



1. Project Data :	
OEDID:	L3034
Project ID:	P002091
Project Name:	Imo Health and Population
Country:	Nigeria
Sector:	Basic Health
L/C Number:	L3034
Partners involved :	
Prepared by:	Timothy A. Johnston, OEDST
Reviewed by:	L. Landau
Group Manager:	Roger H. Slade
Date Posted:	03/31/1998

2. Project Objectives, Financing, Costs and Components :	
Objectives :	
1. Imo State: a) strengthen State capacity; b) improve HNP services.	
2. Federal MOH: a) support HNP policy development; b) strengthen capacity	
Revised objectives : deliver a minimum basic service package in Imo and Abia States through : a) PHC training; b) essential drugs; and c) upgrading health facilities.	
Project cost : IBRD loan of \$27.6 million; \$11.7 million cancelled.	

3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives :	
The project met few of the original State-level objectives, and none of the national objectives . The Objectives were substantially reduced after a mid-term review in 1994. Of the reduced revised objectives, the project met some of its output targets by closing, but the impact on services is still uncertain . The project renovated 119 clinics and 36 local government drug stores; trained 838 village health workers and traditional birth attendants; established essential drug programs in both states; set up drug revolving funds at state and facility level; and provided equipment and drugs to some local facilities . The minimum basic package of health services was introduced to 12 local government areas in Imo and Abia, although implementation varies considerably . The project did help bring together community representations and providers to assess health problems and plan strategies .	

4. Significant Achievements :	
The project achieved modest success in meeting the reduced objectives, including introducing the minimum basic health care package (MBHP) to some local governments. The training, facilities, and equipment provided may continue to be useful, although the impact on services is uncertain given the weak economic and institutional context. Stronger government commitment and project management in Abia State contributed to progress in implementing the MBHP.	

5. Significant Shortcomings :	
The project met none of the national objectives, and few of the original State objectives . Despite some achievements in Abia State after the mid-term review, the impact is uncertain and sustainability unlikely . Project design was overly complex, and did not consider the weak institutional environment . The national government met less than 3 % of its counterpart funding obligations . No project indicators were specified during design .	

6. Ratings :	ICR	OED Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
Outcome :	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Institutional Dev .:	Negligible	Negligible	
Sustainability :	Uncertain	Unlikely	Despite recent progress in Abia State, the

			commitment to the project depends on a few individuals, and the overall economic and institutional environment remains negative.
Bank Performance :	Deficient	Unsatisfactory	.
Borrower Perf .:	Deficient	Unsatisfactory	.
Quality of ICR :		Satisfactory	

7. Lessons of Broad Applicability :

- Project design should be more adaptable
- Projects in weak administrative environments should minimize components
- Project Coordinated Units established separately from the Ministry can undermine ownership
- Community involvement is important for successful PHC
- Mid-term reviews, and restructuring if necessary, can be beneficial and should be conducted earlier in the project
- turnover of Bank task managers undermined supervision effectiveness
- Procurement agents do not solve all procurement problems

8. Audit Recommended? Yes No

9. Comments on Quality of ICR :

The ICR provides a candid review of project experience . Although monitoring indicators were collected only in the project's final years, these should have been summarized in the ICR . The full text of the Borrower's comments should have been included, rather than a summary . The ICR might also have addressed :

1. Why did the Bank allow the project to languish five years?
2. To what extent did corruption influence project implementation, and were the Borrower's complaints regarding ICB justified?