

## TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPLETION REPORT

Division: CWSS

TA No., Country and Name		Amount Approved:	\$500,000
TA4478-AZE: Preparing the Social Infrastructure for Internally Displaced Persons and Vulnerable Population		Revised Amount:	\$840,000
Executing Agency: State Commission for Refugees and Internally Displaced People	Source of Funding: JSF	Amount Undisbursed: \$67,163	Amount Utilized: \$772,837
TA Approval Dates: 14 Dec 2004 (\$500,000) 18 Nov 2005 (\$340,000)	TA Signing Date: 27 Jan 2005	Fielding of First Consultant: 6 Apr 2005	TA Completion Date Original: 30 Jun 2005      Actual: 30 Jun 2007  Account Closing Date Original: 30 Jun 2005      Actual: 30 Nov 2007
<p><b>Description:</b></p> <p>The TA aimed to improve access to basic social infrastructure for vulnerable segments of the population, including internally displaced persons (IDPs) while simultaneously building the capacity of local government and community groups to identify priorities, plan strategically, and strengthen service quality and coverage. The Project included (i) subproject investments in new, rehabilitated or upgraded housing and/or municipal infrastructure (e.g., public schools, water supply and sanitation) for IDPs; (ii) support for local initiatives to improve social infrastructure services, using a community-driven development approach; (iii) capacity building for municipalities, local executive committees, community groups and other partners; and (iv) support for project management.</p> <p><b>Expected Impact, Outcome and Outputs:</b></p> <p>The TA's long-term development objective was to improve living standards for IDPs and other vulnerable groups in urban areas. The TA's immediate development objectives were (i) increased access to affordable social infrastructure services for IDPs and other vulnerable groups in selected towns, and (ii) strengthened capacity of government and community groups to identify priority infrastructure needs and provide services to vulnerable groups in selected towns. The outputs of the TA were (i) completed assessment of the needs of vulnerable groups and capacity building and infrastructure priorities in selected towns, and (ii) preparation of a project suitable for ADB financing, with detailed design of project management and capacity building components, feasibility studies for immediate investments in housing and/or social infrastructure for IDPs, and a program to support social infrastructure for municipal development.</p> <p><b>Delivery of Inputs and Conduct of Activities</b></p> <p>The key inputs of the TA were consulting services (16 international and 40 local person-months). The Government provided counterpart staff with appropriate skills and expertise. The TA activities focused on (i) selection of three towns, (ii) review of the Government's assistance for IDPs, (iii) socioeconomic and poverty profile, (iv) review of policy and institutional framework for infrastructure services, and (v) assessment of the capacity building needs. The project preparation activities were also carried-out: (i) subproject investments in housing and/or municipal infrastructure for IDPs, (ii) program to support local initiatives to improve social infrastructure services, (iii) program of capacity building for municipalities, local executive committees, community groups and other project partners, and (iv) support for project management. The performance of the consultants was marginal. They were not able to complete the remaining work until the original deadline.</p> <p><b>Evaluation of Outputs and Achievement of Outcome</b></p> <p>The original TA scope included the preparation of a loan project to improve access to basic social infrastructure for vulnerable segments of the population, including IDPs, while simultaneously building the capacity of local governments and community groups to identify priorities, plan strategically, and strengthen service quality and coverage. During the implementation, it became necessary to increase the size and coverage of the proposed loan project; and change in the scope, and increase in the TA budget was carried out on 18 November 2005, following agreement with the Government in April 2005. TA budget was increased from \$625,000 to \$1,055,000; ADB's contribution from JSF increased from \$500,000 to \$840,000.</p> <p>The TA resulted in a draft final report that set out a proposed loan project with four components (i) establishment of housing for IDPs in three towns (Barda, Mingachevir and Sumgayit); (ii) improvement of basic infrastructure services in up to eight</p>			

towns; (iii) establishment of a Local Investment Fund to support local community initiatives to address a range of local needs including community centers, rehabilitation of public buildings, and improved public spaces; and (iv) capacity building for local governance. The project design had been carefully undertaken and took into account the results of extensive field work, detailed feasibility work, consultants with community residents, local official and central Government.

However, the project did not materialize due to a lack of interest from the central Government which decided to allocate significant budget resources for IDP housing and services, possibly addressing some areas that the Project was to cover. At that time, the central Government also chose not to pursue other projects that were being prepared by a range of development partners, in part, because the Government may have perceived donor procedures cumbersome or unnecessarily laden with policy or safeguard requirements. Nonetheless, the Government was provided with detailed report describing the proposed project which came out of the project preparatory technical assistance (PPTA). However, there was no evidence that the Government has complied with the safeguard requirements proposed in the report.

The long term development objective of the TA could be achieved through other projects, but not the ensuing loan project. Similarly, the intermediate development objective could be achieved through other projects, but not the ensuing loan project. The outputs of the TA were achieved. These included: (i) completed assessment of the needs of vulnerable groups and capacity building and infrastructure priorities in selected towns; (ii) preparation of a project suitable for ADB financing, with detailed design of project management and capacity building components; (iii) feasibility studies for immediate investments in housing and/or social infrastructure for IDPs; and (iv) a program to support social infrastructure for municipal development

### **Overall Assessment and Rating**

Although the outputs of the TA were achieved, the TA, however, failed to result in a loan project. Thus, TA rating is partly successful.

### **Major Lessons**

Although the project design had been carefully undertaken and considering the results of extensive field work, detailed feasibility work, consultants with community residents, local official and central government, it is imperative that a project preparatory technical assistance (PPTA) should be processed only when there is evident government commitment to pursue the resulting project.

### **Recommendations and Follow-Up Actions**

No specific follow-up action is recommended. If IDP housing arises as a priority in future discussions of ADB's AZE program, careful consideration should be given to Government commitment to safeguards and other aspects of due diligence, and to linkages with urban development, governance and improved infrastructure services. Investments in urban planning and infrastructure would likely benefit from preparatory work completed under the TA.