

Ghana: Village Infrastructure Project

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country & Project Name	Ghana: Village Infrastructure Project	
Loan No.:	429-GH	
Project Id.:	1002	
Board Date	04 December 1996	
Effectiveness date	02 April 1998	
Closing date	31 December 2004	
Total Project Cost USD	60.00	
IFAD loan USD	10.00	
Cofinanciers if any	International Development Association (IDA) 50%, KFW (German development agency) 11%, IFAD 16%	
Implementing Agency	Min. of Food and Agriculture	
Principal Components	Rural infrastructure for 1) water, 2) transport and 3) Post-harvest. Institutional strengthening	
Project Performance		
Design	Inadequate attention to maintenance of infrastructure. Some design pre-testing as part of appraisal. Confusing and duplicative approach to M&E. Hindsight shows that requirement for DA contributions up front reduced participation and accuracy of predicted demand for services (no pre-survey).	4
Implementation	GOG caused substantial start-up delays for unspecified reasons. 22% of project funds unspent. Large shortfall in GOG, DA and beneficiary contributions. IDA led ISM's. Effective MTR.	3
Relevance	Fully consistent with GOG PR strategy and decentralisation policy.	6
Effectiveness	Technical weaknesses in alternative transport component, too many markets (some badly sited), not enough spent on storage and processing as component underperformed. Water component excelled but in elements that were not expected. Disconnect between numbers trained (institutional strengthening) and quantitative parts of other components which were overambitious given goal of being demand driven. M&E performance mixed - project management unit/ PMU performance was good, but the Ministry's weak.	5
Efficiency	Comprehensive re-estimation of internal rate of return (IRR) for project and for components, but lack of attention to the counterfactual.	6
Partner Performance		
Partner Perf. & Quality	Beneficiary participation weak. Implementing sub-agencies lacked commitment owing to incomplete decentralisation. WB performance strong especially country office. Overall borrower performance sound despite shaky start, although GOG contribution to project prep and design was good. IFAD performance indeterminate and seemingly passive.	WB= 5 GOG= 4 KFW=NR, BEN=3 IFAD=NR
Rural Poverty Impact		
Physical Assets	Strong impact but less than expected or than could have been achieved. Water overachieved transport the opposite. Demand poorly predicted. Uncertain sustainability. Physical assets dominated by water facilities.	4
Food Security	Positive but smaller impact than expected	5
Environment	Generally positive but not seriously examined in PCR	5
Human Assets	Extensive training of farmers and rural people, but of unknown relevance and quality.	4
Soc. Cap. & Emp.	No clear evidence on social capital, but positive self-help achievement although farmer abilities to fund new local projects and to maintain old ones strictly circumscribed (financially and technically) .	3
Ag. Productivity	Positive and on greater scale than predicted.	5
Inst. & Serv.	Extensive training of government staff, farmers and rural people. Institutional capacity of DA's and area councils improved. Training quality etc. not assessed. Seeming concentration on inputs (quantity of training) - neglect of outputs (results of training).	4
Financial assets	None. Not relevant	NA
Markets	Positive but of uncertain magnitude. Substantial construction of markets but demand was probably imposed.	4

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country & Project Name	Ghana: Village Infrastructure Project	
Rural Poverty	Based on estimated ERR (economic rate of return) impact strongly positive.	5
Overarching factors		
Targeting	Project fully consistent with GOG Poverty Reduction Strategy, but there is no analysis of whether the project was simply an area rural development project or more specifically focussed on the poorest.	3
Gender	Strong impact owing to water component where benefits were direct, also post-harvest technology. Reduction in head-loading.	5
Sustainability	DA competence, lack of funds raise doubts about maintenance and hence long run sustainability. Follow on project will mask this deficiency.	3
Innov, Rep & Scaling	Project used well tested approaches. No innovation.	2
Overall Performance	A good, broadly conventional project that delivered well on main objectives, but achieved less than predicted. Significant implementation delays. A re-estimated ERR of over 40%. Strong poverty and gender effects, but sustainability uncertain. In line with IFAD SO's and MDG's but level of achievement modest.	5
Contribution to IFAD Strategic Objectives	Positive but slight contribution to strategic objectives. Not much new technology. Some intensification of agriculture. Measurable capacity building, but sustainability unknown. No change in access to fin. services. Modest gains in access to markets.	4
Contribution to MDG's	Project contributed positively to MMDG's 1, 3 and probably 7. Magnitude of contribution not determined. Assertions about 6. General lack of quantitative data on outcomes.	4
PCR Quality		3
Scope	Lack of attention to strategy, design and implementation. Coverage of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness fair. Outputs good but outcomes and results not really examined. Assessment of partners sketchy. No explicit treatment of domains.	3
Quality	Inadequate depth of analysis. Conclusions are often assertions without any clear evidence or with weak causal reasoning. But estimated ERR's unusually comprehensive. Very useful beneficiary assessment which is of superior quality to PCR proper. Not well written or presented. Difficult to distil main messages. Written by consultants.	3
Lessons	Lessons clear (M&E only) but narrowly drawn e.g. no lessons on design, or institution strengthening.	2