou.	The study on the construction of the Tohounou Centre was conducted very late (end-2009) by a consultant. Inflation increased the cost of works which could not be carried out in Tohounou and Kpétou. No increase in production.	1	0.0927	0.000927
Construction of a fish hatchery in the Dakomey Fish Farm in Aplahoué (100 m <sup>2</sup> building, 10 troughs, and 6 ponds). Production of 1 million fingerlings and 2 tons of fish	Construction work began in October 2010 and ended in December 2010, representing a 7% completion rate. No production of fry or fish.	1	0.12	0.0012
Construction of a 200 m <sup>2</sup> fishing base and a 100 m <sup>2</sup>	No work carried out. The profitability of this operation was deemed	NA	NA	NA

smoking centre at Ayiguinou.	unpredictable owing to failure of similar operations under PDRIM.			
Training Centre				
Rehabilitation of the 4 RPCs of Kogbétohoué, Agnavo, Grand Popo and Kpétou, and Dogbé training centre.	Rehabilitation of the 2 RPCs of Kogbétohoué and Agnavo without water and electricity supply. A generator was installed in Kogbétohoué; 91% of Dogbo Training Centre was rehabilitated without external works (water, electricity and an internal road network).	3	8.2	0.246
Construction of 7 multi-purpose halls for apex farmers' organizations.	No work done although farmers' organizations had compiled contract documents.	NA	NA	NA
<b>Component B: Support to Farmers</b>				
Food Crisis				
Procurement of seeds, inputs, farm implements and fishing equipment to cope with the food crisis.	Nothing was procured. Documents could not be compiled on time. The amount allocated to PUASA was UA 2 million.	NA	25.73	NA
Training and Promotion of Farmers' Organizations				
300 grassroots farmers' organizations (25 council farmers' organizations) identified and their members taught literacy and trained in various domains. Members of apex farmers' organizations trained in micro-projects and finance (credit).	300 farmers' organizations out of 1 080 were identified. Short-term training was provided to members of 79 grassroots FOs (5 258 members, 4 300 of them women). Literacy education did not take place; 92 members of apex farmers' organizations 25 of them women, were trained.	3	0.467	0.014
Training plan prepared. Eleven-month training for out-of-school youths (400) and short-term training for farmers (3 200).	The training plan was prepared in 2007. Seventy-one youths and 238 farmers were trained in Agnavo and Grand Popo RPCs. The number of trained youths who have access to land is insignificant.	1	1.229	0.01229
Training of CeCPA technicians: community agricultural promotion officers (RCPA), senior co-operative inspection and education technicians (TSIEC), planning and resource management technicians (TSAGR), livestock production technicians (TSPA) technicians and extension workers.	Training in micro-projects/credit (92 RCPA, PADPPA, TSIEC, TSAGR, TSPA extension workers) and plant production.	3	0.257	0.007718

Seed producers trained and supervised for improved rice and maize seed production.	49 seed producers participated in the production of improved rice (38.3 tons) and maize (13.5 tons) seeds. PUASA was not implemented to improve production.	2	0.149	0.00298
Technicians (50 TSPV, CPV, ACIPV and DPFSA technicians) and pilot farmers are well trained on new irrigated crop control systems.	50 technicians (TSPV, CPV, ACIPV and DPFSA) were trained in irrigated tomato crop control. No training for farmers. The implementation rate for tomatoes was 45%.	2	0.1	0.002
Research and Development				
90 ha of hedge plants and 6 190 rare plant species introduced to improve biodiversity.	8 392 hedge plant seedlings were supplied to farmers. The success rate of 7 821 seedlings for biodiversity improvement in sacred forests is very low.	2	0.103	0.00206
Establishment of a marketing observatory in 8 markets.	The prices and quantities of produce sold were monitored each month in 8 markets. The amount of credit granted to 110 beneficiaries, most of them women, for marketing activities was CFAF 48 565 120 (5.77% of the total amount).	3	0.73	0.0292
Monitoring and analysis of data from 240 farms.	Monitoring of 240 farmers by DPAF / CeRPA and data input and analysis using the SISE software were partially carried out. The project impact assessment conducted by a consultant is being validated.	1	0.198	0.00198
Installation and equipment of 20 phytosanitary brigades.	20 brigades installed. Difficulties faced in ensuring the sustainability of brigades (replacement of equipment, purchase of pesticides with loans)	2	0.219	0.00438
Planting of <i>mucuna</i> (1 680 ha), <i>choc acacia</i> (250 ha) and vetiver (400 ha).	35 ha of acacia were effectively planted. The planting of <i>mucuna</i> (47 ha) and vetiver (37 ha) was not popular among farmers.	2	0.108	0.00216
Credit				
The amount of loans granted under the ADF's line of credit (UA 0.63 million). Continuation of the line of credit (high repayment rate). Promotion of growth sectors (maize, rice, cassava) using short-term loans and value added using medium-term loans.	The CGGC disbursed CFAF 768 160 058 from the ADF line of credit and provided financing totalling CFAF 841 310 058 to 1 119 beneficiaries, 481 of them women. The repayment rate was <50%. The line of credit was downsized in 2009-2010. Small amount of short-term credit (32.6% of the total amount).	2	19.5	0.390
Component C: Project Management				

The PMU team comprises 1 coordinator, assisted by 3 experts (monitoring, supervision, finance).	The positions of supervision (MSF) and financial management experts remained vacant for over a year. The PMU did not operate as a light entity under the supervisory authority of DG/CeRPA as planned at appraisal.	2	10.22	0.2044
The capacity of staff of the project and decentralized services of MAEP strengthened (credit, accounting, monitoring and evaluation). Logistic support to CeRPA.	Training in the setting up of micro-projects using credit, in management using the TOMPRO accounting software and in monitoring using the SISE software. However, the training had setbacks. The implementation of the fish farming and fishing component by DPFSA/CeRPA was unsatisfactory.	2	4.140	0.0828
Financial management, monitoring/evaluation and control tools put in place and functional; 3 finance, credit and monitoring and evaluation technical assistants are recruited for a one-year term.	Two software (SISE and TOMPRO) and monitoring/evaluation procedures manuals developed and validated. Their use was unsatisfactory. Project financial and accounting management encountered problems.	2	4.888	0.09776
The directorates of CeRPA participate as Project Owner Delegate and Project Supervisor in project activities against logistic support (equipment, materials and allowances to CeRPA staff).	Collaboration between the PMU and CeRPA was deficient regarding follow-up of bidding documents and control of service providers. CeRPA served as a service provider for the PMU and its services were poor. The sum of CFAF 257.4 million was used mainly to pay the allowances of CeRPA staff.	2	11.43	0.2286
Signing of agreements with semi-public bodies and NGOs (ABE, ONASA, DHR, SFGRN, JAE-Benin, INRAB).	Although the rate of implementation of financial agreements reached 75%, their impact on the implementation of project activities was low due to discrepancies in the programming of additional project activities.	2	3.30	0.0660
Implementation of the ESMP	The ESMP and the council development plan were not updated. Borrow pits were not restored and trees were not planted along rural roads. The Benin Environment Agency (ABE) did not work with the phytosanitary brigades.	1	0.457	0.004568
<b>OVERALL OUTPUT SCORE</b> [Score is calculated as the sum of weighted scores]				<b>1.709</b>

Check here to override the auto-calculated score

**Provide justification for over-riding the auto-calculated score**

Insert the new score or re-enter the auto-calculated score 1.71

## II. ACHIEVEMENT OF OUTCOMES

OUTCOMES		Working Score
Expected	Actual	
Component A: Rural Infrastructure		
All-season access to 12 municipal councils in Mono-Couffo is improved. Increase in road traffic and volume of produce sold.	The construction of 40 km of rural roads helped to open up 7 villages in the Tchis Depression. The first section, which was completed in 2008, has deteriorated. Since this rural road was completed only recently (August 2010), it is impossible to assess its impact on road traffic. Given that the contract for the rehabilitation of 13 km of rural roads, including the bridge over the Couffo, was not executed, the road linking Adjaïgbonou-Tohou-Border of Atlantique District (Département) could hardly be used. Coordination between the Project Supervisor (DAGR/CeRPA) and the PMU for this rural roads sub-component was weak owing to inadequate resources and delays.	2
RRMCs operate as viable community entities thanks to adequate human, material and financial resources. The sustainability of rural roads is ensured by municipal council budgets.	The 15 RRMCs for 40 km of rural roads were set up, but failed to repair the damaged road section and clear dense vegetation on roadsides. Rain gates did not function properly as some remained open during wet weather. The RRMCs mobilized to rehabilitate and improve rural roads did not function.	1
Supply of drinking water to 30 villages and 2 RPCs, and construction of latrines in 28 villages. Improved quality of life of the population and housing conditions for 2 RPCs.	The Project Owner Delegate agreement signed with DRH came into force in November 2005. The supervision and establishment of WPMCs began in February 2007. The feasibility and control study was launched in 2008, and work and pump contracts prepared in September 2010. These delays resulted in failure to complete works and meet the drinking water needs of villagers and RPCs.	1
WPMCs are financially viable, helping to ensure the sustainability of the water points and latrines constructed.	WPMCs were set up and the financial contribution of beneficiaries amounting to CFAF 200 000 / borehole collected. Failure to complete works, coupled with the amendment of legislation on rural water supply, rendered the outputs of social mobilization by the NGO, JAE-Benin, obsolete.	2
Increase in areas under off-season crops. Increase in food and rice production on 300 ha of marshland.	Due to the programming of this activity at the end of the project, inflation contributed to reducing the amount earmarked for its execution, even for the development of a small area of 150 ha of marshland. No additional production.	NA
Increased in yields and production of market garden crops around artesian wells. Improvement in farmers' income.	The development of the 45 ha of irrigated areas by constructing artesian wells in the Tchis Depression depended on opening up the Depression - which took place at the end of the project. No impact on market gardening because the wells were not constructed.	NA
Improvement in the quality of	As with the marshlands that were not developed by the project, the	NA

agricultural produce and reduction in post-harvest losses, thanks to the construction of 200 m <sup>2</sup> of drying yards.	drying yards envisaged in humid marshlands to ease the drying of crop harvests and reduce post-harvest losses were not constructed.	
Self-sufficiency in fish. Increase in productivity from 1.2 t/ha/yr to 5 t/ha/yr and in the area of fish ponds from 23 ha to 63 ha. Increase in fish production from 27 t/yr in 2000 to 315 t/yr in 2010.	The amount of equipment credit (MT) granted to 3 beneficiaries for fish farming was CFAF 10 235 000 (1.8% of overall MT credits). This amount was insufficient to achieve the expected yields and develop the additional 40 ha of fish ponds under the project. The outcomes achieved were far below the objectives of this component.	1
Resumption of supply by the Tounou Fry Rearing Centre of tilapia and catfish fingerlings (900 000) to new and old ponds. Resumption of training in fish farming by the Kpétou RPC.	No achievement was recorded in the Tohouou Centre. The bid invitation for works was not issued on time because the study was completed in 2009. In addition, the costs of bid documents exceeded those envisaged at appraisal. The rehabilitation of the Kpétou RPC, which was included in the State budget, did not take place. There was no improvement in the supply of fry or production of fish in the region.	1
The Dakomey Fish Farm will once more become functional and contribute to reducing the country's fry and fish shortage.	The farm, which was financed by another donor, has been neglected. Seven percent (7%) of construction work on a 100 m <sup>2</sup> building, 10 fry troughs and 6 fish ponds under the project was executed. Pipes for conveying water from the river to the farm, which are still in good condition, are supplying water to a private fish farm near the farm. A medium-term loan was granted to this fish farmer to improve the feed-grade of his fish farm.	1
Improvement and adjustment of the income of fishermen by constructing a 200 m <sup>2</sup> fishing base and a 100 m <sup>2</sup> smoking centre at Ayiguinou to contribute to increasing production by 600 t/yr, thanks to credit.	A CFAF 19 million medium-term loan was granted to 2 farmers' organizations (20 beneficiaries) to improve their fishing or fish processing fleet, representing 3.33% of total medium-term loans. This amount was not enough to significantly increase fish catch. Thus, existing similar fishing infrastructure has been underutilized by fishermen, obliging the project to cancel this activity.	NA
Improved living and training conditions in rehabilitated RPCs and training centres (TC).	The rehabilitation of 4 RPCs and the Dogbé training centre is incomplete and unsatisfactory. Living conditions without water, electricity and sanitation (latrines and infirmary) are poor. The quality of training is unsatisfactory (limited resources for practical and field work, no permanent teachers).	2
Improvement of the supervision of grassroots farmers' organizations through the formation of council and district producers' unions	The multi-purpose halls to facilitate the activities of council producers' unions (UCP) and district producers' unions (UDP) with grassroots farmers' organizations were not built, preventing them from intensifying their activities.	NA
<b>Component B: Support to Farmers</b>		
<b>Food Crisis</b>		
Improvement of food and fish production in response to the food crisis.	A CFAF 2 551 million (UA 2.63 million) credit fund was set up at the start-up of the project. The UA 2 million allocated to UPSA was not used owing to delay by the PMU in preparing relevant disbursement documents.	NA
<b>Training and Promotion of Farmers' Organizations</b>		
The members of the 300 farmers' organizations selected are taught literacy and trained in various technical and financial domains.	Members of these farmers' organizations (> 5 000) were trained but were not taught literacy. Nevertheless, the results are not satisfactory as only 41 farmers' organizations guaranteed loans from MFIs for 537 beneficiaries. Furthermore, the latter's repayment	2

	rates were much lower than those of the 500 individual beneficiaries, thus jeopardizing loan guarantee by their farmers' organizations.	
Improvement of the maize, cassava, rice and tomato sub-sectors. Building capacity in the design of micro-projects.	The impact assessment currently being validated showed that yields of major crops in 2010 were low: 1 040 kg/ha for maize, 7 200 kg/ha for cassava, 2 500 kg/ha for rice and 4 800 kg/ha for tomato. This is due to the low use of seasonal credit by farmers (CFAF 203 302 265), representing 24.16% of total credit granted.	2
Access to land by youths. Improvement of existing production systems and techniques. Decline in rural-urban migration.	In total, 74 out-of-school youths (25 of them girls) and 362 farmers (144 of them women) were given long-term and short-term training, respectively. The training - which was unprofessional and unsatisfactory - did not ease access to land by the young trainees in RPCs. The very small number of farmers trained in these RPCs had a limited impact on the 12 000 beneficiaries expected to be covered by the project.	1
Preparation of plant, animal and fishery production micro-project documents (32 community agricultural promotion officers and PADPPA extension workers).	To ensure the sustainability of the credit component, CeCPAs (RCPA, TSIEC, PADPPA extension workers), which are permanent entities, played a key role in the loan granting process. Training empowered and enhanced the autonomy of CeCPAs in providing support to farmers in preparing micro-project documents. A total of 27 farmers' organizations and 246 individual beneficiaries benefited from CeCPA support.	2
Reduction in the shortage of improved seeds. Increase in maize and rice yields.	Twenty-nine certified rice (38.3 tons) and 20 maize (13.5 tons) seed growers were monitored. Producers failed to adhere to seed multiplication within the PUASA framework. Close monitoring of the 200 farmers expected to provide reliable data on this outcome did not take place.	2
Improvement in fruit and tomato seed production. Sustained collection of tomato cultivars.	The rate of achievement of this outcome is estimated at 45%. It concerned the training of TCPV and CPV staff and a few farmers in farming techniques, pest control, water management and sustained collection of cultivars in Mono and Couffo.	2
Research and Development		
Planting of trees to protect plots (hedging) and improve biodiversity (rare species).	The project provided 8 392 hedge seedling trees and 7 821 seedling trees for biodiversity. The rate of loss of biodiversity plants in sacred forests is high owing to lack of maintenance by villagers. Farmers' apparent lack of interest in the planting of hedge trees is demonstrated by the absence of personal initiatives in the planting of hedge trees. The only credit granted to a tree nurseryman (oil palm) ended in failure.	1
Farmers are informed in time about price trends, thanks to the market observatory. Improvement in farmers' and traders' income.	The marketing of agricultural produce was an important niche of the credit component. Sixty-six members of 11 farmers' organizations and 44 individuals received credit to market agricultural produce. The repayment rate of this type of credit from the PADMOC line of credit is low. It is higher for credits contracted from other sources of financing.	2
Monitoring project impact on promoters and producers (12 000 farmers).	Data collected from a sample of 240 farms is very limited and partial. The SISE software developed for regular monitoring and assessment of project impact on the 12 000 farmers was not used.	1

	An impact assessment survey, which is being validated, was carried out by a consultant.	
Functional phytosanitary warning system. Improvement in crop yields.	The 20 phytosanitary brigades set up form a regional disease warning and control system. These brigades may soon be dismantled due to problems in replacing their obsolete equipment and supplying pesticides financed from the PADMOC line of credit.	2
Ensuring sustainable farming by controlling <i>imperata cylindrica</i> and soil erosion, and improving soil fertility.	The project provided <i>mucuna</i> (47 ha), vetiver (37 ha) and acacia (35 ha) seeds, strains and seedlings. No personal initiatives for extension to reach the envisaged 1 680 ha of mucuna and 400 ha of vetiver. In contrast, acacia is valued as a source of income for the 3 000 poles/ha it provides in 3 to 5 years. The target of 250 ha was met.	2
Credit		
Access to credit to increase profitability of food crops and improve the value added of agricultural production through processing. High repayment rate.	The total amount of credit granted to 1 119 beneficiaries (481 of them women) as at 31/12/2010 was CFAF 841 310 058. Short-term credit for the intensification of food crop cultivation accounted for 32% of total credit. Very few medium-term loans were granted for processing equipment. The credit repayment rate as at 30 September 2010 for the 12 municipal councils ranged between 20.6% minimum for Houéyogbé and 60.9% maximum for Klouékanmè, thus jeopardizing the continuity of the operation.	2
<b>Component C: Project Management</b>		
Establishment of the Project Management Unit (PMU)		
Services provided by the PMU team are consistent with its terms of reference.	The absence of an infrastructure expert in the small PMU team was exacerbated by the lack of proactive assistance from the technical directorates of MAEP and MMEE, which explains the project's poor performance in this component. The administrative set-up of the PMU under the supervisory authority of the DG/CeRPA planned at appraisal was not followed to the letter. The Technical Assistant partly filled the prolonged vacant posts of SAF and DAF experts of the PMU.	1
The volume and quality of services and the performance of PMU senior officers and CeRPA staff are improved.	Training plans were developed for PMU and CeRPA staff and were effectively used for the credit component. Training in financial management using the TOMPRO software and monitoring and evaluation using the SISE software was not provided, which explains the financial problems and lack of monitoring and evaluation experienced by the project.	2
Project management is effective and activities and outcomes are properly monitored.	Discrepancies in the recruitment of a TA (2007-2008) and the implementation of credit activities (2008-2009) and works (2009-2010) had a negative impact on project management. The non-implementation of some recommendations (of the CDCPS and supervision missions) and low involvement of the DPAF/ MAEP and the steering committee in monitoring and control activities contributed to the weaknesses observed.	1
Collaboration with Partners		
The project is implemented by the permanent entities of the MAEP. The impact of various project activities on beneficiaries is	The decentralized services of MAEP, MMEE, MTPP (roads) and ME are permanent government entities. The resources used and procedures followed (allowances, equipment, agreements) to involve them in project implementation varied from one entity to	2

sustainable.	another. The services provided by the senior officers of these institutions did not match the related expenditure (15.2% of funds disbursed). In general, directorates in charge of infrastructure (DAGR, DHR) and fish farming (DP) put very little effort and time into the project, unlike those in charge of extension (DRC/CeRPA) and credit (DPFSA, CeCPA).	
Project performance is enhanced by contribution from specialized bodies in some project areas.	Three semi-public establishments, three NGOs and one fish farming consultant were recruited to implement some specific project activities. The non-execution of their works situated downstream or upstream of other complementary activities reduced their impact on project performance.	2
Implementation of the ESMP		
Borrow pits are restored and trees are planted on roadsides. Reduction in water- and faecal-borne diseases. Elimination of phytosanitary accidents.	Discrepancies in ABE's intervention programme and activities impeded project implementation (rural roads, marshlands, latrines and boreholes). Borrow pits were not restored and trees were not planted on roadsides. ABE failed to sensitize phytosanitary brigades on the potential hazards of pesticide treatment. ABE's contribution was limited to the description of the environmental conditions created around the road built and borrow pits.	1
<b>OVERALL OUTCOME SCORE</b> [Score is calculated as an average of the working scores]		1.28

Check here to override the auto-calculated score

Provide justification for over-riding the auto-calculated score

Insert the new score or re-enter the auto-calculated score

1.30

Additional outcomes: Not applicable

Risks to sustained achievement of outcomes:

At the time of project closure, final handover of 40 km of new rural roads and the Dogbé Training Centre was still pending. Defects may not be eliminated due to lack of oversight by and non-involvement of DAGRN/CeRPA in the final acceptance process. It will be difficult to assess the sustainability of mobilization carried out by NGOs to improve 60 km of rural roads, water points, latrines and roads constructed as the works of the first two NGOs were not executed and the works executed by the third NGO have not yet been handed over. The sustained planting of acacia to improve soil fertility is guaranteed, thanks to the income farmers derive from the sale of 3 000 to 5 000 acacia poles per hectare after a rotation of 3 to 5 years.

Most MFIs do not have offices in 12 municipal councils covered by the project, which partly explains the low loan repayment rate that varies from one municipal council to another, with a minimum rate of 21% and a maximum of 61%. TSIEC/CeCPA were fully involved and interested in preparing loan documents for beneficiaries, but they may dissociate themselves from following up loans granted after the end of the project. Good payers whose loans were guaranteed by their farmers' organizations are penalized because they cannot obtain new loans as long as other members of the farmers' organizations have not repaid their loans.

Municipal councils and CeRPAs are permanent entities, hence, the sustained achievement of outcomes is dependent on: (i) assistance provided to municipal councils by the government for the management of infrastructure built by the project; (ii) the continuous monitoring of project outcomes by CeRPA directorates in their respective domains; (iii) the participation of TSIEC/CeCPA to represent MFIs in municipal councils to ensure the sustainability of agricultural credits until the General Framework for Managing Lines of Credit (Cadre Général de Gestion des Lignes de Crédit, CGGC) is firmly established; (iv) the provision of human and material resources to permanent agriculture and fisheries training institutions (RPCs, TCs); and (v) the provision of continuous support by decentralized government services (CeRPA) to FOs and the

implementation of the second phase of the CGGC.

## E. PROJECT DESIGN AND READINESS FOR IMPLEMENTATION (250 words)

MAEP, the project owner, has decentralized services at district level (CeRPA). Thus, the project was designed to operate with a small Project Management Unit (PMU) under the supervision of the Director-General of CeRPA, as the first condition precedent to first disbursement was the appointment of the Coordinator of the PMU ranking as Deputy Director-General of CeRPA, without mixing of resources.

The PMU comprises three experts recruited to reinforce CeRPA directorates in charge of overseeing the technical, financial and social activities of the project. These directorates are expected to contribute to implementing project activities from the consultation and bid invitation phase right up to works acceptance. Project implementation did not comply with this set-up and CeRPA served as a body providing services to the PMU like the decentralized entities of other ministries (DRH/MMEE) and semi-public establishments (ABE, ONASA, INRAB). The appraisal report did not indicate and specify the resources and logistics (protocol/agreement, specifications, allowances, equipment) of the various directorates of these ministries (MAEP, MMEE, ME) to avoid the bottlenecks encountered in implementing several project activities.

The appraisal report did not sufficiently highlight the main lessons learned from PDRIM. PADMOC reflected the multi-sector nature of operations under PDRIM, which had limitations. However, it built on lessons drawn from PDRIM concerning the full involvement of beneficiaries during the implementation phase. However, since most facilities were not built, beneficiaries did not own them. In fact, social mobilization heightened the disappointment of beneficiaries whose efforts were not rewarded.

Project appraisal did not diagnose the Borrower's procurement and works procedures to design measures to remedy the very long delays noticed during implementation. The baseline case of municipal councils and even districts is not known, and most implementation and final design studies were not available at appraisal. The project design did not fully take them into account. In the absence of this baseline case and the statistical analysis of the monitoring of the 240 farms by DPAF/CeRPA, the outcomes achieved are not objectively verifiable.

Since each of the three Technical Assistance experts had to provide services for a limited period of 12 months divided into three phases, it was not possible to properly transfer technology and make optimum use of the TOMPRO accounting software and the SISE monitoring and evaluation software owing to the absence of their PMU counterparts during a large part of the period they provided their services.

PROJECT DESIGN AND READINESS FOR IMPLEMENTATION DIMENSIONS		ASSESSMENT	WORKING SCORE
REALISM	(a) Project complexity is matched with country capacity and political commitment.	The success of project outputs depends on the human, financial and logistic capacity of CeRPA/Mono-Couffo, the MFIs and FOs in the project area. The analysis of the capacity of these bodies did not match the complexity of the project, resulting in its poor performance. Municipal councils lack the required capacity to ensure the sustainability of some project outputs.	2
RISK ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION	(b) Project design includes adequate risk analysis.	The assumptions/risks indicated in the project logical framework (matrix) turned out to be accurate during project implementation. Other risks not mentioned occurred during implementation.	2
USE OF COUNTRY	(c) Project	Government and Bank procurement procedures	2

SYSTEMS	procurement, financial management, monitoring and/or other systems are based on those already in use by government and/or other partners.	were followed, but their implementation was defective (very long timeframe). The financial management implemented posed problems. The accounting and monitoring/evaluation systems set up by the project were not used efficiently.		
For the following dimensions, provide separate working scores for Bank performance and Borrower performance:			Working Score	
			Bank	Borrower
CLARITY	(d) Responsibilities for project implementation were clearly defined.	Responsibilities were clearly defined at appraisal. The Borrower did not consider them during the implementation of certain activities when the Bank did not react. The MAEP circular of 22/3/2002 to establish the PMU did not comply with the organization chart set out in the appraisal report.	3	2
PROCUREMENT READINESS	(e) Necessary implementation documents (e.g. specifications, design, procurement documents) were ready at appraisal	Most of the necessary implementation documents were not ready at appraisal, necessitating the repeat of implementation studies for most infrastructure to be built and diagnostic studies for support to farmers. Technical assistance helped in preparing specifications for some agreements.	2	1
MONITORING READINESS	(f) Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan were agreed upon before project launch.	The District Programming and Monitoring Coordinating Committee met regularly. The monitoring and evaluation software (SISE/PADMOC) was not deployed. The mid-term review was carried out five years after project start-up. Bank supervision missions were regular. The steering committee did not play its role.	3	2
BASELINE DATA	(g) Baseline data were available or were collected during project design.	Very little baseline data was available at project start-up. The setting up of a database, diagnostic analysis of FOs and monitoring of a sample of farms in 12 municipal councils were included in project activities. Only the analysis of FOs was carried out.	2	1

## F. IMPLEMENTATION (300 words)

Major characteristics of project implementation: the loan agreement was signed in May 2001, but the project started up only in November 2003 and lasted six years. Up to November 2006, the PMU had received only one working capital, which was used to acquire means of transport (56 motorcycles and six vehicles) and signed eight agreements and three contracts with institutions and NGOs. Bids for the recruitment of consulting and infrastructure control firms, let alone those relating to infrastructure works, had not yet been invited. This was due to the incapacity of PMU staff to process and activate study and

infrastructure works procurement files to offset the late and inefficient collaboration of MAEP directorates (DAGR/CeRPA, DGR, DG Fisheries) and DRH/MMEE and SHAB as Project Owner Delegate or Project Supervisor. Thus, the various contracts (3 works, 3 goods and 12 services contracts) were executed under far from optimal conditions. The procedure for preparing bidding documents for works on the 40 km of new roads was initiated in February 2006 and the contract signed in September 2007, i.e. 19 months afterwards, for a six-month period. However, the roads were provisionally accepted only in August 2010, i.e. 35 months after works start-up. Concerning contracts for infrastructure works, the situation is that at the original project closing date of 31 December 2009, the contract for works on the 40 km of roads was still being executed; bids for the construction of the bridge, 30 boreholes and pumps and 28 latrines, the hatchery of the Dokomey fish farm in Aplahoué and the Dogbo Training Centre had already been launched; all other facilities were under study or the procedure had not yet started. The one-year extension did not significantly improve the situation as some works had not been completed (Dogbé training centre, Dakomey hatchery) or were in poor working condition (RPC).

Outcomes related to service contracts were moderate. The two financial management and credit TA experts assumed the functions of SGF and SAF of the PMU because these positions were vacant at the time of recruiting the experts. Meanwhile, the TA monitoring/evaluation expert could do no more than notice the weaknesses in collaboration between the Project SSE and the SSESD/DPAF/CeRPA. The monitoring and evaluation manual was validated and the computer expert installed the SISE/PADMOC software. However, the PMU did not have time to apply them (database of farmers monitored, analysis of the results of the monitoring of 200 farmers). Social mobilization for infrastructure remained pending, as most infrastructure was not built.

Concerning ADF loan projections by expenditure category, the disbursement rates for works, services and operation categories were 49.3%, 67.9% and 99.37%, respectively. Regarding projections by component at appraisal (ADF + Government), the disbursement rates for the infrastructure, support to farmers, and project management components were 35.38%, 36.27% and 105.84%, in that order. These rates reflect significant imbalance in project financial management characterized by poor programming of project activities. PADMOC did not follow the new PARB approach, confirming the fact that the Steering Committee did not play its role.

The 11 ADB supervision missions and the mid-term review did not contribute to improving the project performance owing to the frequent change of project manager. In fact, a succession of seven project officers handled the PADMOC project at Bank level. These changes sometimes caused delays in the processing of certain dossiers.

Role of other partners: PADMOC was financed with an ADF loan and Government resources, to the tune of 86.47% and 10.35%, respectively. The rest of the financing was contributed by beneficiaries. The disbursement rates of the ADF loan and Government resources were respectively 52.88% and 50.91%.

Harmonization: Belgium financed the Agricultural Sector Support Facility (FAFA/MC) in the same districts as PADMOC and the Benin Fisheries Development Support Project (ADEFIH). IFAD is also involved in the project area through the PADER and PADDPA projects. Although the appraisal report provided that PADMOC had to be implemented in as much complementarity as possible with other donors' projects, no specific actions were carried out to harmonize the instruments and approaches of these projects and PADMOC.

The role played by these partners in achieving project objectives is difficult to assess at the moment without an analysis of the supervision and/or completion mission reports of projects funded by these donors.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DIMENSIONS		ASSESSMENT		WORKING SCORE
TIMELINESS	(a) Extent of project adherence to the original closing date. If the number on the right is: below 12, "4" is scored between 12.1 to 24, "3" is scored between 24.1 to 36, "2" is	Difference in months between original closing date and actual closing date or date of 98% disbursement rate.	Delay at closure generally corresponds to delay at effectiveness.	3
		12 months		

	scored beyond 36.1, "1" is scored		
BANK PERFORMANCE	(b) Bank complied with:		
	Environmental Safeguards	The ESMP was prepared in 2002. The agreement concluded with the ABE was signed late, in February 2008. Supervision missions did not pay due attention to the environmental component.	2
	Fiduciary Requirements	All supervision missions analyzed the financial management of the project. The recommendations made by supervision missions concerning disbursements to the CGGC were not implemented.	2
	Project Covenants	The Bank fulfilled its commitments as stipulated in the Loan Agreement.	4
	(c) Bank provided quality supervision in the form of skills mix and practicality of solutions.	The Bank monitored the implementation of PADMOC through 11 supervision missions. The December 2006 mission noted that the Borrower was incapable of implementing most of the recommendations made by previous missions but failed to take practical measures to address the situation.	2
	(d) Bank provided quality management oversight.	The annual audit reports, submitted late by the Borrower, were validated by the Bank. Implementation of report recommendations was carefully monitored.	3
BORROWER PERFORMANCE	(e) Borrower complied with:		
	Environmental Safeguards	The rate of financing (67%) by ABN exceeded its physical achievements since the two concrete physical actions of the ESMP (planting and restoration of borrow pits) were not executed.	2
	Fiduciary Requirements	Largely, the Borrower did not honour its financial commitments. As at 31 May 2011, 50% of the resources of the Credit Guarantee Fund were not mobilized. There was an overlap between the PADMOC line of credit and credit from other sources. Audits identified problems of financial mismanagement. Financial problems remained unresolved at the end of the project.	1
	Project Covenants	The Borrower did not meet all its commitments as stipulated in the Loan Agreement. The Memoranda of Understanding concluded between the project and some government institutions were not implemented. Community authorities were not fully involved in the project.	2
	(f) Borrower was responsive to Bank supervision findings and recommendations.	The Borrower was not responsive and did not attach the necessary importance to most of the key recommendations of the numerous supervision missions. The implementation of the two main project activities, namely rural infrastructure works and credit, was delayed.	1

	(g) Borrower collected and used monitoring information for decision making.	Most of the recommendations of the 13 supervision missions and suggestions of the District Programming and Monitoring Coordinating Committee (5 sessions of the CDCPS) were not implemented or were implemented late.	1
--	---	---	---

## G. COMPLETION (150 words)

1. IS THE PCR DELIVERED ON A TIMELY BASIS, IN COMPLIANCE WITH BANK POLICY?			
Date project reached 98% disbursement rate (or closing date if applicable)	Date PCR was sent to pcr@afdb.org	Difference in months	WORKING SCORE (auto-calculated) If the difference is 6 months or less, a 4 is scored. If the difference is 6.1 or more, a 1 is scored.
31 December 2010	June 2011	5 months	4

The completion mission comprised an agricultural engineering consultant and two Bank agronomists. Their profiles match the two main project outputs, namely infrastructure and support to farmers. The PMU's completion report did not comply with the format requested. It lacks a lot of information on the implementation rates and the quality of services as well as on the financial situation. However, the PMU gave full assistance to mission team members during office and field work. The sample selected for visits to project areas and discussions held with farmers' organizations, beneficiaries and partners on the ground helped to improve the understanding of realities and outputs. Discussions underscored the population's obvious interest in obtaining credit. Therefore, the PCR is the product of participatory work, involving all stakeholders and includes the lessons learned from frank discussions held with various stakeholders.

Peer comments:

## H. LESSONS LEARNED (300 words)

Key lessons: the completion of PADMOC highlighted a number of lessons in terms of design, implementation and monitoring, notably:

- (i) The PMU team should comprise specialists whose expertise covers the main project areas;
- (ii) The engineering studies of infrastructure to be built should be carried out during project preparation and should focus on the execution of works;
- (iii) The Project Supervisor and PMU should ensure strict compliance with the contractual commitments (equipment, staff, implementation timeframe) made by contractors and operators;
- (iv) Upon project start-up, identify the activities that constitute the critical path in order to give them due priority during planning and implementation;
- (v) Attach greater importance to clauses relating to the technical, material and financial capacity of contractors during the preparation and evaluation of bidding documents for works requiring major earthworks;
- (vi) Ensure the strict monitoring of agreements with service providers and services attached to the project owner, which are responsible for project supervision or project activities;
- (vii) Design projects that do not include activities related to several areas and specialties;
- (viii) Harmonize the social mobilization of beneficiaries and the execution of infrastructure works, the sustainability of which they should ensure;
- (ix) Programme and spread out the intervention of service providers in harmony with complementary and related activities;

- (x) Target the technical assistance needs of projects, taking into account the essential functions of the project requiring capacity building;
- (xi) Ensure, as a priority, the participation of decentralized IMFs in the implementation of the line of credit in the project area and involve the decentralized entities of the project owner in loan recovery;
- (xii) Introduce the adoption by the Borrower of specific measures to strengthen community entities in terms of ownership of investments as a condition precedent to first disbursement.

Recommendations:

To the Government:

1. Make every effort to create a conducive environment for the smooth completion of the project;
2. Take the necessary measures to organize the final acceptance of road works and provisional acceptance of the Dogbo Training Centre;
3. Launch the periodic maintenance of the 40-km Hlassame-Badazoin and Madjre-Zizague road in 2011;
4. Carry out, on the basis of social mobilization under PADMOC, works to improve 60 km of rural roads and construct 30 boreholes equipped with manual pumps, 2 rural water supply projects and 28 latrines;
5. Continue to grant loans at low interest rates in the project area and to refinance good payers applying for loans;
6. Ensure the regular upgrading and functioning of rehabilitated RPCs and TC, and implement a programme for the socio-professional integration of trainees;
7. Make a detailed inventory of project tangible and intangible assets (materials, equipment, buildings, intellectual productions, etc.) before 30 June 2011;
8. Ensure that a project completion report in due form and content is submitted in future.

To the Bank:

- Cancel the undisbursed loan amount of UA 2 302 129.63;
- Ensure that information on the pre-project situation collected at appraisal (institutional framework, local stakeholders, on-going projects and initiatives, baseline data) is reliable so as to better define project objectives and expected outcomes, and to properly target their underlying activities;
- Ascertain, at project appraisal, the effective availability of partner government institutions to implement project activities assigned to them;
- Organize consultative meetings with donors financing similar and/or complementary activities in the project area.

## I. PROJECT RATINGS SUMMARY

CRITERIA	SUB-CRITERIA	Working Score
PROJECT OUTCOME	Achievement of outputs	1.71
	Achievement of outcomes	1.30
	Timeliness	3
	<b>OVERALL PROJECT OUTCOME SCORE</b>	
BANK PERFORMANCE	Design and Readiness	
	Project objectives were relevant to country development priorities	3
	Project objectives could in principle be achieved with the project inputs and in the expected time frame	3
	Project objectives were consistent with the Bank's country or regional strategy	3
	Project objectives were consistent with the Bank's corporate priorities	3
	The logical framework presents a logical causal chain for achieving the project development objectives	2

	The logical framework expresses objectives and outcomes in a way that is measurable and quantifiable	2
	The logical framework states the risks and key assumptions	2
	Project complexity was matched with country capacity and political commitment	2
	Project design includes adequate risk analysis	2
	Project procurement, financial management, monitoring and/or other systems were based on those already in use by government and/or other parties	2
	Responsibilities for project implementation are clearly defined	3
	Necessary implementation documents (e.g. specifications, design, procurement documents) were ready at appraisal	2
	Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan were agreed upon during design	3
	Baseline data were available or were collected during design	2
	<b>PROJECT DESIGN AND READINESS SUB-SCORE</b>	<b>2.43</b>
	Supervision:	
	Bank complied with:	
	Environmental Safeguards	2
	Fiduciary Requirements	2
	Project Covenants	4
	Bank provided quality supervision in the form of skills mix and practicality of solutions	2
	Bank provided quality management oversight	3
	PCR was delivered on a timely basis	4
	<b>SUPERVISION SUB-SCORE</b>	<b>2.83</b>
	<b>OVERALL BANK PERFORMANCE SCORE</b>	<b>2.63</b>
BORROWER PERFORMANCE		
	Responsibilities for project implementation are clearly defined	2
	Necessary implementation documents (e.g. specifications, design, procurement documents) were ready at appraisal	1
	Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan were agreed upon during design	2
	Baseline data were available or were collected during design	2
	<b>PROJECT DESIGN AND READINESS SCORE</b>	<b>1.75</b>
	Implementation	
	Borrower complied with:	
	Environmental Safeguards	2
	Fiduciary Requirements	1
	Project Covenants	2
	Borrower was responsive to Bank supervision findings and recommendations	1
	Borrower collected and used monitoring information for decision-making	1
<b>IMPLEMENTATION SUB-SCORE</b>	<b>1.4</b>	
<b>OVERALL BORROWER PERFORMANCE SCORE</b>	<b>1.58</b>	

## J. PROCESSING

STEP	SIGNATURE AND COMMENTS	DATE
Sector Manager Clearance		
Regional Director Clearance		
Sector Director Approval		

Scale for Working Scores and Ratings

SCORE	EXPLANATION
4	Highly satisfactory Fully achieved with no shortcomings
3	Satisfactory Mostly achieved despite a few shortcomings
2	Average Partially achieved. Shortcomings and achievements are roughly balanced
1	Unsatisfactory Very limited achievement with extensive shortcomings
NA	Not Applicable

Note: The formulas round up or down for decimal points. Only whole numbers are computed.

---

### Project Cost and Financing

#### (a) Project Cost and Expenditure by Component (CFAF million and UA million)

COMPONENT	APPRAISAL		COMPLETION	
	CFAF	UA	CFAF	UA
Strengthening of Rural Infrastructure	3 778	4.40	1 332.510	1.737
Support to Farmers	3 997	4.73	1 446.347	1.934
Project Management	1 222.3	1.45	1 273.008	1.712
Total	10 241	10.55	4 051.865	5.383

#### (b) Project Cost and Expenditure by Source of Financing (CFAF million and UA million)

SOURCE OF FINANCING	APPRAISAL		COMPLETION	
	CFAF Million	UA Million	CFAF Million	UA Million
ADF	8862.308	9.13	3 573.866	4.828
Government	1058.041	1.09	477.999	0.555
Beneficiaries	320.324	0.33	0	0
Total	10 241	10.55	4 051.865	5.383

#### (c) Revised Statement of List of Goods and Services of ADF Loan

Category	Initial Statement (UA million)	Revised Statement (UA million)	Gap
Equipment	0.47	0.47	
Works	3.30	3.30	
Services	0.52	0.52	
Loan	2.63	0.63	-2
Food crisis	0	2	+2
Training	0.39	0.39	
Operating costs	0.37	0.37	
Staff costs	0	0	
Technical assistance	0.36	0.36	
Base cost	8.04	8.04	
Physical contingencies	0.4	0.4	
Price escalation	0.69	0.69	
Total	9.13	9.13	

## ANNEX 2

### Bank Contribution

Date	Mission	No. of Persons	Composition	No. s/d
August 2002	Start up	1	Agro-economist	15
February 2004	Supervision	1	Agro-economist	10
December 2004	Supervision	3	Agro-economist	28
July 2005	Supervision	2	Agro-economist	28
November 2005	Supervision	2	Agronomist and Fisheries Expert	30
April 2006	Supervision	2		26
December 2006	Supervision	2		28
February 2007	Supervision	2		20
December 2007	Supervision	2	Agronomist and Financial Analyst	20
April 2008	Supervision	2	Agronomist and Financial Analyst	28
February 2009	Supervision	1	Agronomist and Financial Analyst	15
May 2009	Supervision	1	Agronomist	5
May 2010	Supervision	2	Agronomist and Financial Analyst	20
December 2010	Supervision	2	Agronomist and 1 Financial Management Specialist	20
May 2011	Completion	3	2 Agronomists and Rural Engineering Consultant	30

## ANNEX 3

### Project Economic Analysis

The assumption was that 12% of the areas estimated at appraisal were covered by the project. This rate corresponds to the ratio of beneficiaries that had access to credit compared to the total number of beneficiaries projected. Yields are those obtained from the project impact assessment.

<b>MAIZE</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>Price</b>	<b>Improved Area</b>	<b>Yield</b>	<b>Production</b>	<b>Gross Margin</b>
	(CFAF 1 000 /T)	ha	(t/ha)	(CFAF 1000)	(CFAF 1 000)
1	200	0	1.1	0	0
2	200	0	1.1	0	0
3	200	0	1.1	0	0
4	200	0	1.1	0	0
5	200	522.0	1.1	114 840	44 672.760
6	200	1044.2	1.1	229 724	89 362.636
7	200	1566.2	1.1	344 564	134 035.396
8	200	2088.4	1.1	459 448	178 725.272
9	200	2088.4	1.1	459 448	178 725.272
10	200	2088.4	1.1	459 448	178 725.272
11	200	2088.4	1.1	459 448	178 725.272
12	200	2088.4	1.1	459 448	178 725.272
13	200	2088.4	1.1	459 448	178 725.272
14	200	2088.4	1.1	459 448	178 725.272
15	200	2088.4	1.1	459 448	178 725.272
16	200	2088.4	1.1	459 448	178 725.272
17	200	2088.4	1.1	459 448	178 725.272
18	200	2088.4	1.1	459 448	178 725.272
19	200	2088.4	1.1	459 448	178 725.272
20	200	2088.4	1.1	459 448	178 725.272

## CASSAVA

Year	Price	Improved Area	Yield	Production	Gross Margin
	(CFAF 1 000 /T)	ha	(t/ha)	(CFAF 1000)	(CFAF 1 000)
1	70	0	8	0	0
2	70	0	8	0	0
3	70	0	8	0	0
4	70	0	8	0	0
5	70	171.6	8	96 096	37 861.824
6	70	343.2	8	192 192	75 723.648
7	70	514.9	8	288 344	113 607.536
8	70	686.5	8	384 440	151 469.360
9	70	686.5	8	384 440	151 469.360
10	70	686.5	8	384 440	151 469.360
11	70	686.5	8	384 440	151 469.360
12	70	686.5	8	384 440	151 469.360
13	70	686.5	8	384 440	151 469.360
14	70	686.5	8	384 440	151 469.360
15	70	686.5	8	384 440	151 469.360
16	70	686.5	8	384 440	151 469.360
17	70	686.5	8	384 440	151 469.360
18	70	686.5	8	384 440	151 469.360
19	70	686.5	8	384 440	151 469.360
20	70	686.5	8	384 440	151 469.360

## RICE

Year	Price	Improved Area	Yield	Production	Gross Margin
	(CFAF 1 000/T)	ha	(t/ha)	(CFAF 1 000)	(CFAF 1000)
1	400	0	0	0	0
2	400	0	0	0	0
3	400	0	0	0	0
4	400	0	0	0	0
5	400	7	2.5	7 000	2 555
6	400	14	2.5	14 000	5 110
7	400	22	2.5	22 000	8 030
8	400	30	2.5	30 000	10 950
9	400	30	2.5	30 000	10 950
10	400	30	2.5	30 000	10 950
11	400	30	2.5	30 000	10 950
12	400	30	2.5	30 000	10 950
13	400	30	2.5	30 000	10 950
14	400	30	2.5	30 000	10 950
15	400	30	2.5	30 000	10 950
16	400	30	2.5	30 000	10 950
17	400	30	2.5	30 000	10 950
18	400	30	2.5	30 000	10 950
19	400	30	2.5	30 000	10 950
20	400	30	2.5	30 000	10 950

## TOMATO

Year	Price	Improved Area	Yield	Production	Gross Margin
	(CFAF 1 000/T)	ha	(t/ha)	(CFAF 1 000)	(CFAF 1 000)
1	300	0	0	0	0
2	300	0	0	0	0
3	300	0	5	0	0
4	300	0	5	0	0
5	300	33.7	5	50 550	22 140.9
6	300	67.3	5	100 950	44 216.1
7	300	101.0	5	151 500	66 357.0
8	300	134.7	5	202 050	88 497.9
9	300	134.7	5	202 050	88 497.9
10	300	134.7	5	202 050	88 497.9
11	300	134.7	5	202 050	88 497.9
12	300	134.7	5	202 050	88 497.9
13	300	134.7	5	202 050	88 497.9
14	300	134.7	5	202 050	88 497.9
15	300	134.7	5	202 050	88 497.9
16	300	134.7	5	202 050	88 497.9
17	300	134.7	5	202 050	88 497.9
18	300	134.7	5	202 050	88 497.9
19	300	134.7	5	202 050	88 497.9
20	300	134.7	5	202 050	88 497.9

### Calculation of Economic Rate of Return at Completion

Year	Gross Margins per Crop (CFAF 1 000)				Total Margin (CFAF 1 000)	Investment Cost (CFAF 1 000 )	Cash Flow (CFAF 1 000)
	Maize	Cassava	Rice	Tomato			
1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	37 528.78	-37 528.78
2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	41 814.43	-41 814.43
3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	66 350.51	-66 350.51
4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	295 791.64	-295 791.64
5	44 672.76	37 861.82	2 555.00	22 140.90	107 230.48	200 881.91	-93 651.42
6	89 362.64	75 723.65	5 110.00	44 216.10	214 412.38	378 294.68	-163 882.29
7	134 035.40	113 607.54	8 030.00	66 357.00	322 029.93	913 194.96	-591 165.03
8	178 725.27	151 469.36	10 950.00	88 497.90	429 642.53	655 301.76	-225 659.23
9	178 725.27	151 469.36	10 950.00	88 497.90	429 642.53	1 46 2706.69	-1 033 064.16
10	178 725.27	151 469.36	10 950.00	88 497.90	429 642.53		429 642.53
11	178 725.27	151 469.36	10 950.00	88 497.90	429 642.53		429 642.53
12	178 725.27	151 469.36	10 950.00	88 497.90	429 642.53		429 642.53
13	178 725.27	151 469.36	10 950.00	88 497.90	429 642.53		429 642.53
14	178 725.27	151 469.36	10 950.00	88 497.90	429 642.53		429 642.53
15	178 725.27	151 469.36	10 950.00	88 497.90	429 642.53		429 642.53
16	178 725.27	151 469.36	10 950.00	88 497.90	429 642.53		429 642.53
17	178 725.27	151 469.36	10 950.00	88 497.90	429 642.53		429 642.53
18	178 725.27	151 469.36	10 950.00	88 497.90	429 642.53		429 642.53
19	178 725.27	151 469.36	10 950.00	88 497.90	429 642.53		429 642.53
20	178 725.27	151469.36	10 950.00	88 497.90	429 642.53		429 642.53

IRR = 8%

## ANNEX 4

### Contracts Executed with ADF Loan Resources

Contract Number and Purpose	Category	Date	Suppliers	Amount (in CFAF)	Amount Paid (in UA)	% Execution
Supply of 56 motorcycles to PADMOC	Goods	2/5/2005	COMOVEP	28 066 646	35 491.67	100
Supply of 4 pick-up trucks and 2 NISSAN TERRANO vehicles	Goods		SONAEC	82 000 000	104 547.25	100
Financial audit (2003, 2004 and 2005 financial years)	Service	6/6/2006	Cabinet Afrique Etude	13 400 000	17 855.56	100
Analysis of farmers' organizations	Service	16/6/2006	IBT	23 525 000	32 642.98	100
Technical assistance (3 experts)	Service	20/9/2007	BIM	234 785 000	331 485.97	100
Computer hardware and software	Goods	18/11/2006	SOFEC Sarl	28 197 540	39 901.67	100
Construction of 40 km of rural roads	Works	20/9/2007	CERAP-TP	891 940 019	1 187 389.90	100
Training consultant	Service	12/2/2007	AD CONSULT	8 780 000	12 490.41	100
Establishment of financial and accounting system	Service	23/12/2006	SEC DIARRA	12 015 000	16 865.11	100
Financial audit (2006 and 2007 financial years)	Services	12/11/2007	CDM Consultants	10 000 000	14 182.57	100
Studies and monitoring of construction of the Dogbo Training Centre	Service	4/6/2007	SETEM Bénin	21 041 000	28 474.40	91.11
Mid-term review	Service	18/3/2008	ADA Consultants	18 494 000	24 698.33	100
Study and monitoring of construction of boreholes, WS and latrines	Service	18/3/2008	BENIN Consult	51 848 000	29 270.31	100
Social mobilization for road construction	Service	6/12/2007	AERAMR-ONG	18 871 000	25 791.60	100
Control of the construction of 40 km of rural roads	Service	27/2/2008	SETEM -Bénin	71 045 700	97 984.42	100
Studies and monitoring of works on the bridge over the Couffo	Service	27/2/2008	ICRES	64 470 000	31 679.35	50
Technical assistance for rural road improvement	Service	9/11/2009	ONG CPADES	12 966 794	16 577.06	100
Financial audits (2008 and 2009 financial years)	Service	14/12/2009	BENAUDIT Consultex Sarl	10 000 000	13 384.71	100
Completion works of the Dogbo Training Centre	Works	28/6/2010	SILCO Sarl	339 735 500	408 142.63	91.11
Studies and monitoring of rural road rehabilitation	Service	18/6/2010	PERS-BTP	36 309 900	22 418.00	50
Construction of the Dakomey fish hatchery	Works	6/9/2010	GIRON-INFRA	86 942 836	8 336.65	7

### Contracts Executed on the Government Budget

Contract Number and Purpose	Category	Date	Suppliers	Amount (in CFAF)	Amount Paid (in CFAF)	% Execution
Rehabilitation of Kogbétohoué Rural Promotion Centre	Rural Works	4/4/2007	KODAF	21 912 093	21 912 093	100
Rehabilitation of Agnavo Rural Promotion Centre	Rural Works	11/8/2008	SILCO SARL	21 971 241	19 774 116	100

## List of Documents Consulted

- (1) PADMOC Appraisal Report;
- (2) PMU Completion Report;
- (3) Aide Memoire of Supervision Missions of February 2004, October 2004, December 2004, February 2005, July 2005, November 2005, April 2006, December 2006, December 2007, April 2008 and February 2010.
- (4) Mid-term Review Report;
- (5) *Etude de relance de la pisciculture* (Study on Revitalizing Fish Farming) by NOUMONVI Kokouvi Julien;
- (6) List of MAEP projects;
- (7) Final Reports on Agreements Concluded with CeRPA, DRH/MEEM, ONASA, ONG JAE-Bénin, INRAB, ABE;
- (8) Reports on the Monitoring of PADMOC Activities by the District Monitoring Committee;
- (9) Final Reports of Monitoring, Evaluation and Credit Technical Assistants;
- (10) SAF Report on the Status of Credit.

## Project Description

<p><b>Basic Data</b></p> <p>A UA 9.130 million loan was approved by the Bank Group's Board of Directors on 18 April 2001 and became effective on 4 July 2003. The project started up on 13 November 2003, date of the first disbursement. Project implementation, which was expected to end on 31 December 2009, was extended to 31 December 2010. The list of goods and services was revised twice; the first revision was carried out in 2005 to correct omissions of detailed costs and the second in 2008 to allocate project resources to finance the food crisis.</p> <p>The project's sector objective is to contribute to strengthening the country's food security. The specific objective is to diversify and increase agricultural production in Mono and Couffo Districts. The Project focuses on three (3) components: A. Strengthening of Rural Infrastructure; B. Support to Farmers; and C. Project Management.</p>
<p><u>Operational Performance: Project Outputs by Component:</u></p>
<p>1. Component A: Strengthening of Rural Infrastructure</p> <p>1.1 <i>The rural roads sub-component</i> includes the construction of 40 km of roads to open up the Tchis Depression, the rehabilitation of 13 km of rural roads, the improvement of 60 km of rural roads and the construction of a bridge over the Couffo. The agricultural water management sub-component includes the development of 300 ha of marshland and 45 ha of irrigated areas by artesian boreholes.</p> <p>1.2 The contract for the monitoring of construction work on 40 km of rural roads was signed with SETEM-Benin after that for works to be executed by CERAB-TP, in February 2008 and September 2007, respectively. Construction work on rural roads started very late (on 2 November 2007) for a contractual period of six months, but was completed in August 2010. The selection of this contractor had risks from the onset because it did not have earth-moving and transportation machinery to be used on the building site. It also presented only one road construction reference. Furthermore, the rented machines mobilized on the building site did not correspond to those presented in the contractor's bid. Hence, the weak technical and financial capacity coupled with non-compliance with the contract specifications resulted in the contractor's inability to fulfill its commitments. In addition, poor close monitoring of the control firm and the contractor by the PMU as well as the Directorate of Rural Engineering in its capacity as Project Supervisor contributed to this excessive delay in the execution of works. The delay affected the quality of works and resulted in poor performance in the social mobilization of beneficiaries.</p> <p>1.3 A visit to the site showed that the surface layer of the first sections constructed collapsed under wheels of passing vehicles, thus jeopardizing the proper drainage of these sections and exposing the geotextile in some places. The mission urges the Project Owner to request the contractor to carry out remedial works before final acceptance.</p> <p>1.4 Studies on the rehabilitation of the 13 km of the Adjaigbonou-Tohou- Atlatique District (Département) Border roads carried out by PERS-BTP started late in June 2010. This made it impossible to start and complete rehabilitation works before the project closure. Studies on the construction of the bridge over the Couffo were conducted in 2008 by ICREAS. The late launching and opening of international competitive bids for the works on 21 December 2009 and 7 June 2010, respectively, as well as the high amounts of bids proposed by contractors did not enable the timely revision of the list of goods and services, on the basis of which the bridge would have been built before the project closing date.</p> <p>1.5 Since the 40 km of rural roads were built at the end of the project and the road rehabilitation and improvement works were not executed, the rural roads management committees set up in 2007-2008 in 11 villages by the NGO, AERAMR, and in November 2010 by the NGO, CPADES, did not function throughout the duration of PADMOC. In spite of CeRPA's exercise of supervisory authority over PADMOC PMU, coordination</p>

between DAGRN/CeRPA and the PMU for this rural road sub-component was weak and slow, thus having a negative impact on the sustainability of this infrastructure, which is contingent on the functioning of the rural roads management committees set up by the project.

1.6 *The agricultural water management sub-component* includes the development of 300 ha (reduced to 150 ha by the mid-term review) of marshland and the creation of 45 ha of irrigated areas (reduced to 30 ha) around artesian wells in the Tchis Depression. No activity was carried out under this sub-component. The CFAF 30 million earmarked for studies and works monitoring was less than the bid amounts presented by the consulting firms. The Bank did not give its 'no objection' opinion because it considered that the revision of the list of goods and services and the procurement timeframes would not allow for the implementation of this action. Although the opinion of the Bank on bids for studies and works monitoring under this sub-component was given in March 2007, the bid invitation was issued on 31 December 2008 or after 20 months. Thus, these works were also not executed due partly to considerable delay in appraising the dossier and the cost of technical studies deemed very high compared to estimates.

1.7 CeRPA's supervisory authority over the PADMOC PMU provided for in the organization chart of the appraisal report was not complied with upon project start-up because of MAEP Order No. 172/MAEP/D-CAB/SGM DPP/DA/HRSC/SA of 22 March 2002 to amend and modify the organization chart. This partly explains the weak collaboration between DAGRN/CeRPA and the PMU for activities under the rural infrastructure strengthening component.

1.8 *The rural water supply and sanitation sub-component* includes the construction of 30 water points on boreholes equipped with manual pumps, village water supply (2 VWS not envisaged at appraisal) and the construction of 28 latrines. The agreement concluded between PADMOC and DRH, the Project Owner Delegate, was only partially implemented because none of these activities was carried out. The DRH participated in recruiting and monitor the consultancy firm BENIN CONSULT (for studies and monitoring) and the NGO, JAE-BENIN (charged with social mobilization). The studies carried out by the studies and monitoring firm helped in constructing the boreholes and latrines, thus enabling the NGO to set up water point management committees (WPMC) in the communities and to train beneficiaries in the use and maintenance of latrines. Concerning VWS, priority was given to the supply of water to Project RPCs (Agnavo, Kpétou, Kogbéthoué) and the Dogbo Training Centre. Although studies were completed in November 2008, contracts for the construction of boreholes and latrines as well as the procurement of pumps were signed only at the end of the project (September 2010), thus preventing their execution as contractual timelines exceeded 31 December 2010. Eight months had elapsed between the date of receipt of the Bank's opinion and the signing of these contracts. This jeopardized project credibility among the population that had been mobilized. Hence, the agreements signed with the DRH (November 2005) at project start-up well before the NGO started providing services (February 2007) lasting four years did not produce the expected outcomes.

1.9 *The fish farming infrastructure sub-component* includes the construction of a fish hatchery in the Dokomey Fish Farm at Aplahoué and a 200 m<sup>2</sup> fishing base and a 100 m<sup>2</sup> smokehouse for maritime fishery at Ayiguinou, the rehabilitation of the Tohonou fish hatchery tanks, and construction of 30 fish ponds in Kpétou. The PMU recruited a fish farming consulting expert to make up for the absence of an agreement with specialized institutions for implementing this sub-component. The study carried out by the fish farming consultant recruited in April 2009 did not contribute to implementation of this sub-component owing to the very long delay (May 2009) in launching the first bid invitation for the construction of the Aplahoué fish hatchery. Construction works started in October 2010 and only 7% of the works was completed as at 31 December 2010. The bid invitation for the rehabilitation of the Tohonou Fry Centre was launched and it turned out that the financial proposals were very high compared to the project detailed cost estimates. The Ayiguinou Smoking Centre and Fishing Base were not built because the project considered these facilities no longer relevant. Actually, similar facilities constructed in this same area by PDRIM are underutilized by beneficiaries. Thus, apart from minor works started in Aplahoué, all activities under this component were not implemented.

1.10 Thus, only the Hlassamè-Badazoin and Madjrè-Zizagué rural roads were constructed and accepted out of all the planned facilities. The 36% credit consumption rate is by far higher than the physical implementation rate of this component estimated at 20%. The absence of an infrastructure expert within the PMU was identified as a constraint on managing this component. The PMU team's obvious incapacity to process and activate files relating to infrastructure contracts from the preparation of bids up to the execution of works as well as weak collaboration between the PMU, the Project Owner Delegate and the Project Supervisors in charge of infrastructure (DAGR/CeRPA, DRH/MMEE, DG Fisheries, D Rural Engineering/MAEP) explain the poor performance of this project component.

## 2. Component B: Support to Farmers:

2.1 The Support to Farmers component comprises three sub-components: (i) Professionalization of Agriculture; (ii) Promotion of Farmers' Organizations (FOs) and Sub-sectors; and (iii) Agricultural Credit.

2.2 The Professionalization of Agriculture sub-component includes the completion of the construction of the Dogbo Training Centre, the preparation of a training plan, the long-term training of 400 out-of-school youths and short-term training of 3 200 selected farmers in the four RPCs to be rehabilitated with resources from the State budget.

2.3 The preparation of documents for selective bidding for studies and monitoring of completion work on the Dogbo Training Centre began in July 2005 and the contract was signed with the successful consulting firm two years later. This was the same for the construction contract whose bids were submitted to the CPMP in February 2008, the Bank's 'no objection opinion' relating to the contract received on 23 April 2009 and the contract signed with SILCO Sarl, the selected contractor, on 28 June 2010. Thus, it took more than 26 months to complete shopping on the construction of the Dogbo TC.

2.4 A follow-up of the stages of award of this contract revealed bottlenecks at the DNMP level since the bidding dossier was received on 25 March 2008 and approved and transmitted on 9 April 2009. The contract was signed and provisional acceptance of works took place at the end of the project with a financial implementation rate of 91.10% as at 31 December 2010. It had been agreed that the 8.9% financing gap was to be covered by the State budget.

2.5 During its visit to building sites in the presence of the contractor and monitoring firm, the completion mission noted that the works had not been completed and that the level of execution of works was well below the progress estimate (80%) submitted to the Bank. Five months after the provisional acceptance, much work remains to be done or uncompleted: painting, closets, electrical installations and other remedial works, etc. The progress estimate was backed by a report of provisional acceptance signed by the representatives of the General Directorate of Budget, the Autonomous Sinking Fund, the MAEP Public Procurement Unit, CeRPA and the Coordinator. This shows that the monitoring firm, the contractor and representatives of public services did not comply with the rules of procedure for the procurement of works and the terms of the disbursement letter. Thus, the mission established on 18 May 2011 that all defects had been corrected by the contractor as stated in the bill of quantities included in the progress estimate of 28 December 2010.

2.6 The rehabilitation of the Kogbétohoué (Aplahoué) and Agnavo (Dogbo) Rural Promotion Centres was carried out by KODAF and SILCO in 2007 and 2009 with the counterpart contribution to the project. The Grand-Popo and Kpétou RPCs were not rehabilitated due to insufficient resources from the State budget. Although drinking water and electricity were not supplied to the Agnavo RPC, it functioned relatively satisfactorily under difficult conditions. The Kogbétohoué and Kpétou RPCs did not function throughout the duration of the project.

2.7 A training plan including the actual training needs of out-of-school youths and farmers to be trained in the Rural Promotion Centres was developed by *AD-Consult Sarl*, selected after bidding based on a shortlist in 2007.

2.8 Long-term (11 months) and short-term (10 days) training courses were organized in the Agnavo and Grand Popo RPCs where 74 out-of-school youths, 25 of them girls, were given long-term training, and 362 farmers, 144 of them women, received short-term training. The implementation rate was 18.5% for long-term training and 11.31% for short-term training. Several reasons account for the low implementation rates, notably: (i) failure to rehabilitate the RPCs on time owing to lack of financial resources; (ii) late preparation of a training plan for the RPCs; (iii) late completion of the Dogbo Training Centre; (iv) poor accommodation conditions; (v) inefficient or lack of teaching aids (means of transportation, building and equipment for practical lessons, farmland); and (vi) lack of training staff and a permanent administration in the centres.

2.9 *The Promotion of Farmers' Organizations sub-component* started in 2005 with the diagnostic analysis of farmers' organizations in the Mono and Couffo Districts by the consulting firm, IBT, which identified 300 key farmers' organizations out of 1 080 functional organizations. Support to grassroots and apex professional agricultural organizations included the construction of multi-purpose halls for Unions of Farmers' Organizations, literacy education and promotion of agricultural sub-sectors.

2.10 Short-term training took place in RPCs for members of 79 grassroots farmers' organizations (5 258 members, including 4 300 women) with an estimated implementation rate of 83%. The training of 92 members, including 25 women, from apex farmers' organizations involved technical and financial (credit) domains for an implementation rate estimated at 86%. Literacy activities could not be carried out due to implementation timeframes that exceeded the project closing date. The terms of reference and shortlist for the recruitment of local NGOs to train 166 groups (about 1 660 people) were prepared. The file obtained the 'no objection' opinion of the ADB on 28 December 2010, but the recruitment process could not be completed as the project closing date was 31 December 2010.

2.11 Bidding documents for the construction of seven (7) multi-purpose halls were prepared for Council Producers' Unions (UCP). The Bank issued its 'no objection' opinion on 12 April 2010, but the bid was not launched because the execution timeframe would exceed 31 December 2010.

2.12 *Promotion of the seed production sub-sector*: the project supported CeRPA (UGP/DRC-CeRPA agreement) to promote the rice and maize sub-sectors through the procurement of seed control equipment and monitoring of 29 certified rice (38.3 tons) and 20 maize (13.5 tons) seed producers. It supported tomato seed production and intensive cultivation by signing an agreement with INRAB.

2.13 *Plant protection* (UGP/DRC-CeRPA agreement): to support CeRPA, the project set up, trained and equipped twenty (20) phytosanitary brigades, thereby forming a regional disease warning and control system. These brigades may be dismantled due to problems in replacing their obsolete equipment and providing pesticides on the PADMOC line of credit. The failure of a recent experiment under this sub-component discouraged the use of loans to finance this activity.

2.14 *Restoration of soil fertility* (UGP/DRC-CeRPA agreement): several techniques for restoring soil fertility and controlling *imperata cylindrica* and erosion were introduced among producers in all municipal councils in the Mono and Couffo Districts. Project support for land protection, soil fertility and biodiversity improvement consisted in: (i) providing seeds for planting 60 ha of *mucuna*; (ii) supplying seedlings to producers to plant 42 ha of *choc acacia*; (iii) providing support for the cultivation of 37 ha of vetiver; and (iv) supporting the opening of hedge plantations and biodiversity improvement with 41.5 ha of protected land and 7 821 seedlings of rare species planted (UGP/DRC-CeRPA agreement). The joint UGP/CeRPA supervision mission of April 2010 noted a high rate of destruction of biodiversity plants in the Ladikpo sacred forest in the Lalo municipal council. In contrast, our mission noted that producers were interested in planting acacia, which enabled them to earn sizeable income from the sale of poles after a rotation of 3 to 4 years.

2.15 *Database*: to establish this database, 200 farms had to be closely monitored jointly by the PMU and DPAF-CeRPA. For this purpose, the project purchased equipment, including 6 motorcycles, for the 6 inspectors recruited. The scanty partial data collected was not analyzed. A project technical and economic impact assessment carried out by a private consultant is being finalized.

2.16 *Agricultural credit sub-component*: a CFAF 2 551 million (UA 2.63 million) credit fund was established at project start-up, but UA 2 million (CFAF 1 400 million) was reallocated to PUASA. The first credits were granted to producers in 2006. The one-year technical assistance of the credit sub-component started in October 2007 at a time when the position of Women Leadership Specialist in the PMU UGP had been vacant for more than one year, due to ill health. This greatly slowed down the activities of the component in 2006/2007. In fact, up to end-October 2007, the amount of credit granted to 130 beneficiaries, including 12 women, stood at CFAF 184 182 600. As at 31 December 2008, the amount of credit refinanced by the CGGC with ADB resources was more than CFAF 757 160 058 for 990 beneficiaries, 39.4% of them women. As at 31 July 2009, the rate of increase in credit granted in 2009/2010 declined since the overall credit granted to 1 119 beneficiaries, of which 481 women, as at 31 December 2010 was CFAF 841 310 058. It should be noted that CFAF 768 160 058 was set aside for 992 beneficiaries (602 men and 390 women) from resources obtained directly from the ADB and the remaining amount from resources repaid to the CGGC by MFIs.

2.17 The granting of credit was suspended in 2009 due to a UA 0.63 million shortage in the credit fund. This activity was revived with funds repaid by MFIs to the CGGC, but the many outstanding payments observed led to another suspension by the ADB supervision mission of October 2009 of IMFs that had not repaid 90% of funds owed the CGGC. The repayment rate as at 30 September 2010 ranged from a low 20.6% for Houéyogbé municipal council to a high 60.9% for Klouékanmé. For example, the repayment rates for Come (143 beneficiaries) and Grand-Popo (70 beneficiaries) municipal councils as at 30 April 2011 were 39% and 58.5%, respectively, for credit due. The number of beneficiaries in the two councils that had repaid 100% of their credit was 12 and 15, in that order. The mission noted that low repayment was common among beneficiaries of credit guaranteed by their farmers' organization, which may penalize good payers within the farmers' organization and encourage them to follow the bad example of the others, particularly as they are aware that the line of credit is from a project nearing completion. Thus, on 30 April 2011, a beneficiary from Aplahoué municipal council fully repaid the CFAF 6 million credit granted on 23 November 2006, but has not begun to repay the CFAF 8 million credit granted on 31 March 2009. However, the mission noted producers' enthusiasm for credit and observed the positive outputs of some micro-projects financed by the project.

2.18 Most credits are granted on a short-term basis (68%) and concern processing and storage equipment, farm equipment, rabbit breeding, fishery and fish-farming equipment. This is likely to weigh on the cash flow of the CGGC and urge it to look for other resources, especially as the lowest repayment rates are noted in this type of credit. The direct involvement of the credit technicians (TSIEC/CeCPA) of CeRPA municipal council entities in preparing micro-credit dossiers and monitoring their implementation militates in favour of the continuation of this activity. Nevertheless, the fact that they are not involved in monitoring credit due coupled with the low level of decentralization of IMFs partly contributes to the low repayment rate.

2.19 Plans have been made with the CGGC to establish a guarantee fund and a disaster fund. Only part of the resources expected from the Government of Benin to put into these funds and the repayment account have been released.

2.20 It should be pointed out that the revision of the list of goods and services under the Emergency Food Security Support Programme (PUASA) helped to reallocate UA 2.0 million of the original allocation for micro-credit (UA 2.63 million). However, the dossier was delayed, as a result of which the deadline could not be met. Given that funds were disbursed from the PADMOC special account, the mission noted that the funds had been repaid on 5 April 2011 to ECOBANK Senegal.

### 3. Component C: Project Management

3.1 Support to CeRPA sub-component: outputs under this sub-component concerning equipment were: (i) procurement of means of transport and computer hardware; (ii) expendable survey and site equipment; and (iii) payment of allowances to CeRPA staff involved in the project. Mapping tools were not procured because PDRIM had produced maps that are stored in CENATEL and are not used.

3.2 Other outputs of the sub-component included: (i) the construction of the observatory of eight markets in Mono and Couffo Districts from May 2006 to April 2010 with the support of the National Food Security Support Board (UGP/ONASA Agreement of 28/11/2005); (ii) the setting up of a project activity database at the DPAF, with the support of a consultant; (iii) the close monitoring of 200 farms; (iv) environmental monitoring of project activities, entrusted to the Benin Environment Agency (UGP/ABE Agreement of 28/12/2007); and (v) capacity building of PMU members and some CeRPA senior officers and technicians on specific topics. The monitoring of farming activities through photo-interpretation was not implemented due to the marked cost under-estimate.

3.3 Project Management Unit sub-component: the outputs of the sub-component were: (i) the procurement of means of transport, computer hardware and office equipment; (ii) the implementation of technical assistance from October 2007 whereby three experts (Monitoring and Evaluation, Financial Management and Credit) conducted an uninterrupted mission (8 months) and short-term missions that ended in 2009; (iii) the conduct in 2008 of the project mid-term review by the consulting firm, ADA-Consult; and (iv) the conduct of periodic project external audits.

#### 4. Gender and Environmental Issues

4.1. Gender mainstreaming was included in the implementation of all project activities. Concerning training, the Grand-Popo RPC specialized in the training of women farmers and young out-of-school girls. The centre trained 153 women farmers out of 237 farmers trained, i.e. 65.55%. Fifty percent of credit beneficiaries are women. The involvement of women improved with the implementation of agricultural produce marketing and processing activities.

4. As regards environmental issues, an ESMP was implemented in 2002 through a partnership agreement signed with the Benin Environmental Agency. The works proper could not be executed because the construction of rural roads was not completed on time and boreholes and latrines were not constructed. Borrow pits were not restored and trees were not planted on roadsides. The ABE did not participate in the training of phytosanitary brigades to reduce the adverse effects of plant treatment on health and pollution.

#### 5. Financial Situation

5.1 The project's financial situation as at 31 December 2010 was as follows: (i) the disbursement rate of the UA 9.13 million ADF loan was 52.88% while that of the Beninese Government's estimated UA 1.09 million contribution was 50.91%; (ii) the disbursement rates for the works, services and operation expenditure categories under the ADF loan were 49.3%, 67.9% and 99.37%, respectively; (iii) the disbursement rates for the infrastructure, support to farmers and project management expenditure components (ADF + Government) were 35.38%, 36.27% and 105.84%, in that order. These rates reflect a major imbalance in financial management and in the scheduling of project activities.

5.2 Refund of the Special Account Balance: at project completion, the special account balance must be paid back to the Bank. Thus, the mission recommends the payment no later than 30 June 2011 of the sum of CFAF 31 547 636 recorded in the special account opened at the Central Bank of West African States and CFAF 64 225 123 in Financial Bank account number 80623139399 at the Lokossa Branch. In addition, PADMOC should present a special account reconciliation statement to justify the current account balance. Thus, the Bank must ensure that funds disbursed from the special account are justified before the project closing date.

5.3 The mission recommends that the project should ensure that all commitments received and provided by the project are identified and measures taken to ensure their clearance. Since the project ended on 31 December 2010, the mission recommends that the Borrower should take necessary measures to organize the final acceptance of works. The allowances of a select staff in charge of monitoring project closing activities (DG CeRPA, coordinator, accounting officer, secretary and driver) will be borne by the Government.

## Progress and Audit Reports

5.4 Quarterly progress reports were regularly submitted to the Bank. The 2010 annual report was not submitted to the Bank. The completion report submitted to the Bank is incomplete and does not comply with the required format.

5.5 The status of implementation of the recommendations of audits carried out in 2008 and part of 2009 submitted to the mission showed that recommendations, in particular those relating to accounting management, were not implemented by the project. Consequently, the mission recommends that the project should expedite the implementation of the said recommendations by 30 June 2011 and requests the project to submit the audit of the 2011 financial year before 30 June 2011. In addition, the mission underscores the importance of involving the external auditor in the inventory of project assets.

## 6. Conclusion and Lessons Learned

6.1 The project ended with a very low disbursement rate of 52.88% despite a one-year extension of the closing date. Works, which represented 36.14% of the loan amount at appraisal, recorded the lowest disbursement rate, i.e. 17.8%. The reasons for this poor performance include: (i) procurement delays at the level of the PMU, the Government and the Bank; (ii) the lack of an infrastructure expert in the project team; (iii) poor performance of service providers and contractors; (iv) lack of rigour in monitoring agreements by the PMU and the involvement of the services of the project supervisory authority (CeRPA); (v) a multitude of small activities involving many partners whose capacity was not sufficiently assessed at appraisal; (vi) poor programming and discrepancy in implementing activities on the ground; and (vii) poor performance of the project team and weak monitoring/supervision by the Borrower.

6.2 The Support to Farmers component recorded an acceptable implementation rate and the credit sub-component achieved good outputs in terms of producer perception, production and income improvement. In contrast, effort must be made to train producers and restructure farmers' organizations. The Project Management component recorded a good implementation rate, although this performance did not have an impact on the overall project performance.

6.3 The main lessons, suggestions and recommendations to draw from this completion mission are as follows:

- (i) The PMU team should comprise specialists whose expertise covers the main project areas;
- (ii) The engineering studies of infrastructure to be built should be carried out during project preparation and should focus on the execution of works;
- (iii) The Project Supervisor and PMU should ensure strict compliance with the contractual commitments (equipment, staff, implementation timeframe) made by contractors and operators;
- (iv) Upon project start-up, identify the activities that constitute the critical path in order to give them due priority during planning and implementation;
- (v) Attach greater importance to clauses relating to the technical, material and financial capacity of contractors during the preparation and evaluation of bidding documents for works requiring major earthworks;
- (vi) Ensure the strict monitoring of agreements with service providers and services attached to the project owner, which are responsible for project supervision or project activities;

- (vii) Design projects that do not include activities related to several areas and specialties;
- (viii) Harmonize the social mobilization of beneficiaries and the execution of infrastructure works, the sustainability of which they should ensure;
- (ix) Programme and spread out the intervention of service providers in harmony with complementary and related activities;
- (x) Target the technical assistance needs of projects, taking into account the essential functions of the project requiring capacity building;
- (xi) Ensure, as a priority, the participation of decentralized IMFs in implementing the line of credit in the project area and involve the decentralized entities of the project owner in loan recovery;
- (xii) Introduce the adoption by the Borrower of specific measures to strengthen community entities in terms of ownership of investments as a condition precedent to first disbursement.

Recommendations:

To the Government:

- Make every effort to create a conducive environment for the smooth completion of the project;
- Take the necessary measures to organize the final acceptance of road works and provisional acceptance of the Dogbo Training Centre;
- Launch the periodic maintenance of the 40-km Hlassamé-Badazoin and Madjré-Zizagué road in 2011;
- Based on social mobilization under PADMOC, carry out works to improve 60 km of rural roads and construct 30 boreholes equipped with manual pumps, 2 rural water supply projects and 28 latrines;
- Continue to grant loans at low interest rates in the project area and to refinance good payers applying for loans;
- Ensure the regular upgrading and functioning of rehabilitated RPCs and TC, and implement a programme for the socio-professional integration of trainees;
- Make a detailed inventory of the project's tangible and intangible assets (materials, equipment, buildings, intellectual productions, etc.) before 30 June 2011;
- Ensure that a project completion report in due form and content is submitted in future.

To the Bank:

- Cancel the undisbursed loan amount of UA 2 302 129.63;

- Ensure that information on the pre-project situation collected at appraisal (institutional framework, local stakeholders, on-going projects and initiatives, baseline data) is reliable so as to better define project objectives and expected outcomes and to properly target their underlying activities;
- At project appraisal, ascertain the effective availability of partner government institutions to implement project activities assigned to them;
- Organize consultative meetings with donors financing similar and/or complementary activities in the project area.