



1. Project Data :	
OEDID:	C1910
Project ID:	P002335
Project Name :	Development Management Project
Country:	Senegal
Sector:	Public Sector Management Adjustment
L/C Number:	C1910
Partners involved :	CIDA
Prepared by :	Josette L. Murphy, OEDCR
Reviewed by :	Luis Landau
Group Manager :	Rene I. Vandendries
Date Posted :	02/24/1998

2. Project Objectives, Financing, Costs and Components :
Goal: to strengthen the GOS' institutional capacity related to planning and execution of policy reforms .
Project Dates and Cost : Project approved in May 1988, closed June 1997 after 3 yearly extensions; total cost US\$24.7 million (IDA credit US\$17 million, CIDA cofinancing: US\$2 million, GOS: 5.7 million); cancellations IDA credit: US\$700,000, CIDA co-financing US\$326,000.
Objectives and components : The objective was to help GOS strengthen the capacity of its agencies involved in the structural adjustment program. Project components focussed on i) improving the national planning system, ii) improving economic and financial management, iii) implementing some civil service reforms (more accurate records on staff and payroll), and iv) setting up a system of periodic surveys to provide better data on social dimensions of adjustments and on poverty, as part of the Social Dimensions of Adjustment program (SDA).

3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives :
The project had no impact on implementation of structural adjustment reforms, and the institutional development achievements were negligible. While some 450 staff received training, training activities were not planned in a strategic way and their usefulness is unclear. There is no evidence that technical assistance related to the SDA component made a difference. A SDA priority survey was completed, analyzed and used in Bank publications; data for the SDA integrated survey were collected after much delays but never analyzed; some studies were done but little used. The ICR rates overall achievements under the SDA component as negligible .

4. Significant Achievements :
none

5. Significant Shortcomings :
Shortcomings in design and supervision: i) project overly complex and ambitious, not supported by Borrower commitment; ii) 6 task managers over 8.5 years and 11 supervisions, with significant differences in understanding of project objectives, and iii) supervision ratings on development objectives and institutional development remained high in spite of serious problems.
Bank management: i) ignored warnings from staff during review that GOS was not committed; ii) did not react to continuing good ratings on development objectives and institutional performance when it was obvious that progress was slow and limited, but iii) allowed periodic narrowing down of objectives, and yet extended implementation three times.

6. Ratings :	ICR	OED Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
Outcome:	Highly Unsatisfactory	Highly Unsatisfactory	
Institutional Dev .:	Negligible	Negligible	
Sustainability :	Unlikely	Unlikely	
Bank Performance :	Deficient	Highly Unsatisfactory	ICR and OED have different scales. ICR

Borrower Perf .:	Deficient	Highly Unsatisfactory	author and her manager indicated that they would have used Highly Unsatisfactory for both Bank and Borrower performance if that rating had been available to them.
Quality of ICR :		Satisfactory	

7. Lessons of Broad Applicability :

i) Borrower ownership and commitment is essential for project success; solutions to sensitive problems (such as lack of motivation in civil service) must be developed through open debate and earn wide support before they can be implemented successfully.

ii) the Bank must adjust its actions to the realities of the country, and be ready to close a project when it becomes obvious that achievements will remain minimal.

8. Audit Recommended? Yes No

Why? If an evaluation of the Social Dimensions of Adjustment program is undertaken, in cooperation with the other agencies involved, this project should be included together with other projects with SDA components .

9. Comments on Quality of ICR :

Candid, thoughtful and clear review of the serious faults in design and supervision . The Borrower and co-financiers did not respond to Bank requests for comments .