

Country Name	The Project for Developing Inclusive City Governance for City Corporation
People's Republic of Bangladesh	

I. Project Outline

Background	<p>In Bangladesh, the rapid urbanization was progressing and at the year of 2006, 24.6% (34.6 million) of the total population lived in the urban area. Due to the lack of institutional capacity of local government and their financial resources, the urban planning was not well exercised. As a result, many cities in Bangladesh were burdened with insufficient infrastructure, immature institutional system and poverty of citizens, etc. Furthermore, the country confronted with other issues such as non-availability of proper urban planning, functional overlap among the central government, local government and related institutions and a lack of strategic leadership.</p> <p>The Government of Bangladesh (GOB) pledged to promote the decentralization in the Fifth Five-Year Plan (1997-2002) but failed to fulfill it. In the Sixth Five-Year Plan (2011-2015), GOB supported the decentralization as well as the needs for planned urbanization and public services. However, it was required to have the better mechanism and to make much effort in order to materialize the pledge.</p>								
Objectives of the Project	<p>By creating Infrastructure Development Plan for City Corporation (IDPCC), Inclusive City Government Improvement Action Program (ICGIAP) and Administrative Reform Plan (ARP) to targeted City Corporations (CCs), this project aimed to establish a framework for the improvement of Urban Governance and Infrastructure Development, thereby enhancing economic growth potential and improving the Quality of Life (QoL).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Expected Goals through the proposed plan¹: To enhance economic growth potential and improve quality of life in the targeted cities Expected utilization of the proposed plan: Framework for the improvement of urban governance and infrastructure development in order to achieve the concept of Inclusive City Government established by the project has been utilized. 								
Activities of the Project	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Project Site: Narayanganj City Corporation (NCC), Comilla City Corporation (CoCC), Rangpur City Corporation (RCC), Gazipur City Corporation (GCC) and Chittagong City Corporation (ChCC)* Note: ChCC was officially added by the decision made at the 2nd Project Steering Committee Meeting held in April 2013 as it was considered as one of the most important CCs in the country in terms of trade. And ChCC's economic relation and opportunity with foreign investors were significant. Main Activities: 1) To make IDPCC of the targeted CCs, 2) To make ARP of the targeted CCs., 3) To develop ICGIAP, 4) To compile the practical experiences on development planning for CCs Inputs (to carry out above activities) <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Japanese Side</td> <td>Bangladesh Side</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1) Mission members: 16 persons (65.16MM for Japanese experts, 23.46MM for local consultant)</td> <td>1) Staff Allocated: 2 persons 2) Land and facilities: Office space</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2) Trainees Received: 18 persons</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3) Equipment: needed to conduct research</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> 	Japanese Side	Bangladesh Side	1) Mission members: 16 persons (65.16MM for Japanese experts, 23.46MM for local consultant)	1) Staff Allocated: 2 persons 2) Land and facilities: Office space	2) Trainees Received: 18 persons		3) Equipment: needed to conduct research	
Japanese Side	Bangladesh Side								
1) Mission members: 16 persons (65.16MM for Japanese experts, 23.46MM for local consultant)	1) Staff Allocated: 2 persons 2) Land and facilities: Office space								
2) Trainees Received: 18 persons									
3) Equipment: needed to conduct research									
Project Period	November 2012 to February 2014	Project Cost	(ex-ante) 250 million yen, (actual) 279 million yen						
Implementing Agency	Responsible supervisory agency: Local Government Department (LGD), Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Cooperatives Implementing agency: Local Government Engineering Department (LGED), Ministry of Local government, Rural Development and Cooperatives								
Cooperation Agency in Japan	PADECO Co., Ltd.,								

II. Result of the Evaluation

< Special Perspectives Considered in the Ex-Post Evaluation >

• [Issues to be clarified for Effectiveness/Impact]:

- In the first indicator, “the infrastructure projects have been implemented based on IDPCC.” of “Utilization Status of the proposed plan after project completion”, followings describe the progress expected by 2017 in each batch of sub-projects respectively.
- Among the proposed 72 sub-projects, those whose estimated costs are relatively small are to be implemented as Batch 1 of JICA's yen loan project, “Inclusive City Governance Project (2014-2020)” (ICGP), while relatively large scale of sub-projects which are also one of the components of ICGP are to be implemented as Batch 2.
- Batch 2 sub-projects are to be implemented only after the 1st performance review of ICGIAP in June 2016, where 13 trigger activities, out of total 42 activities, are required to be fulfilled as the condition to proceed with Batch 2 implementation.
- All five City Corporations have been qualified to proceed with Batch 2 sub-project implementation after the 1st performance review of ICGIP in June, 2016, and most of the Batch 2 sub-projects are in progress at the time of ex-post evaluation. Thus, not only Batch 1, but also most of Batch 2 sub-projects are subject to the ex-post evaluation.
- There is no reference of ChCC made in the indicator 2 and 3 of “Utilization Status of the proposed plan after project completion”, due to its later inclusion to the project as of June, 2013. However, this ex-post evaluation examines the performance of ChCC for those indicators as well as it is

¹ The degree of achievement of expected goals is not to be assessed in principle at the time of ex-post evaluation, since it is defined as the medium-to-long-term goals which will be attained as a result of crystallizing the proposed plan (“output” of the project).

considered that there has been certain period of time for ChCC to generate the outcome.

- [Issue to be clarified for Efficiency]: ChCC was included as one of the target CCs seven months later than other CCs. Such delay could affect the efficiency of the project, thus the judgment of efficiency is to be made considering effects caused by the delayed inclusion of ChCC.

1 Relevance

<Consistency with the Development Policy of Bangladesh at the Time of Ex-Ante Evaluation and Project Completion>

At the time of ex-ante evaluation, the project was consistent with the development plan such as “The Sixth Five Year Plan” (2011-2015) which focused on job creation, promotion of industry, enhancement of governance, extension of social services provision under the objective of “Accelerating Growth and Reducing Poverty” to realize the society to enjoy lives at the level of middle-income country by 2021. This development plan was still effective as a key policy in the country’s economic development at the time of project completion.

<Consistency with the Development Needs of Bangladesh at the Time of Ex-Ante Evaluation and Project Completion >

This project was consistent with Bangladesh’s development needs for urban development at the time of ex-ante evaluation as described in “Background” above. The development of urban infrastructure has not kept pace with rapid population growth in urban areas, causing an acute shortage of infrastructure and services, such as piped water, sewerage, drainage, roads and bridges. With a huge number of institutions involved in the city management, there has been the gross overlapping of functions, lack of coordination among institutions, which often lead to the plurality in the planning, implementation and development approaches. It has become necessary for GOB to establish the Inclusive City Government with a view to meeting the future demand and efficient management of urban development. No information or report have been made that indicates the change of Bangladesh’s development needs for urban development since the time of ex-ante evaluation.

<Consistency with Japan’s ODA Policy at the Time of Ex-Ante Evaluation>

The project was relevant at the time of ex-ante evaluation with the priority areas of the Country Assistance Program for Bangladesh (2012) in which the focuses were on the acceleration of economic development for all in order to reach out the level of middle-income-country, in particular on the development of transportation and traffic infrastructure which contributes to efficiently mobilizing people and commodities and to the resolution of regional gap.

<Evaluation Result>

In light of the above, the relevance of the project is high.

2 Effectiveness/Impact

<Status of Achievement for the Objectives at the time of Project Completion>

The framework for the improvement of urban governance and infrastructure development to achieve the concept of Inclusive City Government was established by the project completion since the three plans, namely, IDPCC, ARP, and ICGIAP were all produced by the project completion. Through on the job trainings, those officers and staff in charge of the Project accumulated the knowledges and practices in the field of 1) Development of inclusive planning, 2) environmental burden consideration, 3) consensus building through stakeholder meetings and 4) implementation of subprojects.

< Utilization Status of the Proposed Plan at the time of Ex-post Evaluation>

The framework has been partially utilized by the time of ex-post evaluation as one out of four indicators has been achieved and three indicators have been partially achieved.

Out of the total number of proposed 72 sub-projects, 40 subprojects (56%) have been undertaken and 32 subprojects (44%) were not partly due to the changes of plan after the project completion as well as shortage of funds. (Indicator 1). In terms of the Administrative Reform Program, according to the 1st ICGIAP Implementation Performance Assessment Report (June 2016), as for 13 trigger activities that are mandatory to start Batch 2, 74% of them has been executed in fully satisfactory level. While for 29 non-trigger activities that are not mandatory, only 49% of them have been executed in fully satisfactory level. It should be also noted that institutional changes, such as administrative and tax reforms, are required to fully implement ICGIAP. However, amendments and/or formation of related rules and regulations are not under the jurisdiction of LGED, but LGD (supervisory authority of LGED). For example, to increase holding tax revenue, interval of tax assessment needs to be changed from every 5 year, current practice stipulated by “The City Corporation (Taxation) Rules, 1986)” to every 3 years. However, authority to amend this rules is exclusively given to LGD, which has made the process taken much time. As for the staff allocation, more than 80% of proposed staff in total has been allocated by the time of ex-post evaluation. Staff allocation level is high for NCC, GCC and ChCC showing the status as more than 90%. It was found that proposed staff will be fully allocated only after the proposed organogram, which were submitted by each CC to LGD, obtain official endorsement by LGD and other authorities (e.g. Ministry of Public Administration and Ministry of Finance) with subsequent budget allocation (Indicator 2). In terms of the institutional improvement based on the institutional structure reform program, all CCs have implemented both measures of e-governance activities and mass communication cells. However, due to manpower and budget constraints, only half of CCs have implemented the measures of City Information Service Center and Meeting with Mass Public (Indicator 3). Coordination meetings with Civil Society Coordination Committee (CSCC) were carried out 4 times and those with Ward Level Coordination Committee (WLCC) twice as planned for all CCs (Indicator 4).

<Status of Achievement for Expected Goals through the Proposed Plan at the time of Ex-post Evaluation>

Through the proposed plan, the Expected Goals, “To enhance economic growth potential and improve quality of life in the targeted cities” at the time of ex-post evaluation have shown some progresses in terms of the economic growth potential. Investment toward ChCC up to the time of ex-post evaluation has been steadily increased year by year. According to the interview with those ICGIAP informants, the reason of increased investments for ChCC is because it is economically important industrial hub of the country with dynamic leadership and absorption capacity. For other CCs, investments have been fluctuating during the same period. (Indicator 1).

<Other Impacts at the time of Ex-post Evaluation>

It was identified through comments of LGED that although ICGP is a gender-neutral project, certain governance arrangements have shown actions to cope with gender bias, e.g. formation of CSCC, developing gender action plan by the CCs, standing committees for divorce mitigation. The Bangladeshi cities are facing numerous negative impacts from climate change. The drainage facilities and water supply system improvement is couple of such initiatives that have reduced the urban risks posed by the climate change.

<Evaluation Result>

In light of the above, through the project, the framework for the improvement of urban governance and infrastructure development to achieve the concept of Inclusive City Government was established by the project completion, and it has been partially utilized, by the time

of ex-post evaluation. Furthermore, the expected goals, “To enhance economic growth potential and improve quality of life in the targeted cities” at the time of Ex-post Evaluation have shown some progresses in terms of the economic growth potential.

Therefore, the effectiveness/impact of the project is fair.

Status of Achievement of Utilization Status of the Proposed Plan and Expected Goals through the Proposed Plan

Aim	Indicators	Results																																																																																																																																								
(Utilization Status of the Proposed Plan) Framework for the improvement of urban governance and infrastructure development in order to achieve the concept of Inclusive City Government established by the project have been utilized.	1. The infrastructure projects have been implemented based on IDPCC.	Status of the Achievement: partially achieved (Ex-post Evaluation) Out of total number of 72 subprojects, 40 subprojects (56%) have been undertaken. Of those undertaken, 11 subprojects (28%) were already completed by the time of ex-post evaluation, 20 subproject (50%) have been in progress and 9 subprojects (22%) have been approved to be undertaken, but not yet started. <table border="1" style="margin-top: 10px;"> <caption align="center">Implementation status of sub-projects across CCs</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>CCs</th> <th># of sub-project</th> <th>80% and more (Achieved)</th> <th>50% - 79% (Partially Achieved)</th> <th>Less than 50% (Not achieved)</th> <th>0% (not undertaken)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NCC</td> <td>8</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CoCC</td> <td>14</td> <td>8</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>RCC</td> <td>24</td> <td>0</td> <td>9</td> <td>3</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GCC</td> <td>15</td> <td>0</td> <td>6</td> <td>3</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ChCC</td> <td>11</td> <td>1</td> <td>3</td> <td>1</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>72</td> <td>11</td> <td>20</td> <td>9</td> <td>32</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><i>Ratio of subprojects in different progress made</i></td> <td align="center">28%</td> <td align="center">50%</td> <td align="center">22%</td> <td align="center">na</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><i>Ratio of number of subprojects undertaken</i></td> <td align="center" colspan="3">55.6%</td> <td align="center">44.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	CCs	# of sub-project	80% and more (Achieved)	50% - 79% (Partially Achieved)	Less than 50% (Not achieved)	0% (not undertaken)	NCC	8	2	1	2	3	CoCC	14	8	1	0	5	RCC	24	0	9	3	12	GCC	15	0	6	3	6	ChCC	11	1	3	1	6	Total	72	11	20	9	32	<i>Ratio of subprojects in different progress made</i>		28%	50%	22%	na	<i>Ratio of number of subprojects undertaken</i>		55.6%			44.4%																																																																																		
	CCs	# of sub-project	80% and more (Achieved)	50% - 79% (Partially Achieved)	Less than 50% (Not achieved)	0% (not undertaken)																																																																																																																																				
NCC	8	2	1	2	3																																																																																																																																					
CoCC	14	8	1	0	5																																																																																																																																					
RCC	24	0	9	3	12																																																																																																																																					
GCC	15	0	6	3	6																																																																																																																																					
ChCC	11	1	3	1	6																																																																																																																																					
Total	72	11	20	9	32																																																																																																																																					
<i>Ratio of subprojects in different progress made</i>		28%	50%	22%	na																																																																																																																																					
<i>Ratio of number of subprojects undertaken</i>		55.6%			44.4%																																																																																																																																					
	2. The Administrative and financial reform has been carried out based on fiscal and administrative reform program (ARP) of 5CCs*. <p style="margin-top: 10px;"><i>(Note): In the original document, it was stated as 4 CCs because of delayed inclusion of ChCC.</i></p>	Status of the Achievement: partially achieved (Ex-post Evaluation) <table border="1" style="margin-top: 10px;"> <caption align="center">Performance results of 13 Trigger activities as of June 2016</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>CC</th> <th>Number of trigger activities with full satisfactory level of performance</th> <th>%</th> <th>Number of trigger activities with minimum satisfactory level of performance</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NCC</td> <td>12</td> <td>92%</td> <td>1</td> <td>8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CoCC</td> <td>7</td> <td>54%</td> <td>6</td> <td>46%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>RCC</td> <td>10</td> <td>77%</td> <td>3</td> <td>23%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GCC</td> <td>9</td> <td>69%</td> <td>4</td> <td>31%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ChCC</td> <td>10</td> <td>77%</td> <td>3</td> <td>23%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>average</td> <td>9.6</td> <td>74%</td> <td>3.4</td> <td>26%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" style="margin-top: 10px;"> <caption align="center">Performance results of 29 Non-Trigger activities as of June 2016</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>CC</th> <th>Number of non-trigger activities with full satisfactory level of performance</th> <th>%</th> <th>Number of non-trigger activities with partial satisfactory level of performance</th> <th>%</th> <th>Number of non-trigger activities not done</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NCC</td> <td>24</td> <td>83%</td> <td>4</td> <td>13%</td> <td>1</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CoCC</td> <td>6</td> <td>20%</td> <td>8</td> <td>27%</td> <td>15</td> <td>52%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>RCC</td> <td>15</td> <td>52%</td> <td>9</td> <td>31%</td> <td>5</td> <td>17%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GCC</td> <td>14</td> <td>48%</td> <td>8</td> <td>27%</td> <td>7</td> <td>24%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ChCC</td> <td>12</td> <td>41%</td> <td>8</td> <td>27%</td> <td>9</td> <td>31%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>average</td> <td>14.2</td> <td>49%</td> <td>7.4</td> <td>25.5%</td> <td>7.4</td> <td>25.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" style="margin-top: 10px;"> <caption align="center">Staff allocation for each CC at the ex-ante and ex-post evaluation</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Timing</th> <th></th> <th>NCC</th> <th>CoCC</th> <th>RCC</th> <th>GCC</th> <th>ChCC</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Ex-ante evaluation</td> <td>Proposed*</td> <td>683</td> <td>1,274</td> <td>941</td> <td>1,722</td> <td>3,180</td> <td>7,800</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Actual</td> <td>168</td> <td>127</td> <td>223</td> <td>350</td> <td>3,175</td> <td>4,043</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Achieved</i></td> <td align="center">24.6%</td> <td align="center">10.0%</td> <td align="center">23.7%</td> <td align="center">20.3%</td> <td align="center">99.8%</td> <td align="center">51.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Ex-post evaluation</td> <td>Proposed**</td> <td>660</td> <td>1,321</td> <td>941</td> <td>1,237</td> <td>3,180</td> <td>7,339</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Actual</td> <td>822</td> <td>758</td> <td>547</td> <td>1,132</td> <td>2,935</td> <td>6,194</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Achieved</i></td> <td align="center">124.5%</td> <td align="center">57.3%</td> <td align="center">58.1%</td> <td align="center">91.5%</td> <td align="center">92.30%</td> <td align="center">84.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Note: The proposed staff number was changed between the time of ex-ante evaluation and ex-post evaluation due to that some of the administrative and financial reform activities have required institutional changes.</p>	CC	Number of trigger activities with full satisfactory level of performance	%	Number of trigger activities with minimum satisfactory level of performance	%	NCC	12	92%	1	8%	CoCC	7	54%	6	46%	RCC	10	77%	3	23%	GCC	9	69%	4	31%	ChCC	10	77%	3	23%	average	9.6	74%	3.4	26%	CC	Number of non-trigger activities with full satisfactory level of performance	%	Number of non-trigger activities with partial satisfactory level of performance	%	Number of non-trigger activities not done	%	NCC	24	83%	4	13%	1	3%	CoCC	6	20%	8	27%	15	52%	RCC	15	52%	9	31%	5	17%	GCC	14	48%	8	27%	7	24%	ChCC	12	41%	8	27%	9	31%	average	14.2	49%	7.4	25.5%	7.4	25.5%	Timing		NCC	CoCC	RCC	GCC	ChCC	Total	Ex-ante evaluation	Proposed*	683	1,274	941	1,722	3,180	7,800	Actual	168	127	223	350	3,175	4,043	<i>Achieved</i>	24.6%	10.0%	23.7%	20.3%	99.8%	51.8%	Ex-post evaluation	Proposed**	660	1,321	941	1,237	3,180	7,339	Actual	822	758	547	1,132	2,935	6,194	<i>Achieved</i>	124.5%	57.3%	58.1%	91.5%	92.30%	84.4%
CC	Number of trigger activities with full satisfactory level of performance	%	Number of trigger activities with minimum satisfactory level of performance	%																																																																																																																																						
NCC	12	92%	1	8%																																																																																																																																						
CoCC	7	54%	6	46%																																																																																																																																						
RCC	10	77%	3	23%																																																																																																																																						
GCC	9	69%	4	31%																																																																																																																																						
ChCC	10	77%	3	23%																																																																																																																																						
average	9.6	74%	3.4	26%																																																																																																																																						
CC	Number of non-trigger activities with full satisfactory level of performance	%	Number of non-trigger activities with partial satisfactory level of performance	%	Number of non-trigger activities not done	%																																																																																																																																				
NCC	24	83%	4	13%	1	3%																																																																																																																																				
CoCC	6	20%	8	27%	15	52%																																																																																																																																				
RCC	15	52%	9	31%	5	17%																																																																																																																																				
GCC	14	48%	8	27%	7	24%																																																																																																																																				
ChCC	12	41%	8	27%	9	31%																																																																																																																																				
average	14.2	49%	7.4	25.5%	7.4	25.5%																																																																																																																																				
Timing		NCC	CoCC	RCC	GCC	ChCC	Total																																																																																																																																			
Ex-ante evaluation	Proposed*	683	1,274	941	1,722	3,180	7,800																																																																																																																																			
	Actual	168	127	223	350	3,175	4,043																																																																																																																																			
	<i>Achieved</i>	24.6%	10.0%	23.7%	20.3%	99.8%	51.8%																																																																																																																																			
Ex-post evaluation	Proposed**	660	1,321	941	1,237	3,180	7,339																																																																																																																																			
	Actual	822	758	547	1,132	2,935	6,194																																																																																																																																			
	<i>Achieved</i>	124.5%	57.3%	58.1%	91.5%	92.30%	84.4%																																																																																																																																			

	<p>3. The institutional improvement has been carried out in the targeted 5CCs* based on the institutional structure reform program (ICGIAP).</p> <p><i>(Note): In the original document, it was stated as 4 CCs because of delayed inclusion of ChCC.</i></p>	<p>Status of the Achievement: partially achieved (Ex-post Evaluation) According to the 1st ICGIAP Implementation Performance Assessment Report (English), June 2016, following measures have been implemented to CCs.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="555 159 1509 387"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">Progress of ICGIAP</th> </tr> <tr> <th>CCs</th> <th>E-governance activities</th> <th>Mass Communication Cell</th> <th>City Information Service Center</th> <th>Meeting with Mass Public</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NCC</td> <td>○</td> <td>○</td> <td>○</td> <td>○</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CoCC</td> <td>○</td> <td>○</td> <td>○</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>RCC</td> <td>○</td> <td>○</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>GCC</td> <td>○</td> <td>○</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>ChCC</td> <td>○</td> <td>○</td> <td>○</td> <td>○</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Progress of ICGIAP					CCs	E-governance activities	Mass Communication Cell	City Information Service Center	Meeting with Mass Public	NCC	○	○	○	○	CoCC	○	○	○		RCC	○	○			GCC	○	○			ChCC	○	○	○	○																								
Progress of ICGIAP																																																													
CCs	E-governance activities	Mass Communication Cell	City Information Service Center	Meeting with Mass Public																																																									
NCC	○	○	○	○																																																									
CoCC	○	○	○																																																										
RCC	○	○																																																											
GCC	○	○																																																											
ChCC	○	○	○	○																																																									
	<p>4. Coordination meetings on the participatory urban development have been carried out.</p>	<p>Status of the Achievement: achieved (Ex-post Evaluation) In all of CCs, Coordination meetings with Civil Society Coordination Committee (CSCC) were carried out 4 times and with Ward Level Coordination Committee (WLCC) twice as planned.</p>																																																											
<p>(Expected Goals through the proposed plan)</p> <p>To enhance economic growth potential and improve quality of life in the targeted cities</p>	<p>1. The increase of investment toward CCs</p>	<p>(Ex-post Evaluation) Investment toward ChCC has been steadily increased year by year up to the time of ex-post evaluation. According to the interview with those ICGIAP informants, the reasons of increased investment for ChCC are because it has served as economically important industrial hub of the country with dynamic leadership and with its high level of absorption capacities. For other CCs, investments have been fluctuating partly due to the fluctuation of government allocation and tendency to invest more funds in early years for infrastructure development cost.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="544 763 1493 1093"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">City Corps.</th> <th colspan="5">Investment toward each CCs</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="5">Unit of CCY (in thousand Taka)</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>FY 2015-16</th> <th>FY 2016-17</th> <th>FY 2017-18</th> <th>FY 2018-19 (forecast)</th> <th>FY 2019-20 (forecast)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NCC</td> <td>600,000</td> <td>524,100</td> <td>560,000</td> <td>616,000</td> <td>677,600</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CoCC</td> <td>10,000</td> <td>400,000</td> <td>170,000</td> <td>187,000</td> <td>205,700</td> </tr> <tr> <td>RCC</td> <td>200,000</td> <td>300,000</td> <td>28,500</td> <td>31,350</td> <td>34,485</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GCC</td> <td>na</td> <td>94,700</td> <td>11,400</td> <td>12,540</td> <td>13,794</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ChCC</td> <td>962,100</td> <td>1,561,000</td> <td>2,780,000</td> <td>3,058,000</td> <td>3,363,800</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>na</td> <td>2,879,800</td> <td>3,549,900</td> <td>3,904,890</td> <td>4,295,379</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><i>Rate of increase compared to the previous year</i></td> <td><i>na</i></td> <td><i>23.3%</i></td> <td><i>10%</i></td> <td><i>10%</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	City Corps.	Investment toward each CCs					Unit of CCY (in thousand Taka)						FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19 (forecast)	FY 2019-20 (forecast)	NCC	600,000	524,100	560,000	616,000	677,600	CoCC	10,000	400,000	170,000	187,000	205,700	RCC	200,000	300,000	28,500	31,350	34,485	GCC	na	94,700	11,400	12,540	13,794	ChCC	962,100	1,561,000	2,780,000	3,058,000	3,363,800	Total	na	2,879,800	3,549,900	3,904,890	4,295,379	<i>Rate of increase compared to the previous year</i>		<i>na</i>	<i>23.3%</i>	<i>10%</i>	<i>10%</i>
City Corps.	Investment toward each CCs																																																												
	Unit of CCY (in thousand Taka)																																																												
	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19 (forecast)	FY 2019-20 (forecast)																																																								
NCC	600,000	524,100	560,000	616,000	677,600																																																								
CoCC	10,000	400,000	170,000	187,000	205,700																																																								
RCC	200,000	300,000	28,500	31,350	34,485																																																								
GCC	na	94,700	11,400	12,540	13,794																																																								
ChCC	962,100	1,561,000	2,780,000	3,058,000	3,363,800																																																								
Total	na	2,879,800	3,549,900	3,904,890	4,295,379																																																								
<i>Rate of increase compared to the previous year</i>		<i>na</i>	<i>23.3%</i>	<i>10%</i>	<i>10%</i>																																																								

Source : Project completion report, 1st Batch of ICGIAP Implementation Performance Assessment Report, June 2016, Quarterly Progress Report of the Inclusive City Governance Project (July -September, 2017), questionnaire and interview with those concerned.

3 Efficiency

Both of the project period and the project cost slightly exceeded the plan (ratio against plan: 106%, 112%), due to the political unrest during the first half of 2015, which delayed the deployment of project consultants and staff of Project Implementation Unit, and the later inclusion of ChCC. Therefore, efficiency of the project is fair.

4 Sustainability

<Policy Aspect>

The Seventh Five-year Plan (2016-2020) has given a priority to the urban infrastructure development and strengthening of the capacity of the local government. Furthermore, the National Housing Policy approved in July 2016 and Urban and Regional Planning Act approved in 2017 have supported the project in the policy aspect.

<Institutional Aspect>

The Local Government Division (LGD) under the Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Cooperatives, has a dedicated wing dealing with the urban local government named Urban Development Wing with a function of monitoring of activities of CCs and municipalities. But they still do not have sufficient manpower to implement its function. The staff allocation percentage has achieved more than 90% of what was proposed for three CCs (NCC, GCC, ChCC) and more than 55% for two CCs (CoCC, RCC). However, due to lack of coordination between some CCs and national agencies, some ineffective service delivery cases have been observed. For example, even though the building permission is given by the CC and Capital Development Authority (known as RAJUK) the CCs are not informed of building constructions undertaken within their jurisdictions. Roads renovated by the CC have been re-excavated by other agencies for some other purpose. In order to cope with these uncoordinated process, the City Development Coordination Committee (CDCC) has been formed aiming to facilitate the coordination between CCs and national agencies through quarterly meetings at which their plans of activities should be shared and issues related to public services should be discussed among them. A Municipal Association of Bangladesh (MAB) was also formed to work with Local Government & International Organization to deliver the very best services. They have not been adequately functional yet to exploit synergies and collaborative advantages among the city local governments.

<Technical Aspect>

Almost all the CCs relevant to ICGP are lacking planning and implementation capacity for large projects. The ARP has not been yet fully in place due to delayed administrative reforms as described above. In order to cope with insufficient capacity of planning and implementation for large projects, along with the existing CCs' human capacity, the project recruited a number of staffs for each CC in a position of Senior and Junior Field Engineer, Facilitator for IT, Governance, Finance and Community and Urban Planning as well. Moreover, a Senior Slum Development Officer and a Socio-economist are also recruited by the CCs as government contribution. The project for Capacity Development of City Corporations (2016-2021) is now being implemented by Local Government Division and JICA, part of which activities address to accelerate the process of LGD-led administrative reforms. The project is now in its 3rd year of implementation.

<Financial Aspect>

More than 50% of the priority projects are either completed or being implemented using JICA loan (ICGP) and Government funds. The original IDPCC has been updated under ICGP and the funding priorities have changed. Many of the projects were re-casted and changed their names. There are some new projects included during revision process and approved by the ICGP's steering committee. Relocation of all those projects by name and category in the original plan may be done by the ICGP. With surplus budget of ICGP, approximately 2 billion yen, the rest of the priority projects are expected to be implemented in due course, however, it is uncertain whether the LGED and each CC have secured the sufficient budgets for the maintenance costs for the infrastructures developed by the project.

<Evaluation Result>

In light of the above, slight problems have been observed in terms of the institutional, technical and financial aspects of the implementing agency. Therefore, the sustainability of the effectiveness through the project is fair.

5 Summary of the Evaluation

Through the project, the framework for the improvement of urban governance and infrastructure development was established by the project completion, and it has been partially utilized by the time of ex-post evaluation. Through the proposed plan, the Expected Goals, "To enhance economic growth potential and improve quality of life in the targeted cities" at the time of ex-post evaluation have shown some progress. As for sustainability, slight problems have been observed in terms of institutional, technical and financial aspects such as lack of coordination between CCs and related agencies partly due to slow implementation of administrative reform process proposed by the project. As for efficiency, both project cost and period slightly exceeded the plan.

Considering all of the above points, this project is evaluated to be partially satisfactory.

III. Recommendations & Lessons Learned

Recommendations for Implementing Agency:

To: LGED in terms of ICGP

The ex-post evaluation has revealed that the limited progress has been made for 29 non-trigger activities except NCC.

Although achieving the non-trigger activities are not binding to access the Batch-2 fund, it is equally important for all CCs to achieve non-trigger activities for the capacity development purpose. Therefore, before the 2nd Batch Performance Assessment in 2018, it is recommended that all non-trigger activities should be carefully examined by;

1. Closely following up and monitoring the progress of ARP(organogram) approval especially for GCC, CoCC, RCC
2. Developing manuals and organizing regular trainings on financial management and resource mobilization
3. Organizing peer-groups between well performing CCs(e.g. NCC) and CCs which are lagging behind (e.g. CoCC)

To: Each CC

The ex-post evaluation has revealed that lack of coordination between CCs and related agencies has posed the concerns in city governance. Due to lack of coordination between CCs and these national agencies, ineffective service delivery has been observed as explained in the institutional aspect of sustainability above. In order to cope with this, the committees to facilitate the coordination between CCs and national agencies such as CDCC to exploit synergies and collaborative advantages among the city local governments, such as MAB should be effectively utilized among CCs.

Lessons Learned for JICA:

- 1) Careful considerations should be given to the methodology and measurement of criteria as the condition to determine further infrastructure implementation.

The ex-post evaluation has revealed that the approach of combining governance and infrastructure component by setting criteria of trigger activities as the condition to proceed with Batch 2 sub-project implementation provides strong incentives for the target CCs to implement governance improvement (ICGIAP) activities. However, it was also observed that some CCs have tended to concentrate on achieving trigger activities which serve as the condition to proceed with Batch 2 sub-project implementation and pay less attention to non-trigger activities. Thus, methodology of setting criteria as the condition to determine further implementation and how to measure its achievement should be more carefully considered.

- 2) Proper consultation and coordination among stakeholders depending on their TOR are needed when institutional/legal changes are expected.

As described in "2. Effectiveness and Impact", some of administrative and financial reforms of CCs require institutional changes, which are not under the jurisdiction of LGED, the implementing agency of the project, but LGD, the supervisory authority of LGED. Therefore, proper consultation and coordination among concerned organizations, depending on their TOR, should be more considered, particularly when institutional/legal changes are expected.



Chittagong Airport Road Improvement in Chittagong (ChCC)



Road Improvement in Comilla (CoCC)



Lighting Subproject in Narayanganj (NCC)



Drainage improvement in Rangpur (RCC)



Road infrastructure Subproject in Gazipur (GCC)