

The World Bank in Africa: An analysis of World Bank aid and programmes in Africa and their impact

Nahashon Gulali, ITRD Consulting Group and the Lending for Education in Africa Partnership Programme, a pilot programme of Volta Capital.

Introduction

Conceptualizing development

There is a considerable amount of literature that examines the complex and highly contested components of development and development assistance. To date, no single definition of development has been agreed upon by academics or policy analysts. However, there is general agreement that development is multidimensional and requires a multidisciplinary approach. Competing and related ideas that most thinkers associate with development include economic growth, modernisation, progress and westernisation. These elements are necessary, but not sufficient, conditions for development.

Development is more than growth, progress and modernisation. In its *World Development Report (1998)* the World Bank states development includes economic, social and political attributes. This translates into a sustainable increase in people's standard of living, which allows for consumption, education, health and environmental protection, equality of opportunity and liberties as well as political freedom. These are the fundamental attributes of development, ones that make the process of development concrete and measurable.

Post-Independent development trajectories and World Bank aid in Africa

Africa did not begin to experience meaningful development until the post independence era. Development processes in Africa have been characterised by diverse trajectories, making for a complex and heterogeneous continent. Few initiatives have actually achieved much in terms of development impact, largely because development has never been the main agenda. According to Ake,

“the problem is not so much that development has failed as that it was never really on the agenda in the first place. By all indications, political conditions in Africa are the greatest impediment to development” (1:1996).

Post-independence, most of the vital sectors needed immediate state attention and heavy investments. All states have failed to respond to the aspirations, real issues and demands of the majority of African people. State controlled development and planning in agriculture, healthcare, industrialization, education, energy generation, transmission and distribution, import substitution, inter alia, failed to bear results in large swaths of Africa. Consolidation of political power became the pet obsession of a majority of African leaders.

Various leaders adopted different approaches. Some of the most promising ones, such as President Kwame Nkrumah, became outright despots. Others, like Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia and Jomo Kenyatta of Kenya, performed no better. Jomo Kenyatta became a diabolic dictator and one of the wealthiest men in East and Central Africa. President Julius Nyerere of Tanzania moved away from a capitalistic approach, implementing instead the ujamaa ideology which was initially a success but failed to fortify the country against poor agricultural development and food insecurity. The Democratic Republic of Congo has failed to build an effective government to date, largely due to the ongoing violence and divisions in the country. Without a lasting peace it has been impossible to pursue development. Angola, the Central African Republic, and South Sudan, among others, have also had to contend with major drawbacks to sustainable development.

It is important to note that human aspirations have always been transcendental, and this is also true for the people on the African continent. The international 'development merchant system' has found room to grow inside Africa countries, which have experiencing the results of stagnated and failed development. For many African countries' economies, their dismal performance has led to the need for external development assistance. Such assistance was first provided in the form of technical assistance, financial, physical infrastructure development, economic planning, and governance

The World Bank initially focused its aid on the reconstruction of the war-torn economies of Europe and Japan. According to Kanbur R. (2000), Africa and other developing countries were not a priority for the World Bank. Instead of a wide definition of development, it concentrated on increasing production and incomes. Africa started receiving development support later, once the post-war reconstruction had been completed. The World Bank's development objectives also evolved to include a deeper understanding of poverty, resulting in a more complex approach to development assistance.

Various Western governments, development agencies, and multi-lateral development banks (MDBs) have been deeply involved in Africa's postcolonial development. They have provided generous assistance, pouring in more than \$400 billion since 1960. According to Richard L. Sklar and C.S Whitaker. (1991):

“Even in 1965 almost 20 percent of the Western countries' development assistance went to Africa. In the 1980s, Africans, who are about 12 percent of the developing world's population, were receiving about 22 percent of the total, and the share per person was higher than anywhere else in the Third World - amounting to about \$20, versus about \$7 for Latin America and \$5 for Asia“(p.60).

The World Bank has provided over \$50 billion to various projects and programs, particularly structural adjustment initiatives, over the past 30 years. Unfortunately, its project failure rate has been over 50% in Africa, which is greater than the 40% failure rate in other poor regions of the world. In an independent rating, the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) claimed that 39% of World Bank projects in 2010 were unsuccessful (Chauvet et al., 2010). There is a general consensus that the World Bank's programs in Africa have failed in reducing poverty, the greatest challenge affecting the continent. In 1994, the Bank evaluated the performance of 29 African countries where it had provided more than \$20 billion in funding to sponsor structural adjustment programs (SAPs) from 1981-1991. Its report, *Adjustment Lending in Africa*, released in March 1994, concluded that only six African countries had performed well: The Gambia, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Nigeria, Tanzania, and Zimbabwe. This makes for a failure rate of over 80 percent. Despite this dismal record, it is also true that aid has produced some spectacular successes. For instance, in the health sector World Bank development aid has made a significant contribution towards an increase in the life expectancy in the developing world from 40 to 65 years the eradication of diseases such as smallpox and the reduction of infant mortality (CGD, 2004).

Proponents of aid such as Professor Jeffrey Sachs argue that many poor countries are caught in a *poverty trap* and so the best strategy is for rich countries to increase aid flows and work closely with aid recipients in order to eradicate extreme poverty by 2025: “Aid is actually working albeit not perfectly, and with provision of more aid, the turnaround in terms of development will be seen.” (Sachs, 2005). Easterly sharply opposes this approach and maintains that if Africa continues to receive aid for development, there will be little good to show for it since the continent continues to be immersed in a dark cloud of poverty. (Easterly, 2006). According to another analyst, Moyo (2009), aid itself is part of the problem, as it has contributed to low development and poverty in Africa. She argued that it should either be cut by half or done away with entirely. The sobering reality is that Africa's development challenges run very deep and change will not come easily. There are no quick fixes.

Why has the World Bank failed?

The World Bank has admitted that some of its projects have performed dismally and failed to address poverty and development issues in developing countries. This failure can't be blamed entirely on the Bank. It is also partly the fault of aid recipient countries. On the Bank's side, perhaps the biggest contributor to the failure of western aid to Africa is the culture of doublespeak and inconsistencies in policy actions that have resulted in a confusing and overlapping array of objectives. (Rondinelli, 1976). Despite being cloaked in "development" garb, economic development assistance to Africa has been used as an instrument by donors to achieve a variety of non-economic (geopolitical and political) objectives, including the containment of democratization, the promotion of human rights and communist expansion in Africa. Foreign aid allocations have often been smothered in bureaucratic red tape and shrouded in secrecy. Many programs lack transparency and the people being helped are seldom consulted. (Calderisi, 2007).

According to Santiso (2001), most western governments and development agencies have failed to exercise prudence in granting aid and loans to African governments. In his view, a considerable amount of aid has been used to finance grandiose projects, which have little economic value, impose many conditionalities, and have been created to underwrite economically ruinous policies. More often than not these projects have ended up producing little or no meaningful economic gains to the recipient countries. One example is the financing of \$250 million for the construction of the Garoe-Bosaso road in Somalia which stretches 450 kilometers across a barren desert and is only crossed by nomads by foot.

Donor governments and the World Bank have often allowed themselves to be duped by shrewd and corrupt African despots. The structural adjustment programs have failed because of design flaws, sequencing, pedagogical inanities and weak commitment to reform. Foreign loans and aid programs in Africa have been badly monitored and monies have frequently been stolen by corrupt bureaucrats. The World Bank itself estimates that "nearly 40 percent of Africa's aggregate wealth has fled to foreign bank accounts." Despite this reality, the Bank considers these same bandit African governments as "partners in development." The World Bank has sponsored structural adjustment programs in failing regimes such as Angola. If the World Bank had insisted on SAP agreements with only democratic countries and those at peace, the course of history in Angola might have been different. The very act of signing an existing SAP agreement was an admission of failure.

Failure has also been caused by actions on the recipient countries side. While it is not necessarily wrong for countries to borrow, the borrowing should be used productively to generate a net income over the required amortization. However, many times this has not been the case. Aid has been used to finance reckless spending, to establish grandiose losses and to purchase weapons. Aid dollars have been squandered, creating a phenomenon known as the "black elephant" – a cross between unexpected events with terrible consequences and problems visible to everyone, yet no one wants to address it. Examples of the misuse of aid includes times when African countries have spend large amounts of aid on consumption, either to finance recurrent expenditures such as civil servants' salaries or to purchase consumer goods. For example, during the 1980s more than half of Tanzania's imports were financed by loans from foreign governments. This included buying arms and ammunition. Ethiopia received \$924.9 million from the World Bank, more than two-thirds of it in 1998 after a first round of fighting. Eritrea, a much smaller country, received less. The World Bank never threatened to stop the money. An example of "black elephants" occurred in Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of the Congo) where half of its foreign debt of \$6 billion went to build two big dams and Inga-shaba power line, as well as a \$1 billion double-decked suspension bridge over the Congo River. The upper level is for a railroad that does not exist. Had the money been invested in visible productive ventures, it could have contributed to better livelihoods.

Critics have long maintained that foreign assistance has been wasted by bloated aid agencies pouring money into the pockets of corrupt African governments. Nigeria, for example, does not know the true amount of its foreign debt. Back in 1990, while Nigeria sank deep into debt, its former military rulers amassed huge personal fortunes. General Ibrahim Babangida acquired an estimated fortune of \$8 billion and General Sani Abachahad a personal fortune of \$5 billion after only four years in office. (West Africa, Sept 25 – Oct 1, 1990; p.1614). In Kenya, the former Nairobi Mayor, Abdi Ogle, demanded the resignation of the World Bank's country director for Kenya, Harold Wackman, accusing him of turning a blind eye to embezzlement of an emergency loan of \$77.5 million in July 1998 to repair infrastructure damaged by heavy rains. "Not a single cent has come to the City Council because it has disappeared into private pockets within the Ministry of Local Government," he fumed. (The Washington post, Nov 25, 1999; p.A31).

In summary, it would be true to say that

- The programs and policies of the World Bank to tackle poverty have not been evenly successful, particularly in Africa. The World Bank's projects have overwhelmingly failed to reduce poverty. There have been various causes for this outcome, including immature state systems as well as rigid adjustment packages imposed by the World Bank onto African governments. (Ika et al, 2012).
- All too often, World Bank project failures have been the result of a poor understanding of local cultures and gender norms, insensitivity towards local needs, the imposition of donor projects, structures and values, and a lack of maintenance frameworks to ensure project sustainability.
- These pitfalls have resulted from the failure of donors to engage in consultative dialogues with local people, causing projects to fail and considerable resources going to waste.
- Internal country structures of governance, despotism and corruption have also contributed to the failure of various donor funded programmes.

The next section describes case studies where World Bank projects have failed in Africa. This has been caused by a lack of local community involvement/ local integration as well as bad governance, corruption and double standards.

Case studies:

The Chad Cameroon Pipeline Project

The Chad Cameroon Pipeline Project demonstrates the consequences of corruption, double standards, a lack of community engagement, and failed attempts to beat the resource curse.

The existence of oil in Chad has been known for many years. Production agreements have been negotiated since 1973, but with no signed agreements to date. In the early 1990s Chad was recognized for peace and relative stability. This gave birth to new negotiations and, ultimately, the involvement of the World Bank in an oil exploration project. The World Bank was engaged as a 'moral negotiator' to enhance project viability, something that was needed as Chad was considered too high a risk by foreign investors to inject capital into the project. The World Bank's other interest was to transform the initiative into a development project to substantially reduce poverty in one of Africa's poorest region.

The World Bank strongly believed that this project would promote Chad's growth and change people's lives for the better. In 2004, investments in the project increased to \$4.2 billion, with the World Bank providing \$93 million. The International Financial Corporation (IFC), which is a member of the World Bank, added \$100 million in form of direct loans to the consortium and mobilized a further \$300 million from commercial banks.

In the beginning the program exhibited a high element of transparency and accountability, including the adoption of a legal framework to ensure prudent management of oil revenues and a prioritization on poverty reduction. Eight-five percent (85%) of the dividends from direct revenues were allocated for poverty reduction in

five priority sectors of education, health and social services ,rural development, infrastructure, as well as environment and water resources. In 1999, oil extraction became a reality. However, one year later, in 2000, problems started cropping up when the Chad government channeled \$4.5 million of the \$25 million bonus from oil proceeds i.e.; into buying weapons. Even though bonuses were not part of the World Bank revenue management plan, it was perceived as a broken promise which resulted in the Bank and the IMF threatening the Chad government by cancelling its debt relief program.

Three years later, in 2003, the construction of the pipeline was finalized and there was an increase in revenues. In 2006 however, the Chad government amended the 1999 revenue management plan to make more room for unrestricted government spending. This move allowed the government another purchase of weapons to the extent that it spent 4.5 times more on military than on health, education and other social projects combined. These priorities angered the World Bank, which proceeded to block all oil revenues by freezing Chad's offshore escrow accounts and suspending all its programs in the country. The World Bank thought it had guarantees based on a model framework for oil led development. In practice, however oil has been used to fuel war with civilians being the primary victims.

"Oil for war and war for oil" is a deeply ingrained reality in Chad's popular political consciousness. Nadji Nelambaye, the coordinator of a Chadian NGO, snapped "Are you trying to provoke me?" when asked if he thought there was a link between oil and war in the country. In September 2008, the World Bank finally terminated its operations on the pipeline project due to Chad's continuous failure to comply with the guidelines set up under the revenue management plan. At this point, oil is still being pumped and revenues, to an increasing extent, continue to be spent on military operations, a clear sign of lack of prioritization.

Marred with corruption and misappropriation allegations, the 5% of oil revenues promised to residents of the oil-producing zone is being spent on "presidential projects." One of these projects is an already crumbling football stadium. Local residents claim that the more than \$74 million dollars spent on development projects in the region have produced no evident changes.

For President Idriss Deby, oil revenues have served as a means to prolong abusive and undemocratic rule. He has changed the country's constitution to allow him to be president for life. Over 30% of the oil revenues have been used on war. Money allocated for development in "priority sectors" has instead been used to grant non-transparent, no-bid public contracts to a variety of colleagues. It is little wonder that Chad's civil society has declared the pipeline's inauguration a day of national mourning.

Many displacements have taken place for residents living near the oil exploration zone. A woman in Bero Village, one of the oil producing zones, tells how Exxon displaced her whole family, promising to find them new land and to build them new houses equipped with furniture. Although the houses were built, there was no furniture provided and the work was so shoddily done that Exxon was forced to return two years later to rebuild them. In theory, everyone displaced by the Chad Cameroon Pipeline Project received some form of compensation, but the reality is considerably different. In fact, the compensation has not been sufficient to restore their standard of living. Exxon and the project planners claimed that compensation would be paid to displaced people, but that "self-resettlement" would take place naturally whereby villagers would find/purchase new land for farming from a "village land pool." A recent Chadian report notes that this has not happened and that many farmers have not found land or enough land. Agricultural production is continually declining, which will ultimately have consequences for the entire country.

This project covers two countries so the harsh reality has also not spared Cameroon. Almost 900 kilometers of the pipeline pass through Cameroon, which is receiving only minimal revenues from Chad's oil. However, the

pipeline's social and environmental impact has been harsh, particularly for Cameroonians living along its route with 248 villages being directly impacted by the pipe. Dozens more have been affected by the roads, operations centers, and employee living bases all built for the project. Unlike neighboring Chad, no oil revenues have been set aside for development spending in the affected villages. The Cameroonian government claims it only receives \$25 million per year in revenues and some of this money has been returned to impacted villages via increased social spending. But the truth is no one knows where the \$25 million has been spent (or if that's the true amount) as there is no accountability for the use of the revenues. Today, Cameroonian NGOs have documented hundreds of cases in which compensation was never paid, partially paid, or paid in kind with shoddy materials.

Neither Chad nor Cameroon has seen a rise in their population's standards of living as a result of this project. This is due to poor governance, corruption and misappropriation of oil resources. The majority of Chad's population still survives on less than one dollar a day. They continue to live in mud shanties with limited access to water and sanitation. The project is regarded as a great failure in its own right, largely because of internal problems rather than because of the World Bank's actions.

The Lesotho – South Africa Water project

According to research conducted by the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists, a large percentage of projects financed by the World Bank have been responsible for threatening the livelihoods of more than 3.4 million people, pushing them out of their homes and off their lands. The Lesotho Highlands Water Project, which included the construction of two large dams (Katse and Mohale) between 1989 and 2007, has been earmarked as one of these projects. It is an irony that the World Bank, which was the primary financier, also critiqued this project.

The Lesotho Highlands Water Project (LHWP), which began in 1986, is one of Africa's largest hydroelectric projects. The project's objective was to supply water to South Africa and electricity to Lesotho. Another goal was to reduce environmental degradation, which for decades was considered to be have one of the worst problems of soil erosion of any country in the world (Showers 2005). The project entailed the building of several large dams and other supportive infrastructure including roads, bridges and power lines. All this required the relocation of the local population. The World Bank provided funding of US\$45,000,000, approximately 3% of the total project cost. Other funders included the government of Lesotho, the Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA), the European Investment Bank (EIB), the African Development Bank, and various commercial banks and institutions.

According to the Lesotho Highlands Development Authority and the Lesotho Highlands Water Commission, it was important to include the World Bank in the project in order to encourage other funders. Because Lesotho is categorized as one of the World Bank's lowest income countries, with 55.1% of its population living below US\$2 a day, it was able to qualify for a loan. It was also believed that, by having the Bank on board would generate goodwill from stakeholders such as non-government organizations as well as communities concerned about social, economic, and environmental issues. In short, the view was that the World Bank's participation would help guarantee its success.

The project was intended to bring benefits to both South Africa and Lesotho by supplying much-needed water to Johannesburg and easing poverty in Lesotho. It had two phases: Phase 1 focused on the transfer of water from the headwaters of the Gariep River (called the Senqu in Lesotho) to the Vaal river catchment in South Africa and the provision of hydroelectric power to Lesotho. Phase 1A, costed at approximately R20 billion, concentrated on major construction. This included the building of a large dam at Katse on the Malibamatso river (the highest dam in Africa at 180 million Rand), a 45 km transfer tunnel to 'Muela hydropower station and 'Muela tail-pond, and a further 37 km delivery tunnel to the Ash River in South Africa. Phase 1B included the construction of the Mohale

Dam, the highest rock-filled dam in Africa at 145 million Rand, the Mohale Reservoir, a 32 km tunnel connecting the Mohale Reservoir to the Katse Reservoir, and a 5.6 km transfer tunnel to the Katse Reservoir.

The project, which was implemented from 1986 to 2009, provided compensation, resettlement and development initiatives to affected populations with the aim of ensuring that project-affected people would maintain a standard of living equivalent to what they had at the time of first disturbance. (Government of Lesotho and Government of South Africa [1986] Lesotho Highlands Water Project Treaty, Article 7, paragraph 18).

The World Bank had comprehensive guidelines on the resettlement process and approaches to ensure environmental and social protection during the implementation of development projects (World Bank 2001, 2005). These guidelines called for the restoration of affected people’s livelihoods, not the improvement of their standard of living. Although the World Bank sees the project’s compensation policies somewhat positively, it has criticized the emphasis on payments rather than helping people to secure their livelihoods. The World Commission on Dams (2000) argued for the need to improve the livelihoods of project-affected people as well as those downstream from the project. While non-government organizations such as International Rivers (formerly International Network, IRN), the Highland Church Action Group (HCAG), and the Transformation Resource Center (TRC) as well as members of the Panel of Environmental Experts for the Lesotho Highlands Water Project all called for improvement in the living standard of resettled people, the two governments claimed that they were only willing to restore living standards to what they had been before the first disturbance.

As the LHWP progressed, other issues emerged that had consequences for the affected population. One of these issues related free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC). The Bank argued that free, prior, and informed consultation was necessary, but not consent. People in the highlands of Lesotho, who were being affected by the project, argued that just consultation was not enough. They also wanted to have a say in issues such as whether or not the project should go forward, what kinds and levels of compensation should be provided to project-affected people, and what kinds of land they should receive in exchange for the land that they lost in the project area. None of these arguments held sway with the two governments, the Lesotho Highlands Water Commission, or the World Bank. In most dam related projects, the affected populations are often moved to upland areas that are less productive. This greatly affects their incomes and their agricultural productivity as well as having to cope with various social, psychological and physiological stresses. Some of those affected by the project have been turned into permanent aid recipients. The World Bank has insisted that in future, any compensation program must be set up together with those affected instead of a top-down approach.

As indicated in the below table, a total of 573 households were affected directly and an additional 20,000 indirectly affected.

Table 1: Families Relocated or Resettled by Destination and Stage in LHWP Phase 1A and 1B

Stage	Destination	Foothills	Maseru	Total
1 A Katse	Katse basin			
	71 (25 in cash program in 1995)	0	0	71
1B Mohale	Mohale Basin			
Stage 1 (1996-1998)	37	38	24	99
Stage 2 (2002-2006)	27	177	18	222
Stage 3 (post inundation, 2006-present)	103 (165)	4	0	169
People who lost over 50% of	72			74

their land under stage 3				
Total	298	233	42	573 relocated, resettled or affected directly

Note: Data obtained from the Lesotho Highlands Development Authority (LHDA). In the Stage 3 (Residual Resettlement) category of Phase 1B, project affected households that lost over 50% of their arable land were allocated fields in two areas in the Mophale basin, Ha Nthakane and Ha Kopor

The project also had several unintended consequences. It clearly stands out as an example where planners concentrated on restoring homes to the affected rather than restoring the means of production (especially land, grazing resources, and wild resources on which people depended for subsistence and income). Another major problem was that in nearly all cases, the degree of impact on populations was seriously underestimated, particularly in terms of cultural, social, spiritual and personal losses. While they were able to get cash compensation and have their dead relatives moved to their new locations, affected people felt that their new lives were seriously lacking compared to what they had experienced prior to the project. According to some resettlers, there were fewer traditional ceremonies being conducted in the new locations, and people had to go long distances to take part in cultural activities. The Lesotho Highlands Water Project, they maintained, represented a serious threat to Basotho culture. Such losses are irreparable and cannot be made good by monetary means of compensation.

Secondly, the project led to the drying up of springs in several catchment areas. These areas included the village of Ha Mensel near Katse, close to the Katse Township and administrative offices that were built to oversee the project. It was ironic, villagers said, that there was a large water tank built by LHDA in the village to provide water to the engineers and dam workers and their families in Katse, but they themselves had less access to water now than they had before the project began. Springs also dried up in Ha Lejone, Ha Theko, Ha Soai, Kholontsho, Mphoroshane, and Mapaleng, all in the catchment area of Phase 1A (the Katse Dam and Reservoir).

Thirdly, there was an increase in the spread of HIV/AIDS amongst the populations living in the highlands of Lesotho. Some organizations say that the dam construction workers, most of whom came from South Africa and lived in make-shift camps, contributed to the spread of HIV-Aids in Lesotho. In the late 1980s, HIV prevalence amongst the population was 0.9%. Recent figures point to 22%. (Human Sciences Research Council 2009; AmusaalNambao, personal communication, 2014). It is not certain that the LHWP itself is responsible for the increase in HIV/AIDS. The World Bank says it has no concrete data linking the LHWP and the spread of HIV-Aids in the country, but admits that there maybe a connection between the two. Today, one fourth of Lesotho’s population is HIV positive, and as one of the world’s least developed countries, the kingdom’s medical services are unable to cope.

Lastly, the LHWP had a major corruption scandal in the early 1990s. Forensic audits revealed problems in the accounting of the Chief Executive of LHDA, Mr. Masupha Sole as well as several large private companies involved in the project’s infrastructure construction. The project has done little to help Lesotho’s people. Without controls and regulations on how the funds were distributed, large sums of money have disappeared into a black hole. (R. Hoover, 2001).

Conclusion

A bucket filled with holes can only hold water for a short amount of time. Pouring in more water makes little sense as it will just drain away. To the extent that there are internal leaks in Africa – corruption, civil wars, wasteful military expenditures, capital flight and government waste - pouring in more aid makes little sense. Instead, priority should be placed on plugging the holes to ensure that the little aid that comes in stays in and has a positive impact.

As Maritu Wagaw wrote: “Let Africa look inside Africa for the solution of its economic problems. Solutions to our predicament should come from within not from outside” (*New African*, March 1992; p.19).

There are a number of lessons to be learned from both the Chad-Cameroon Pipeline project and the Lesotho Highlands Water Project experiences that are applicable to other development partners and donors’ infrastructure projects other than the World Bank.

First, the success of any infrastructure project or any aid funded project depends on transparency, openness, accountability and flexibility.

Second, in order to determine whether communities, households, and individuals are better off, the same, or worse off as a result of project activities, it is necessary to obtain detailed baseline data against which changes can be monitored and measured. Social impact assessments done as part of safeguards policies should ensure that various categories of people are interviewed and monitored, breaking the population down along gender, age, class, ethnic, occupational, vulnerability and other lines.

Third, it is necessary to have a policy environment that is appropriate and positive for all concerned, one which takes into careful consideration international, regional, national, and local level policies and practices and places significant emphasis on local culture, heritage, and traditions. According to Ika et al, (2012), parties that are involved in any infrastructure projects including the World Bank, must pay close attention to the social, political, economic, and environmental situations in the project areas.

Fourth, no matter how good a development policy is, it is likely to fail if it goes against the interests of the local populations and if local people are not involved in decision-making and planning. Public participation, therefore, is crucial to the success of any donor funded projects. (Lancaster. C, 1999). Free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC) should include not just consultation but meaningful information dissemination, local-level discussion, and real consent.

Fifth, one of the areas where significant progress has been made in the past was in the rules and procedures relating to involuntary relocation or resettlement resulting from the establishment of large infrastructure projects (World Bank 2001; Scudder 2005). An issue currently with the World Bank is that the Bank is reducing their safeguards when it comes to environmental, social, and resettlement issues, in line with some current thinking on being less regulatory and more market-oriented (Chavkin et al 2015). Given the experiences of large dam projects in Africa, Asia, and Latin America this will have a negative impact on people and habitats around the world. Involuntary resettlement policies of the world’s agencies doing resettlement must be improved and strengthened, as must the performance standards for social and environmental sustainability. The scholarly community should be consulted in this effort along with states, non-government organizations, and institutions engaged in partnerships on development.

Finally, much greater attention must be paid to issues of corruption and misdirection of finance in donor funded programmes, particularly in large infrastructure projects. The World Bank’s actions on corruption issues in Lesotho had a relatively good effect. However, the companies involved in the corrupt practices should have received greater sanctions. The World Bank, the International Finance Corporation, the European Union and other institutions need to pay greater attention to corrupt practices of states, project authorities, consultants, and transnational corporations.

References

Ake, Claude. 1996. *Democracy and Development in Africa*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

- Ayittey, G. (1992)** *Africa betrayed* St. Martin's Press, New York
- Calderisi, R. (2007).** *The trouble with Africa: Why foreign aid isn't working.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chauvet, L., Collier, P., & Duponchel, M. (2010).** *What explains aid project success in post-conflict situations?* (World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 5418).
- Easterly, W. (2006).** *The white man's burden: Why the West's efforts to aid the rest have done so much ill and so little good.* New York, NY: Penguin.
- Guyer, Jane L. (2002):***Briefing: the Chad-Cameroon petroleum and pipeline development project, African Affairs* 101, 402
- IAG (International Advisory Group) (2009):***Chad-Cameroon Petroleum Development and Pipeline Project – Final Report.* International Advisory Group IAG Secretariat, 5 Place VilleMarie, Suite 200, Montreal (Quebec) CANADA. September 3, 2009
- Ika, L. A., Diallo, A., & Thuillier, D. (2012).** Critical success factors for World Bank projects: An empirical investigation. *International Journal of Project Management*, 30(1), 105–116.
- Kanbur, R. (2000)** "Conditionality and Debt in Africa" in Tarp, F. (ed) *Foreign Aid and Development: Lessons Learnt and Directions for the Future*, London: Routledge, pp.409-422
- Lancaster, C. (1999).** Aid effectiveness in Africa: The unfinished agenda. *Journal of African Economies*, 8(4), 487–503.
- Lesotho Highlands Development Authority, (1997).** An Overview of the Lesotho Highlands Water Project, Maseru:
- Maritu W. (1992).** Let Africa look inside Africa for the solution of its economic problems. Solutions to our predicament should come from within not from outside" (*New African*, March 1992; p.19).
- Moyo, D. (2009).** *Dead aid: Why aid is not working and how there is a better way for Africa.* Vancouver, BC, Canada: D&M Publishers.
- R, Hoover. 2001.** 'Pipe Dreams: The World Bank's failed efforts to restore lives and livelihoods of dam affected people in Lesotho,' International Rivers Network, 2001, p 7
- Richard L. Sklar and C.S Whitaker. (1991).** African Politics and problems of Development New ed. edition
- Rondinelli, D. A. (1976).** Why development projects fail: Problems of project management in developing countries. *Project Management Quarterly*, 7(7), 10–15.
- Sachs, J. D. (2005).** *The end of poverty: Economic possibilities for our time.* New York, NY: Penguin.
- Santiso, C. (2001)** "Good Governance and Aid Effectiveness: The World Bank and Conditionality", *The Georgetown Public Policy Review*, pp.1-22
- World Bank. (1997).** *Adjustment lending in Sub Saharan Africa: An update*
- World Bank. (1998).** *Assessing aid: What works, what doesn't and why.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press
- World Development Report (1991),** vol.20, No.10, pp.1481-1488