



<b>1. Project Data:</b>		<b>Date Posted :</b> 08/08/2002	
<b>PROJ ID:</b> P010503		<b>Appraisal</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>Project Name:</b> Agric Human Res Devt	<b>Project Costs (US\$M)</b>	74.2	65.1
<b>Country:</b> India	<b>Loan/Credit (US\$M)</b>	59.5	53.7
<b>Sector(s):</b> Board: RDV - Tertiary education (75%), Agricultural extension and research (25%)	<b>Cofinancing (US\$M)</b>	0	0
<b>L/C Number:</b> C2699			
	<b>Board Approval (FY)</b>		95
<b>Partners involved :</b>	<b>Closing Date</b>	12/31/2000	12/31/2001
<b>Prepared by :</b>	<b>Reviewed by :</b>	<b>Group Manager :</b>	<b>Group:</b>
Anthony J. Blackwood	Nalini B. Kumar	Alain A. Barbu	OEDST
<b>2. Project Objectives and Components</b>			
<b>a. Objectives</b>			
The project had two primary objectives:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve the quality and relevance (to modernization and productivity growth of agriculture) of higher education and in-service training programs, and</li> <li>Strengthen the capacity of the participating states (Andhra Pradesh, Haryana and Tamil Nadu) to develop and manage human resources for agriculture.</li> </ul>			
(These are qualitative open-ended objectives of an unobjectionable character such that evaluating achievements is challenging.)			
<b>b. Components</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Strengthening of the Indian Council for Agricultural Research (ICAR)</i> (US\$10.1 million): enhance the central apparatus to establish nationwide norms, monitor compliance and prepare projects. The project would finance specialist services, information systems, incremental staff, staff training, computing facilities, new office accommodation, office equipment and related studies for ICAR(ED), and selective support for non-participating State Agricultural Universities (SAUs) and ICAR-deemed universities; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>University Programs</i> (US\$41.8 million): at each of four participating SAUs, foster policy and institutional changes focusing on student education, better teaching skills and efficient management. The project would finance equipment and facilities, staff training, fellowships, related travel and subsistence, student welfare, and develop student placements with agroindustries;</li> <li><i>In-Service Human Resource Development and Management</i> (US\$17.6 million): the project would: (i) improve the effectiveness of state agricultural employees by increasing the capacity for HRD, (ii) enhance training quality, and (iii) establish a human resources management (HRM) approach for supervision of extension staff. The project would also foster training of trainers from in-service institutes, field-testing of new courses, selective establishment/renovation of training centers, staff study visits and seminar participation; and</li> <li><i>Manpower Needs Assessment</i> (US\$0.3 million): in the three project states establish Manpower Advisory Councils (MACs) to sponsor studies on agricultural labor market requirements and trends on which to base directives, budgeting and curriculum reform. The project would foster systematic data collection, analysis and discussion of labor market issues, and fund specialist services and secretariat expenses for operating MACs.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			
<b>c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates</b>			
After a variety of delays and a one year extension of the closing date, 90 per cent of the IDA funds were disbursed mostly as planned, except that the ICAR component had a shortfall of over 40 per cent.			
<b>3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:</b>			
According to the ICR the project achieved its main objectives satisfactorily by improving management and performance at the central, state and university levels: (i) improved quality and relevance of higher agricultural education was achieved by accreditation, demand-driven curricular reform and updating, and investment in staff training, materials and infrastructure; (ii) the quality and relevance of in-service training has improved by needs-based training, stakeholder involvement, and			

modernization of training facilities; (iii) the capacity of the participating states to develop and manage human resources for agriculture was enhanced by adding new skills, and increased institutional capacity and infrastructure. However these results are subject to the comments on the objectives statement, the ICR's reservations on indicators as below, and the reservations on physical aspects in sections 5 and 9 below.

**4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts:**

Almost anything would improve the situation where, as the ICR puts it, "the development landscape is characterized by a large number of poorly performing public institutions, with massive sunk investments." Five points are notable in the ICR: (i) establishment of an Accreditation Board and Monitoring Cell at ICAR; (ii) 32 of 35 colleges at state agricultural colleges have been accredited, and new courses to promote entrepreneurial skills and address growth areas have been introduced; (iii) ICAR has started to extend the accreditation system to non-project training institutions, a project impact bonus; (iv) independent impact studies suggest that improved management at universities and colleges is helping to improve relevance and quality; and (v) improved in-service training is being reflected in indicators of extension performance.

**5. Significant Shortcomings (including non-compliance with safeguard policies):**

(i) Project design was over-optimistic on the readiness and capacity of implementing agencies (the Bank was remiss here and also in that consequent early delays were inadequately pursued by the Bank during supervision). (Put another way, there was no scheduling allowance for appropriate "mobilization and start-up", an habitual flaw in project designs.)  
(ii) Specific and measurable output indicators, linked to project development objectives, were neither specified in the SAR nor developed during supervision. This made evaluation of outcomes against objectives somewhat subjective. The ICR reports divergence of views between students and staff on the benefits of project activities.  
(iii) The Manpower Needs Assessment component was unsatisfactory. The national assessment was completed late in 2001 and the results have not been used as intended to optimize the use of scarce public resources for agricultural HR development.  
(iv) There were delays on many activities (releases of funds, staffing, procurement, organization of training and studies, by agencies in seeking routine approvals, audit reports, and in implementation of agreed actions) which eventually led to extension of the credit by a year.  
(v) "Weaknesses" highlighted by the ICR included accounting deficiencies, poor management (libraries, computer centers and student facilities), weak links of faculty and students with industry, and that despite the use of more instructional aids the quality of teaching (substance and style) changed little.  
(vi) Very little known about the predominant expenditure on civil works and goods, 77 per cent of costs, except that the ICR noted that there was over-investment in civil works.  
(No information in the ICR on compliance with safeguard policies.)

6. Ratings:	ICR	OED Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
<b>Outcome :</b>	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
<b>Institutional Dev .:</b>	Substantial	Substantial	
<b>Sustainability :</b>	Likely	Likely	
<b>Bank Performance :</b>	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
<b>Borrower Perf .:</b>	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
<b>Quality of ICR :</b>		Unsatisfactory	

**NOTE:** ICR rating values flagged with '\*' don't comply with OP/BP 13.55, but are listed for completeness.

**7. Lessons of Broad Applicability:**

(i) Open ended objectives should be avoided in project designs as they weaken accountability and evaluation of outcomes.  
(ii) If open ended objectives are unavoidable, the project design should include a structured set of quantitative indicators tied to the objectives, for each component, and an M&E program which includes independent qualitative assessments of major outputs during implementation and on completion.

**8. Assessment Recommended?  Yes  No**

**Why?** The omission in the ICR of discussion of physical aspects of the project needs following up . Other education/training projects have experienced major difficulties in that area, including in the sub -continent.

**9. Comments on Quality of ICR:**

Rated unsatisfactory, despite being well written, detailed and comprehensive in many respects, because there is almost nothing on the civil works and goods financed by the project (even the indicators almost totally ignore tracking performance on this three quarters of the project), costs lack clarity, and information on safeguard policies is absent. Also little information on some 1,400 instances of staff overseas tours and training, more than twice the target.