

# PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS (PCR)



AFRICAN  
DEVELOPMENT  
BANK GROUP

## I BASIC DATA

### A Report data

<b>Report date</b>	Date of report:	<b>08 December 2020</b>	
	Mission date (if field mission)	From: 11 November, 2019	To: 23 November 2019

### B Responsible Bank staff

Positions	At approval	At completion
<b>Director General</b>	Mr. Franck PERRAULT	Mrs. Marie-Laure AKIN-OLUGBADE
<b>Country Manager /DDG</b>	Ms. Leila MOKADEM	Mr. Serge N'GUESSAN
<b>Sector Director</b>	Mr. Abdirahman BEILEH	Mr. Martin FREGENE
<b>Sector Manager</b>	Mr. Ken B. JOHM	Mr. Ken B. JOHM
<b>Task Manager</b>	Mr. Olagoke OLADAPO	Mr. Tabi KARIKARI
<b>Alternate Task Manager</b>		
<b>PCR Team Leader</b>		Mr. Tabi KARIKARI
<b>PCR Team Members</b>		Ibro MANOMI Principal Agricultural Economist, RDGW.2 Aime BICABA, Senior Irrigation Engineer, RDGW.2 Philip DOGHLE Principal Financial Management Specialist, SNFI.2 Daniel OSEI-BOAKYE Snr. Procurement Officer, SNFI.1 Ms. Sarah FAHN, Principal Disbursement Officer, FIFC.3

### C Project data

<b>Project name: FOOD AND AGRICULTURE SECTOR DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (FASDEP)</b>		
<b>Project code: P-GM-AA0-013</b>	<b>Instrument number(s): GAFSP Grant number 557 015 500 0251</b>	
<b>Project type: Investment (GASFP Financed)</b>	<b>Sector: AGRICULTURE AND AGRO-INDUSTRY</b>	
<b>Country: THE GAMBIA</b>	<b>Environmental categorization (1-3):2</b>	
<b>Processing milestones – Bank approved financing only (add/delete rows depending on the number of financing sources)</b>	<b>Key Events (Bank approved financing only)</b>	<b>Disbursement and closing dates (Bank approved financing only)</b>
<b>Financing source/ instrument1:</b>	<b>Financing source/ instrument1:</b>	<b>Financing source/ instrument1:</b>

Date approved: 15 MAY 2013	Cancelled amounts:	Original disbursement deadline: June. 2019		
Date signed: 28MAY 2013	Supplementary financing:	Original closing date: December 2018		
Date of entry into force: 28 MAY 2013	Restructuring ( <i>specify date &amp; amount involved</i> ): N/A	Revised ( <i>if applicable</i> ) disbursement deadline: 30 September, 2020		
Date effective for 1st disbursement: 07 OCTOBER, 2013	Extensions ( <i>specify dates</i> ): 2 (from December 2018 to December 2019; and December 2019 to June 2020)	Revised ( <i>if applicable</i> ) closing date:30 June 2020		
Date of actual 1st disbursement: 07 OCTOBER, 2013				
<b>Financing source/instrument (add/delete rows depending on the number of financing sources):</b>	<b>Disbursed amount (amount, USD):</b>	<b>Percentage disbursed (%):</b>	<b>Undisbursed amount (USD):</b>	<b>Percentage undisbursed (%):</b>
Financing source/ instrument1: <b>USD26,600,000</b>	<b>26,576,723.11</b>	<b>99.91%</b>	<b>23,276.89</b>	<b>0.09%</b>
Financing source/ instrument2:				
Government: <b>USD700,000</b>	<b>822,507.37</b>	<b>117.50%</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
Other (e.g. co-financiers). <i>Add rows as needed</i>				
<b>TOTAL: USD27,300,000</b>	<b>27,242,378.02</b>	<b>99.79%</b>	<b>180,129.35</b>	<b>0.66%</b>
<b>Financing source/instrument (add/delete rows depending on the number of financing sources):</b>	<b>Committed amount (USD):</b>	<b>Percentage committed (%):</b>	<b>Uncommitted amount (USD):</b>	<b>Percentage uncommitted (%):</b>
Financing source/ instrument1:	<b>26,600,000</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
Financing source/ instrument2:				
Government:	<b>700,000.00</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
Other (e.g. co-financiers). <i>Add rows as needed.</i>				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>27,300,000.00</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
Co-financiers and other external partners:				
Executing and implementing agency (ies): Ministry of Agriculture				

## D Management review and comments

Report reviewed by	Name	Date reviewed	Comments
Country Manager	Serge N'GUESSAN		
Sector Manager	Ken B. JOHM		
Regional Director (as chair of Country Team)	MRS. Marie-Laure AKIN-OLUGBADE		
Sector Director	Martin FREGENE		

## II Project performance assessment

### A Relevance

#### 1. Relevance of project development objective

Rating*	Narrative assessment (max 250 words)
3	<p>The relevance of the project development objective is rated satisfactory. This is because the project at appraisal was designed in line with the relevant country, Bank and global level policies and remain so all through its implementation: At the country level, the project development objective hinged on the first pillar of the Programme for Accelerated Growth and Employment (2012 – 2015) - to promote accelerated growth and economic development in the Gambia. Other policies, strategies and investment plans that the project was aligned to at appraisal were the Gambia National Agricultural Investment Plan (2011 – 2015) and Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy (2009 – 2015).</p> <p>During implementation, the project was observed to remain in line with the ensuing policies. These included: JAS Agricultural and Natural Resources Policy 2017-2026; and Gambia National Agriculture Investment Plan -Food and Nutrition Security 2019-2026 - which has overarching aim at maximizing of poverty reduction and enhancement of food, income and nutrition securities through the optimal utilization of the resources consistent with safeguarding the integrity of the environment. It is again aligned to the National Nutrition Policy 2018-2025. It is also in line with the Country Brief 2017-2019 which prioritized: (i) Enhancing Productive Capacity and Competitiveness in order to strengthen resilience to External Shocks, and; (ii) Strengthening the Institutional Capacity for Economic Governance and Public Service Delivery.</p> <p>At the Bank level, it was designed to be consistent with both the Bank’s Agriculture Sector Strategy (2010-2014) which among others sought to promote the development of essential infrastructures to unleash the potentials of the sector (through sustainable water management, irrigation, rural roads, marketing and storage infrastructure, and promoting agro-industry development). It remained consistent with other intervening Bank policies and strategies including the Ten-Year Strategy (2013-2022); and is addressed thematic areas that are included in the High Five Priority Areas of the Bank - especially Feed Africa and Improve Livelihoods. Enabler 1 (Increase Productivity); Enabler 3 (Increase investment into enabling soft and hard infrastructure); Enabler 4 (Catalyse flows of increased Agricultural Finance); and Enabler 6 (Increase inclusivity, Sustainability and Nutrition) of the Bank’s Feed Africa Strategy for Agriculture Transformation in Africa (2016-2025) are supported by the project.</p> <p>The development objective of the project is directly in line with the aims of the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) which is to improve the income and food security of poor people in developing countries through more and better public and private sector investment in the agriculture and rural sectors that is country-owned and led and through technical assistance; which is informed by the UN Sustainable Development 2030 Agenda.</p>

\* For all ratings in the PCR use the following scale: 4 (Highly satisfactory), 3 (Satisfactory), 2 (Unsatisfactory), 1 (Highly unsatisfactory)

## 2. Relevance of project design

Rating*	Narrative assessment (max 250 words)
3	<p>The project design is rated satisfactory. The theory of change of the project is that the following three intervention areas would derive the desired reduction in poverty and enhance food security: a) Improving land management infrastructure and practices to expand production and enhance productivity; b) Improving market access and promoting market led private sector environment to foster small holder commercialisation for the productive poor; and c) Supporting social protection and food safety net programs to reduce food and nutrition security of vulnerable populations. The design prioritises commodities such as rice, vegetables, poultry, small ruminants and fish which is largely consumed in the Gambia. The key beneficiaries considered in the design were farmer groups, individual entrepreneurs and selected government assisted schools in Central River Region, Lower River Region and West Coast Region. The design was highly infrastructure centred with 42.5% of the project cost allocated to infrastructure development. The project thus enhanced the installed capacity to produce rice by ~ 1,500Ha; poultry by 250,000 broilers perbatch and 100,000 creates of eggs per month; and 125Ha of all-year round horticultural crops. Other capacities enhanced include that for the production of upland cereals, groundnut, small ruminants and fish. The design addressed the need for the beneficiaries in that it built on earlier projects that improved rice production and introduced new activities that will engender commercialisation and diversification of agriculture production to improve incomes. The project implementation arrangement sought to strengthen the Central Project Implementation Unit of the Ministry of Agriculture where it was intended that all donor funded project will be managed to synergize and harmonise sector development efforts and optimise resource use.</p> <p>One weakness of the project design is that the interventions were not informed by a thorough value chain profiling analysis. Consequently, these interventions that could support some aspects of the production chain of selected</p>

commodities (e.g. fingerling and fish feed production) were not included in the project. Thus, there were sub-interventions that ended-up with limited successes because other important but weak parts of the value chain were not addressed in the project, e.g. marketing of broiler birds became a challenge to some farmer groups because of sole concentration of the project's activity on introducing broiler production activities. Another weakness in the project design was the budgeting amounts for some of the activities. Some of the activities including the costs for construction of feeder roads and other land development activities were generally higher than the budget rates and this necessitated a revision of the targets for some by as much as 50% during MTR.

### 3. Lessons learned related to relevance

Key issues <i>(max 5, add rows as needed)</i>	Lessons learned	Target audience
Need for Value Chain Profiling Studies to inform Agriculture Production related interventions	Without profiling the commodity value chains of interest in an intervention, there is the propensity to leave out some activities in project design that could minimise the impact of the intervention in the short run.	Executing Agency / Bank

## B Effectiveness

### 1. Progress towards the project's development objective (project purpose)

Comments
<p>The development objective of the Project was to reduce rural household poverty, food insecurity and malnutrition through increased agricultural production, productivity and commercialization. The specific objectives of the project were to: (i) Increase food and nutritional security and household incomes particularly for vulnerable households and; (ii) Stimulate inclusive growth of the Gambian economy through employment opportunities for the teeming active and youthful population. The Project had four components namely: (i) Improved Agriculture Infrastructure Development; (ii) Agricultural diversification and commercialization; (iii) Improved approaches to national food and nutrition security; and (iv) Project Management and Capacity Building.</p> <p><b>Component 1: Improved Agriculture Infrastructure Development</b></p> <p>This component had two subcomponents namely: (i) Development of infrastructure for land management; and (ii) Development of infrastructure for market access. Under <b>land management</b> the project sought to (i) strengthen the institutional capacity in the management of 3,000 ha that were supported in the earlier Participatory Integrated Watershed Management Project (PIWAMP); and (ii) Develop of 1,500 ha new lowland for cultivation activities. The lowlands were made up of: a) 100 ha of intensive rice irrigation schemes; b) creating tidal access to road (~10km length) and estimated 500ha of fertile land that were inaccessible due to inundated access routes during the rainy season; and c) reclaiming an estimated 900 ha of arable lands in 6 sites through the construction of water retention facilities (dikes and spillways). In addition, the Land Development sub component was to support soil and water conservation practices on an estimated 400 hectares of upland in five watersheds/sites. Furthermore, the component sought to support the development of comprehensive framework policy document for the sustainable management of Gambia agricultural water. All the rural infrastructures that would be supported have their technical designs with climate resilient features to enable them cope with the adverse effects of climate change. Under the <b>market access subcomponent</b>, the project targeted a. Improving farm to market access by upgrading of 100 km of the existing feeder roads and b. Improving infrastructure in 20 municipal markets in the project area.</p> <p><b>Component 2: Agricultural diversification and commercialization</b></p> <p>The subcomponents of the Agricultural diversification and commercialization component are a) Support to Aquaculture, Small ruminants and poultry; b) Promotion of improved horticultural practices; c) Promotion of Agro Enterprises; and d) Linking Producers to Markets. The project targeted establishing 30 aquaculture schemes each comprising of three or four ponds; 50 small ruminant schemes (20 for production and 30 for fattening); 25 intensive poultry production schemes (fifteen 1000 bird capacity schemes for FBOs and ten 500 birds capacity schemes for selected schools). The activities related to the establishment of the schemes included</p>

construction of the infrastructure and supply of the inputs for the first cycle of production. In addition, the project provided support for traditional/village poultry farming in 60 villages to include the construction of traditional houses and the provision of production equipment. The project targeted establishing/improving the production of horticultural crops (tomatoes, onions, green peppers, cabbages etc.) in 155 ha made up of 27 community and 60 schools gardens that are fenced, provided with a water system comprising a borehole for harvesting groundwater for storage in overhead reservoirs, distributed through a water reticulation system that brings for farmers to fetch and water crops. The project also provided for training of farmers in improved on-farm water management techniques and improved agronomic practices. For the promotion of agro enterprises the project targeted providing supporting the establishment and expansion of 120 agribusinesses using matching grants schemes and others. The project also aimed at supporting agribusinesses by establishment of platforms for value chain actors, organizing business fora between micro enterprises and agribusinesses and conducting regional promotional activities (trade fairs, field and market days). In addition, the Planning Services of MoA will be supported to strengthen the (market information systems) collect, analyze and disseminate accurate market information through the national media, rural community radios and other media sources for beneficiaries including the use of mobile phones.

**Component 3: Improved approaches to national food and nutrition security**

The targeted activities for the Improved approaches to national food and nutrition security component were: (i) Contributing funds to the on-going World Food Program supported Food for Education Program2 in LRR and WCR by targeting the feeding of 33,350 pre and primary school children in 101 schools; (ii) Providing ready-to-use therapeutic feeds for children with micro nutrients deficiencies; and (iii) Promoting of use of improved good food preparation practices in 65% of households in the targeted areas through community based nutrition education. In addition, the project sought to build community household resilience to food insecurity by caused by external shocks such as drought by rehabilitating five (5) existing cereal banks and constructing ten (10) new ones. The fifteen (15) cereal banks and the four (4) regional reserves will be replenished with emergency cereal stocks in the three project targeted regions.

**Component 4: Project Management and Capacity Building**

Under this component the project trained staff of the Central Projects Coordinating Unit staff trained in project coordination, M&E, financial management; and gender mainstreaming; and environmental monitoring; established a Project Support Unit; and undertake special consultancy services including meeting fiduciary and safeguards requirement.

**2. Outcome reporting**

Outcome indicators (as per RLF; add more rows as needed)		Baseline value (2013)	Most recent value (A)	End target (B) (expected value at project completion)	Progress towards target (% realized) (A/B)	Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 50 words per outcome)	Core Sector Indicator (Yes/No)
Improved land management to enhance agricultural production and productivity	Hectares developed under improved lowland rice production	926 Ha (LADEP)	1,420 Ha (New)	1,500 Ha (New)	96.3%	Hyper-salinity in some of the tidal access area affects the potential improved lowland production area developed. While the additional potential areas for rice production has been increased by 1445Ha (comprising of actual area under tidal irrigation schemes -100Ha; potential area opened by tidal access – 720Ha and potential area reclaimed through flood recession schemes 500Ha), it must be noted that production has not commenced on most of the area as at the close of the project due to late completion of the schemes. Areas cropped such as in Jailand demonstrated high productivity.	Yes

Outcome indicators (as per RLF; add more rows as needed)		Baseline value (2013)	Most recent value (A)	End target (B) (expected value at project completion)	Progress towards target (% realized) (A/B)	Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 50 words per outcome)	Core Sector Indicator (Yes/No)
	Hectares under upland soil & water conservation	800 Ha (PIWAMP)	349 Ha (New)	400 Ha additional area under upland conservation	87.3%	The contour bunds / diversions greatly helped to reduce run-off and erosion in the farmlands as well as preventing flooding in the beneficiary communities	Yes
Market led private sector environment to foster small holder commercialisation promoted	Increased number of smallholder agro processing and agro business enterprises	75 agro-processing business enterprises	122 new agro-enterprises	120 new agro-enterprises	101.6%	The matching grant support to 122 agro-enterprises of both crop and livestock value chain actors in mechanisation, agro-processing and production.	Yes
Improved food security and nutritional status and households	Improved nutritional levels of at-risk groups and households	Nutritional status: (wasting 9.5% under 5 years)	5.8% (2018)	5% of wasting of under 5 years	82.2%	The school feeding program coupled with the nutrition education in schools and vegetable gardens contributed to improving the nutritional status specifically wasting in under 5 years. Note that most recent value is dated 2018.	Yes
Rating* (see IPR methodology)		Narrative assessment					
3		<p>The progress towards the outcome indicators is rated satisfactory as the project achieved over 80% of the targets for most of the indicators: With respect to the expansion of cultivable area the project sought to expand potential lowland rice growing area; and conserve water and nutrients for arable lands in the upland. In pursuit of this, the project invested in putting on ground some permanent structures that will derive the targets set for these. These include the named land development infrastructure discussed in the outputs below. These permanent structures put in place were completed rather late in project implementation and the beneficiaries only commenced in expanding their cultivation areas in the last year of project implementation. It is expected that the utilised area will progressively expand until the entire potential area is reached with interest from subsequent projects such as the AfDB financed Rice Value Chain Transformation Project and the pipeline Gambia Food and Agriculture Sector Development Project (GAFSp). The matching grant schemes contributed substantially to the attainment of the increased number of smallholder agro-processing and agro businesses enterprises outcome indicator target. Out of USD1.5 Million that was budgeted as matching grant sum ~USD 1.15 Million was used to support 122 businesses (59 group-owned and 63 individual-owned) which have directly benefited 7,603 of which 4,328 (57%) are women.</p>					

### 3. Output reporting

Output indicators (as specified in the RLF; add more rows as needed)	Most recent value (A)	End target (B) (expected value at project completion)	Progress towards target (% realized) (A/B)	Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 50 words per output)	Core Sector Indicator (Yes/No)
Output 1: Water Management in existing tidal irrigation Schemes Improved	Water management within existing tidal schemes improved and facilitated the adoption of improved agronomic practices.	Rehabilitation of water control infrastructure for existing 3,000 ha of tidal irrigation schemes.	100	The areas identified included areas supported by previous project including (ROC: 1,800 ha; FMRIP: 1200 ha)	Yes
Output 2: Improved Tidal Irrigation	100 ha of tidal constructed in six sites	100 ha tidal irrigation scheme constructed.	100	Though this activity was completed it was completed late in project implementation	Yes

Output indicators (as specified in the RLF; add more rows as needed)	Most recent value (A)	End target (B) (expected value at project completion)	Progress towards target (% realized) (A/B)	Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 50 words per output)	Core Sector Indicator (Yes/No)
schemes developed and functional				and on 25Ha was cultivated during the project implementation period.	
Output 3: Access to choppable riverine tidal flood plains improved	8 km of tidal access constructed	10 km of tidal access road constructed	72	Portions of identified area (in Gisadi swamp) is susceptible to hyper-salinity resulting to a lower croppable area. Effective production is yet to commence in the potential sites due to late completion of works.	Yes
Output 4: Water retention schemes established and functional	Completed works include - 3.95 km of access road - 12.2 km of dike equipped - 14 spillways and - 7 culverts.	900 ha of tributary valleys (upper reaches of the floodplains) provided with appropriate water retention infrastructure (dikes, culverts and spillways)	122%	By the project design, it is expected that every kilometre of dykes (with associated water management structures) leads to 90ha of water retention schemes	Yes
Output 5: Upland Soil Improvement and Erosion control schemes established	400 ha of upland conservation schemes established with associated capacity building provided	340 ha completed including the associated capacity building provided;	85	Measures reduced run-off into the villages, enhance fertility restoration and improve land productivity as note in Sare Ngai.	Yes
	8 Ha community agro-forestry schemes established, and committees trained	9 ha of reforestation sites established (6 sites of 1.5ha each fenced and planted with trees) committees trained	112.5		Yes
Output 6: Inter-village access road rehabilitated	100 km rehabilitated /constructed	100 km of inter village feeder roads	100	The roads were in 13 lots stretches of 2km to 20.5km lengths. It linked 31 communities to the main trunk roads and directly benefits about 20,932 persons of whom 10,663 (about 50%) are female.	Yes
Output 7: Structures in markets (Community/ Regional/Livestock) constructed	Structures for 10 Markets constructed	Structures for 10 Markets including the women's market complex at Brusubi, KMC are constructed and functional	100	These market infrastructure in addition to serving the nation in general directly benefits approximately 94,766 persons of whom 50% (47,414 persons) are female. Estimates of Brikama Livestock Market indirect beneficiaries stands at 688,744 persons including 344,123 (50%) female. The structures are revenue generating avenues for the VDC.	Yes
Output 8: Aquaculture, small ruminants and poultry schemes established	30 schemes (100 fish ponds contracted) established and operational	30 schemes (100 fish ponds contracted) established and operationalised	100	Though the fish ponds were constructed, most of the beneficiaries are not able to produce fish scientifically due to the absence of a functional fish hatchery in the country. Most use fingerlings harvested from the wild and consequently are not able to obtain optimal yields.	Yes
	30 small ruminant fattening schemes established and operational	31 small ruminant fattening schemes established and operationalised	103	Beneficiary were provided with training and extension services, and initial stock for fattening and sale. Revenue realised from the initial sales is used to acquire new animals another cycle of fattening and sale.	Yes
	20 schemes completed and stocked with 2 Rams and 20 Ewes each.	20 small ruminant breeding schemes established and operational	100	Each scheme was stocked with two (2) Rams and 20 Ewes for production. All schemes have their stocks increasing and extension services	Yes
	15 Schemes established and operational	15 Commercial poultry schemes for schools established and operational	100	Each scheme was supported with the poultry house, facilities and feed, medicine for one cycle of production and initial stocks (day old chicks) and extension services	Yes

Output indicators (as specified in the RLF; add more rows as needed)	Most recent value (A)	End target (B) (expected value at project completion)	Progress towards target (% realized) (A/B)	Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 50 words per output)	Core Sector Indicator (Yes/No)
	10 Schemes established and operational	10 Commercial Poultry Schemes FBOs established and operational	100	Each scheme was supported with the poultry house, facilities and feed, medicine for one cycle of production and initial stocks (day old chicks) and extension services	Yes
Output 9: Improved horticultural management practices promoted	125 ha horticulture gardens established in 27 locations	125.5 ha under improved horticultural management practices	100	27 community gardens were supported with secured fence (to keep stray animals from the gardens, especially in the dry season), waiting shed and store, and watering facilities comprising of borehole, overhead reservoir, solar powered water lifting unit, reticulation system and ground reservoirs. All are completed and in active production.	Yes
	28 ha completed (56 School gardens i.e. half ha per school)	30 ha school gardens (60 schools)	93.33	All were completed. They constitute the first batch of gardens supported and learning from them were incorporated in the community gardens. The learning included the type of fencing materials and water system.	Yes
Output 10: Agro-enterprises promoted	126 Agro business enterprises established and supported	120 Agro business enterprises established and supported	102	The project supported 112 agro-enterprises and 14 Youth Agric Service Centres through the matching grant categorized as follows: (i) Horticulture Production 20#; Poultry production 33#; Small & Large Ruminants production 25#; Piggery production 2#; Veterinary Services provision 1#; Mechanisation Services 12#; Agro-processing 19 #; Youth Agric Service Centres 14#	Yes
Output 11: Producers linked to Markets	75 Beneficiaries participated in Trade fairs	100 Value chain actors' platform established agribusiness for trade fairs, market days organized.	75%	Participation in trade fares expose the value chain actor to potential customers and marketing strategies.	Yes
	1 Agricultural MIS equipped and operational	Planning Services Unit of DoA supported	100%	The support has enhanced the Planning Service Unit's capacity in the collection, collation and dissemination of market news – commodity prices and availability.	Yes
Output 12: Malnutrition addressed through enhanced access to SFP and provision of therapeutic food supplement	103 Schools	101 Schools accessing School Feeding Programs	103%	35,500 pre and school children access SFP thereby addressing malnutrition within the beneficiary community and enhance retention	Yes
	1,600 cartons of therapeutic food purchased	17 assorted antibiotics purchased in various quantities	100%	At the request of the Health Services, the support was changed from therapeutic foods to antibiotics because of need.	Yes
Output 13: Building household resilience in food and nutrition security promoted	10 community seed/Cereal established and operational	10 Community seed/Cereal banks established and functional	100%	Though the activity were completed, the designs of the structures were not informed thoroughly by the required uses, and in some places such as Bwiam structure is being used of other purposes.	Yes
	4 regional stock piling for emergency	4 regional stock piling established	100%	NACOFAG, the National Coordinating body for Farmers Association in the Gambia, was the main conduit for linking FASDEP and farmer-based organizations. It also manages cereal banks and buffer stocks on behalf of farming communities.	Yes
Output 14: Operational and Technical Capacity of CPCU strengthened	CPCU capacity in programmes/projects coordination and monitoring enhanced	CPCU staff trained (and retained) in project coordination, M&E, financial management and gender mainstreaming	100%	CPCU staff benefited from capacity building training at various levels both in country and overseas.	Yes



Output indicators (as specified in the RLF; add more rows as needed)	Most recent value (A)	End target (B) (expected value at project completion)	Progress towards target (% realized) (A/B)	Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 50 words per output)	Core Sector Indicator (Yes/No)
Output 15: FASDEP Project Support Unit established	FASDEP Project Support Unit (PSU) established and functional	Functional PSU established for the implementation of FASDEP	100%	Initial PSU was marred with instability thereby delaying effective project implementation due to interference by the political/executive leadership. This affected the implementation of project activities in the first years of the project. Stability was restored with the appointment of the third project director.	Yes
Output 16: Technical Assistance	TAs (FAO)	3 TAs received during project operational phase	100%	TA services by FAO also suffered some political interference, with the government being ambivalent about the activities of FAO during part of the project implementation period. and thereby couldn't derive all the full benefits of synergy with the project implementation activities.	Yes
Rating* (see IPR methodology)	Narrative assessment				
4	Output is rated highly satisfactory: The average of the progress towards end targets for the twenty five (25) output indicators is 99% with a mean of 100% and minimum 75%. However, this achievement is realised on a time overrun of 18 months. The project did not have adequate time and resources for some of the infrastructure developed to be used before project closure. This necessitates a purposive action by the government to ensure that if continue to support the beneficiaries to optimise the utilisation of the schemes through own resources, other projects and/or engendering private sector participation.				

#### 4. Development Objective (DO) rating

DO rating (derived from updated IPR) *	Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 250 words)
3	The attainment of the development objective of the project is rated satisfactory because most of the outcomes and output targets were achieved. One hundred and twenty-two (122) sustainable agro-business enterprises were established / strengthened. Also 103 schools received support for school feeding. Production and productivity improvement for various commodities was also improved or enhanced. It must be noted that at midterm, the project activities were rescoped to more realistic targets considering budgetary and time constraints. The success stories narrated by cross session of women group that benefited from the horticulture gardens and matching grants schemes especially that were met during the PCR mission corroborate this rating. Again, it must be noted that whereas most of the output level indicators were achieved the project could have enhanced the attainment of the outcome level indicators if the infrastructure development activities were completed on time to allow beneficiaries utilise the facilities within the project implementation period. The construction of the infrastructure were delayed because of (i) initial political /executive interference in project management leading to the dismissal of a project director; (ii) poor performance of engineering design and construction supervision consultant which lead to the termination of the contract; and (iii) poor performance on contractors. Noting this, in the forth year of the project, the Bank supported the project to review the technical designs and guide contractors through its supervision mission and ensure that the works were eventually completed.

#### 5. Beneficiaries (add rows as needed)

Actual (A)	Planned (B)	Progress towards target (% realized) (A/B)	% of women	Category (e.g. farmers, students)
193,954	240,000	80.8%	51%	Farmers, Students, Traders

#### 6. Unanticipated or additional outcomes (add rows as needed)

Description	Type (e.g. gender, climate change, social, other)	Positive or negative	Impact on project (High, Medium, Low)
Water facilities for the gardens being used for domestic water supply in several communities	Social, gender	Positive	High
Access (feeder) roads open communities to health centres, schools and other social services	Social, economic	Positive	Medium
Crop production schemes attracting wild life into community (monkeys in horticulture gardens and hippos in rice schemes)	Environmental	Negative	Low

## 7. Lessons learned related to effectiveness (add rows as needed)

Key issues (max 5, add rows as needed)	Lessons learned	Target audience
Political / executive leadership interference in project management	The attempts by the political / executive leadership to micro-manage the project activities which led to among others, the sacking of project directors and staff stifled the project implementation. Staff of Bank funded project should be insulated from political /executive leadership interferences.	Bank / Government
Weak capacity of government institutions to implement project activities	Most of the government institutions that were used by the project did not have the requisite expertise, logistics and budget to support the project. These included the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Livestock, Soil and Water Management Division, National Environmental Agency and Public Works Department. For future interventions there should be thorough capacity assessment of government institutions that may be identified as implementing partners and where necessary budgetary allocations should be made in building the capacities of these institutions. It must be noted that the project at appraisal did not include some of these institutions as implementing partners, but had to resort to them after attempts to use private firms proved futile.	Bank /Government
Weak M&E System and lack of visibility of project successes	Though the FASDEP project is widely observed as successful the project in various reports could not provide this outlook due to a weak M&E system. First, the initial proposal (at appraisal) to use a then on-going software being prepared for the Gambia National Agricultural Database (GANAD) did not materialize because the software had not been completed till date. The project was not adequately resourced at appraisal to deploy its own robust M&E system. The complexity of the project further magnified weak M&E system that was put in place by the project. This complexity stems from several factors. Firstly, the large number of technical solutions the project uses (productivity improvement, diversification, infrastructure development, access to finance, entrepreneurship development etc.) enhance income and engender food security using various value chains actors made up of producers, aggregators, processors and consumers (including school children) of rice, horticulture crops, small ruminants, poultry and fish. Secondly the project was situated in a country where the capacity of governmental institutions and local private sector was weak; propensity for political interference was high; and political climate discouraged external firms to work in the country. Thirdly the financiers (GAFSP), supervising entity (AfDB) and the country did not have a harmonised reporting format and had differing core objectives for the project. The M&E system deployed was not smart in isolating these elements and this incapacitated the project from churning out purposive cogent “human face stories” reports that could provide the needed visibility locally and internationally. For similar future projects it is recommended that M&E including impact assessment should be addressed more comprehensively.	Bank /Government

Engineering services and capacity of contractors	The project faced a lot of engineering challenges / weakness in the design and supervision of project activities. This contributed to the delays and reduced resource use efficiency as designs were sometimes not implementable (e.g. tidal irrigation scheme at Janjanburah had to eventually be changed to a pump irrigation scheme due to topographical issues that were not captured in the design). The engineering feasibility studies that informed the activity were inadequate and inaccurate in some instances. The project could not benefit fully from the TA component under the FAO exogenous reasons including political interference. The contractors also were inexperienced and lacked machinery suitable for some of the works. For future such project emphasis should be given to technical assistance to support civil works. The government may also consider an intervention to create a plant pool for local contractors to access machinery.	Government / Development Partners
--	---	-----------------------------------

## C Efficiency

### 1. Timeliness

Planned project duration – years (A) (as per PAR)	Actual implementation time – years (B) (from effectiveness for 1st disb.)	Ratio of planned and actual implementation time (A/B)	Rating*
5 years	6.75 years Sept 2013 – June 2020	0.74	2
<b>Narrative assessment</b> (indicative max length: 250 words)			
The project is rated unsatisfactory with respect to timeliness because the ratio of the planned relative to the actual implementation time is 0.74 and it falls with the range $<0.75$ and $\geq 0.5$ . The reasons for the additional implementation period include: (i) Initial political/executive interference which led to change in project director in the first year of implementation; and (ii) a considerable delay in the implementation of the infrastructure development activities because sub-optimal performance of engineering design and construction supervision consultant; and poor performance on land development contractors. After two years of project implementation, the project could only disburse 13% of project funds (9% in year 1 and 4% in year 2) as against an anticipated 40%. About 20% of the project resources were utilised in the project extension period.			

### 2. Resource use efficiency

Median % physical implementation of RLF outputs financed by all financiers (A) (see II.B.3)	Commitment rate (%) (B) (See table 1.C – Total commitment rate of all financiers)	Ratio of the median percentage physical implementation and commitment rate (A/B)	Rating*
100%	97.6%	100%	3
<b>Narrative assessment</b> (indicative max length: 250 words)			
The resource use efficiency is rated satisfactory as ratio of the median percentage physical implementation of the project outputs and commitment rate is between 0.75 and 1. This implies that the project largely delivered the outputs expected within the available budget. It must however be noted that the project targets were revised during the midterm review and the implementation period also needed to be extended to allow completion of some salient project activities. Without the extension of the implementation period, the project will have achieved only 67% of it target.			

### 3. Cost benefit analysis

Economic Rate of Return (at appraisal)	Updated Economic Rate of Return (at completion)	Rating*
FIRR of 28% and EIRR of 23%	FIRR of 23% and EIRR of 25.77%	3
<b>Narrative assessment</b> (indicative max length: 250 words)		
The cost benefit analysis performed indicates that at project closing the Financial Internal Rate of Return and the Economic Internal Rate of Return, respectively estimated at 23% and 26%, are satisfactory and of the same order of magnitude as those of project appraisal.		

At Project Appraisal the financial and economic analysis was based on the prevailing circumstances at the time supported by the following assumptions: a) The investment of the project would be undertaken over a five- year period; b) Incremental benefits accruing from the project is estimated over a 20- year period; c) The project's intervention would bring about double the cropped area for rice cultivation to 3900ha, and promote other major crops including groundnuts and high value horticultural crops (onions, chillies, cabbage carrots etc). Based on these underlying assumptions and the expected project benefits and costs, it was estimated that the Project's EIRR and FIRR would be 23% and 28% respectively with an estimated Net Present Value of USD10.805million.

These underlying assumptions remained largely valid during implementation except that the project experienced some implementation delays and had to go beyond the expected initial five-year implementation period by almost a year and a half resulting in significant amount of disbursement being made around the final years of the project. This could have potentially affected actual income expected to be generated as a result of project intervention. As mentioned in the project's results framework, FASDEP's overall objective has been; reduced poverty, food insecurity and malnutrition through enhanced household income from agricultural production, productivity and commercialization. Though the project may not have achieved all the key objectives, it has nonetheless been able to achieve a few critical indicators especially relating to Food Security Status which the Project targeted to reduce to 8% from its baseline of 11% in 2011. According to the 2016 Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Analysis (CFSVA), out of the 1.85 million people, about 148,458 persons are food insecure or vulnerable to food insecurity. This represents about approximately 8 percent of the total population and extension indicating that this critical objective of the Project was 100% achieved.

At Project Completion: Financial analysis at completion was based on set of sample information extracted and provided to the PCR team by the project management and on the assumptions and calculations done by the PCR team. Key underlying assumptions used in the calculation of the resulting EIRR and FIRR included: a) Project lifespan – the calculation was based on the 20 years with the assumption that net incremental revenue as a result of the project intervention will remain constant from 2023 to 2033; b) Discount rate – the 11% discount rate was used in discounting the respective cashflows associated with the project based on the average of 12% at the time of appraisal and 10% at project completion (CBG website as at August 2020); c) Exchange Rate – the revenue and costs provided by the Project in GMD were translated into USD at GMD50/US\$1, which indicates a slight adjustment on the official rate of GMD/US\$48.08 at project completion (CBG website September 2020); d) Induced Social Benefit – this was calculated based on 10% of the incremental revenue attributed to the project intervention and include social benefits such as savings in repair and maintenance costs of vehicles which could have been higher without the roads constructed by the project, increased marketability of produces as a result of the roads constructed by the project linking the production centers to the market and vice versa as well increase economic activity for transport drivers, manual laborer's and other non-direct players. This marginal percentage was taken for prudence purpose only but actual non-monetary benefits that could be attributed to the project as a result of its intervention activities is potentially far more than what has been considered by the PCR team during calculation of economic benefits.

Overall, in terms of its revenue generation, the project is expected to contribute immensely to the overall macro-economic activities. Estimated revenue by key intervention area over the ten-year period (2014 to 2023) is as provided below:

- Crop Production -USD29.524 million
- Horticulture - USD28.368 million
- Livestock - USD10.312 million
- Aquaculture - USD 0.687 million

The project is expected to generate a constant annual stream of revenue based on the 2023 figures and with the same estimated constant figure with regards to the operational costs, the annual net incremental revenue of the project is estimated at USD2,898m over the ten-year period covering 2024 to 2033 at project completion.

Apart from the direct farmer income that is expected to be accrued from the cultivation of each hectare of land, the project will significantly contribute to one of the national development priorities pertaining to self-sufficiency in food. At macro level this will reduce the country's overall food import bill on a number of foods crops and food stuff and in effect contribute to the improvement in the overall balance of payment deficit.

In respect of assessing the financial viability of the project, a Net Present Value (NPV) was carried out using the total disbursement over the project life (2013/2014 to 2019 including all funding sources) as initial capital investment compared to the net revenue expected to be generated from production activities. This analysis revealed an NPV of USD3.428m at 11% discount rate over the 20-year life of the project (2014 to 2033) compared to the NPV of USD10.805m as at appraisal. The project having the potential capacity of generating such a positive NPV excluding potential revenue from other indirect activities can be apparently considered to be viable and thus worthy of having been implemented.

#### 4. Implementation Progress (IP)

IP Rating (derived from updated IPR) *	Narrative comments (commenting specifically on those IP items that were rated Unsatisfactory or Highly Unsatisfactory, as per last IPR). (indicative max length: 500 words)
3	<p>The implementation progress as at November 2019 supervision was rated satisfactory. The Project was deemed to be highly satisfactory with respect to (i) Compliance with project covenants; (ii) Audit compliance; (iii) Disbursement; (iv) Budget commitments; and (v) Counterpart funding disbursements. For (i) Compliance with environmental and social safeguards; (ii) Procurement; (iii) Financial management; and (iv) Monitoring and evaluation the project could not be rated highly satisfactory. The project was rated these as satisfactory after previous ratings as unsatisfactory having observed some improvements. For the environmental and social safeguards the National Environmental Authority eventually produced a monitoring report. However, a private individual had to be used to further produce an environmental audit report. For financial management the project was doing okay until the demise of the financial controller. The project thence became inefficient at financial management documentation and managerial accounting guidance. This led to an over-commitment of funds which necessitated additional government contribution to re-rationalisation of some of the activities. As discussed, the project M&amp;E was unsatisfactory during most of the project implementation stages. It improved following the introduction of additional M&amp;E tools in the last years of project implementation.</p>

#### 5. Lessons learned related to efficiency

Key issues (max 5, add rows as needed)	Lessons learned	Target audience
1. Use of National Environmental Agencies for ESMP Supervision and Monitoring	<p>The NEA of the Gambia was inadequate in the supervision and monitoring of the Project ESMP. It is necessary to do proper capacity assessment of such agencies prior to engaging them for the supervision and monitoring of projects. The use of an independent consultant for the environmental audit in the last year of the project was more efficient. For such project, technical assistance to build the capacity of national institutions to monitor ESMP may be crucial.</p>	Executing Agency, Bank.

### D Sustainability

#### 1. Financial sustainability

Rating*	Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 250 words)
3	<p>The project is rated satisfactory with respect to financial sustainability. This is because most project beneficiaries that were weaned off support during the project implementation phase have survived and grown their ventures. The project intervened in the production of horticulture crops, rice, poultry, small ruminants and fish. In each of these, the project enhanced the installed capacity for production and provided initial inputs as seed capital for one cycle of production (apart from the schemes that were completed in the last year of the project). The enhanced capacity comprised of development of key infrastructure (such as tidal schemes and poultry houses) and auxiliary infrastructure (such as roads); as well as training on good agricultural practices. For some of the schemes the revenue derived from cycle of production were made available for subsequent ones. However, for the schemes such as the fish production, where the inputs were not available locally, most of the beneficiaries have not been able to reinvest as desired.</p> <p>The poultry and horticulture value chain enterprises were the most financially viable. The community vegetable gardens (Busumbala, Wassadun &amp; Kwinella) and the Busumbala and Gambia college poultry schemes have been operating on self-sustaining basis. The beneficiaries from the garden schemes have reported realizing increased output and income from the vegetables produced, ensuring year-round optimal production will be dependent on staggering of the planting time to lower peak water demand; more so for onions, a highly marketable crop.</p> <p>On average the Matching Grant has demonstrated evidence of financial support through an increased in the number of enterprise units that resulted in increased output for agricultural raw material, as well as locally processed goods from these raw materials. This has subsequently generated direct employment for beneficiaries and employees, majority of</p>

	whom are youths. Some of the production units, for example, Allatentu Farms of Berending, WCR employs 4 people on permanent basis with an aggregate monthly wage bill of GMD11,000 (~USD220.00). The company also makes approximately GMD170,000 (~USD3,400.00) net profit for every circle of layer production.
--	--

## 2. Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities

Rating*	Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 250 words)
3	At appraisal FASDEP identified several governmental and non-governmental agencies to work with. However, during the course of the project's implementation and specifically as a result of the sub-optimal performance of private design and supervision engineers, it became apparent that expertise from additional governmental agencies would be required to supplement existing capacities. Through support from FASDEP, these institutions have had their capacities strengthened and many have mainstreamed their activities that were undertaken for FASDEP. However, in most cases FASDEP support were either inadequate or the project period too short for the capacities to be sufficiently built to commensurate the task. For example, the absence of well qualified and experienced engineers at the SWMS could not have been addressed by FASDEP. The capacity building activities included provision of logistics and allowances, ICT and other equipment and training of relevant staff. The institutions included the following: (i) relevant Ministry of Agriculture Departments and Agencies (Department of Agriculture (DoA), MoA; Horticulture Technical Services, Dept. of Agriculture (HTS-DoA); Department of Livestock Services (DLS), MoA; Soil and Water Management Services of the Dept. of Agriculture (SWMS-DoA), MOA; National Agricultural Research Institute (NARI), MoA; National Road Authority (NRA); National Environment Agency (NEA) Produced Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP); (ii) Not for Profit Organisations/NGOs (National Coordinating Organisation for Farmers Association-The Gambia (NACOFAG); Gambia Chamber of Commerce and Industry (GCCl); and National Enterprise Development Initiative (NEDI).

## 3. Ownership and sustainability of partnerships

Rating*	Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 250 words)
3	Ownership and sustainability of partnerships is rated satisfactory: With respect to infrastructure, those in the category of public goods such as feeder roads were properly handed over to the National Roads Authority who selected, designed and supervised the construction of these roads. The market infrastructure were also handed over to the respective local level authorities. Others, such as small ruminant production and fattening centres, poultry houses and gardens were all handed over beneficiaries comprising of farmer-based organisations and individuals that were selected, organised and/or trained through project activities. The active involvement of NACOFAG ensured these. However, it was apparent during the PCR Mission that the tidal access schemes at Sankwia and Gissidi could not command the needed workforce and support to develop most of the fields that is now accessible for rice cultivation. The reasons for this include local conflicts issues, limited interest and capacity of indigenes. The mission recommended that the Regional and National Departments of Agriculture considers the land for lease to the emerging interest from foreign investors for in rice cultivation in the Gambia. It was also observed in the mission that vegetable garden schemes (Wassadu, Kwinella and Busumbala), the community poultry scheme at Busumbala, the cereal bank at Brikamaba and Bwiam, upland conservation at Sare Ngai and livestock market at Brikama have all shown high level of community involvement and to some extent ownership. The project also collaborated with the following UN Agencies: Food and Agriculture Organisation (UN-FAO) and World Food Programme (UN-WFP). In the absence of the financial support to these institutions they would not have been able to continue some project activities. These institutions are currently better placed to support other projects.

## 4. Environmental and social sustainability

Rating*	Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 250 words)
3	The environmental and social sustainability is rated satisfactory. Adequate safeguard measures to mitigate adverse potential impact on the environment and the beneficiary communities was provided in FASDEP's implementation strategy and no adverse environmental impact was observed during the field mission. The project has (i) promoted green technology, namely, tidal irrigation for rice production, solar powered water lifting devices in the vegetable schemes; and (ii) reduce land degradation and fertility restoration in upland conservation (diversion structures and tree planting). There also exist of recycling of nutrients through use of composting material from the small ruminant and poultry schemes and the use of by-products from the garden schemes as feed for small ruminants thus a symbiotic relationship. Other positive environmental benefits included the reduction in flooding in communities owing to the construction of flood recession /

	water conservation schemes and the reclaim of soils affected by saline water. However, the monitoring of the environmental and social management plan of the project was observed to have some inadequacies as for example, some of the borrow pits sited during the PCR mission were not properly reconstructed.
--	---

## 5. Lessons learned related to sustainability

Key issues (max 5, add rows as needed)	Lessons learned	Target audience
Non realisation of optimal value of commodities produced	Loose arrangements between buyers and farmers inhibited farmers from deriving the full benefits of their trade. The vegetable gardens, poultry schemes especially provide opportunity for production for organised markets and this was not honed during the project implementation.	Executing Agency

## III Performance of stakeholders

### 1. Bank performance

Rating*	Narrative assessment by the Borrower on the Bank's performance, as well as any other aspects of the project (both quantitative and qualitative). See guidance note on issues to cover. (indicative max length: 250 words)	
3	The Bank, through its supervision missions, provided necessary guidance in the implementation of project activities to ensure adherence to project design at appraisal and where necessary approve/recommend revision. This was demonstrated in the case of the consultancy for lowland development and upland conservation and use of chain-link and/or cement block for perimeter fencing of some vegetable schemes instead of barbed wire and fencing of the fish ponds which was not accounted for in the project design. Through the missions, the PSU was trained on the Bank's procurement and disbursement procedures. Disbursement performance in terms of the turnaround time between request for funds and actual disbursement of funds into the designated accounts by the respective funding sources could not be ascertained due to lack of reliable record on the request dates and disbursement dates. Despite the lack of records to assess the turnaround time for disbursement, stakeholder consultation and review of other project related documents including the Mid-Term Review (MTR) report revealed that the project had in some instances faced implementation challenges that emanated from delays with regards to direct payments as substantial amount of payments relating to small and/or medium size contracts were effected through direct payments. Timely response of the Bank to requests for direct payments could have enhance speed of project implementation and mitigate against potential delays associated with the direct payment method. Overall, the performance of the Bank was rated as satisfactory.	
Comments to be inserted by the Bank on its own performance (both quantitative and qualitative). See guidance note on issues to cover. (indicative max length: 250 words)		
The Bank agrees to the rating by the project. In addition to supervising the project, in the fourth to fifth year of project implementation, the Bank observing weaknesses in the engineering capacity to design and supervise of land development schemes ensured that the skill mix during supervision of the project included engineers who could provide assistance to the Soil and Water Services in reviewing designs and took particular interest in visiting related sites. During the same period, the Bank re-trained project staff on the theory of change of the project; and the results chain to engender better project activity planning and reporting during its supervision missions.		
Key issues (related to Bank performance, max 5, add rows as needed)	Lessons learned	
Effectiveness of supervision missions	The skill mix for supervision of projects should commensurate the project implementation challenges. The use of Bank staff with engineering background and consultants in the Bank supervision of the project ensured that design flaws in the tidal irrigation schemes were corrected.	

### 2. Borrower performance

Rating*	Narrative assessment on the Borrower performance to be inserted by the Bank (both quantitative and qualitative, depending on available information). See guidance note. (indicative max length: 250 words)	
---------	--	--

2	<p>At the level of the Grant Recipient (Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs), of the key obligation at implementation were (i) facilitating the opening of special account with the Central Bank (ii) facilitating access to relevant documents and information to the Bank; (iii) provision counterpart funds; and (iv) regular compilation and submission of progress reports in the Bank's appropriate format and establishment of the project steering committee (PSC). The PSC was to provide oversight function such as overall policy direction, review annual work plans and budgets, monitors progress and quality of project implementation and results on a bi-annual basis. However, the PSC guidance was superseded by executive/political interference resulting to successive turnover of one project directors and one acting project director. This had serious effect on project implementation as it delayed the commencement of key project implementation activities by about two years. The recipient's performance is deemed unsatisfactory. An audit undertaken by the Bank on the Gambia portfolio including the FASDEP Project in year 2019 identified weaknesses in the constitution and leadership of the PSC and recommended changes for future project. It was also observed that the borrower from time to time relied on the project resources and logistics for non-project related activities, for example commandeering project vehicles for non-project assignment. These were identified by the Bank and discouraged.</p> <p>At the executing agency level, however, the project was well supervised by the sector management. The sector management again ensured that the project challenges are well articulated to the Bank during either through writing or ducing missions timeously. They also got involved in the supervision of contractors and ensured that they deliver on their contracts. This positively affected the pace of project implementation activities duing especially during the extended period of the project. The executing agency's performance was observed as satisfactory.</p>
<b>Key issues</b> (related to Borrower performance, max 5, add rows as needed)	<b>Lessons learned</b>
Weak Project Steering Committee	Project Steering Committee should be constituted in such a way that political / executive interference could be controlled. Most importantly the chairman for the PSC should be other than the leader of the executing agency as recommended by the Bank audit on projects in the Gambia

### 3. Performance of other stakeholders

Rating*	Narrative assessment on the performance of other stakeholders, including co-financiers, contractors and service providers. See guidance note on issues to cover. (indicative max length: 250 words)	
2	<p>The other stakeholders are made up of (i) implementing partners comprising of mostly government ministries, department and agencies (MDA) that were contracted by the project to deliver certain services; non-governmental agencies; and third party (mostly Gambia based) services providers (consultants), contractors and suppliers that were competitively recruited for specific activities. The performance of these stakeholders was mixed. With respect to the MDA partners, the National Roads Authority was efficient in the design and construction supervision of the feeder roads but some others such as the Soil and Water Management Services of the Department of Agriculture were unsatisfactory in the design and construction supervision of the tidal irrigation schemes; tidal access roads and soil and water conservation schemes due to capacity challenges. It must be noted that at project appraisal, the project was designed to outsource the consultancy services for design and construction supervision all the infrastructure to private firms using ICB. It was realised during the procurement the financial proposal by firms were far beyond the budget. The project thus awarded the contract to a local consultancy firm who was more competitive with respect to price. However, the delivery was this firm was unsatisfactory and after 18 months the contract was terminated for poor performance. The government resorted to using the relevant government agencies to design and supervise the works.</p> <p>The civil works contractors' performance was generally unsatisfactory: Contractor for the community gardens and poultry structures were satisfactory but the contractors for the tidal irrigation schemes and tidal access roads were unsatisfactory as most contractors did not have the requisite equipment and human resources for working in flood plains. With respect the supplier of goods, some that needed quick responsive after sales support services (e.g. solar pump suppliers) posed challenges as the venders do not have workshops in the country. These were largely because the political climate in the country during the period of project investment were made it unattractive for private sector investment.</p>	
<b>Key issues</b> (related to performance of other stakeholders, max 5, add rows as needed)	<b>Lessons learned</b> (max 5)	<b>Target audience</b> (for lessons learned)
Absence of effective after sales services for some of the technologies deployed increase downtime and negatively affect profitability and sustainability	Established after-sales services should be used as a salient criteria from procurement of machinery and equipment in the Gambia to engender sustainability.	Bank / Borrower



## IV Summary of key lessons learned and recommendations

### 1. Key lessons learned

Key issues (max 5, add rows as needed)	Key lessons learned	Target audience
Political / executive leadership interference in project management	Staff of Bank funded project should be insulated from political /executive leadership interferences.	Bank / Government
Engineering services and capacity of contractors	For future such project emphasis should be given to technical assistance to support civil works.	Government / Development Partners
	The government may purposefully build the capacity of local contractors as a development objective through policies that will encourage joint venture with experienced and well resourced foreign contractors and create a plant pool for local contractors for machinery /equipment hire.	
Need for Value Chain Profiling Studies to inform Agriculture Production related interventions	For agriculture intervention projects, there should be a thorough value chain profiling study for the commodities of interest to ensure that all the weaknesses in the value chain are addressed holistically.	Executing Agency / Bank
Under-reporting of project achievements	Project M&E should be robust and well harmonised to capture information of interest to differing stakeholder with keen interest in creating visibility.	Executing Agency/ Bank/GAFSP
Using weak government institutions	A thorough capacity assessment ought to be done before any government institution is assigned project implementation responsibilities. Where needed TA should be provided through the projects to build the capacity of the institutions	Bank / Executing Agency

### 2. Key recommendations (with particular emphasis on ensuring sustainability of project benefits)

Key issue (max 10, add rows as needed)	Key recommendation	Responsible	Deadline
1. Utilisation on tidal irrigation and tidal access schemes	The executing agency should consciously factor the production capacity that has been put in place by the project for especially rice and horticulture in future project activities as most of these are yet to be optimally utilised due to time and resources constraints experienced by FASDEP	Executing Agency	Continuous

## V Overall PCR rating

Dimensions and criteria	Rating*
<b>DIMENSION A: RELEVANCE</b>	<b>3</b>
Relevance of project development objective (II.A.1)	3
Relevance of project design (II.A.2)	3
<b>DIMENSION B: EFFECTIVENESS</b>	<b>3</b>
Development Objective (DO) (II.B.4)	3
<b>DIMENSION C: EFFICIENCY</b>	<b>2.75</b>
Timeliness (II.C.1)	2
Resource use efficiency (II.C.2)	3
Cost-benefit analysis (II.C.3)	3
Implementation Progress (IP) (II.C.4)	3

<b>DIMENSION D: SUSTAINABILITY</b>	<b>3</b>
Financial sustainability (II.D.1)	3
Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities (II.D.2)	3
Ownership and sustainability of partnerships (II.D.3)	3
Environmental and social sustainability (II.D.4)	3
<b>AVERAGE OF THE DIMENSION RATINGS</b>	<b>2.93</b>
<b>OVERALL PROJECT COMPLETION RATING</b>	<b>S</b>

## VI Acronyms and abbreviations

Acronym	Full name
AfDB	African Development Bank
AWPB	Annual Work Plan and Budget
CPCU	Central Project Coordination Unit
CRR	Central River Region
DDG	Deputy Director General
EIRR	Economic Internal Rate of Returns
ESMP	Environmental and Social Management Plan
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FASDEP	Food and Agriculture Sector Development Project
FIRR	Financial Internal Rate of Returns
FMRIP	Farmer Managed Rice Irrigation Project
FGD	Focus Group Discussions
GAFSP	Global Agriculture and Food Security Program
GAIMS	Gambia Agricultural Information Management System
GCCI	Gambia Chamber of Commerce and Industry
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GHE	Gambia Horticultural Enterprise
GMD	Gambia Dalasi
IP	Implementing Partners
IPR	Implementation Progress Report
LRR	Lower River Region
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MGF	Matching Grant Facility
MoA	Ministry of Agriculture
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NACOFAG	National Coordinating body for Farmers Association in the Gambia
NDP	National Development Plan
NEDI	National Enterprise Development Initiative
NEMA	National Environment Management Act
NPC	National Project Coordinator
NPV	Net Present Value
PETT	Performance Tracking Tool

PSC	Project Steering Committee
PSU	Project Support Unit
ROC	Republic of China (Rice Project)
SFP	School Feeding Program
TA	Technical Assistance
USD	United States Dollars
WCR	West Coast Region

**Required attachment:** Updated Implementation Progress and Results Report (IPR)– the date should be the same as the PCR mission.