



1. Project Data:		Date Posted : 05/07/2004	
PROJ ID: P001759		Appraisal	Actual
Project Name : Transfrontier Conservation Areas Pilot And Institutional Strengthening Project	Project Costs (US\$M)	8.1	4.7
Country: Mozambique	Loan/Credit (US\$M)	5.0	4.7
Sector(s): Board: RDV - Other social services (48%), Central government administration (21%), Sub-national government administration (19%), Forestry (12%)	Cofinancing (US\$M)	2.6	0.0
L/C Number:			
	Board Approval (FY)		97
Partners involved : Swiss Development Corporation	Closing Date	06/30/2002	09/30/2003
Prepared by :	Reviewed by :	Group Manager :	Group:
John R. Heath	Roy Gilbert	Alain A. Barbu	OEDST
2. Project Objectives and Components			
a. Objectives			
<p>(i) Create an enabling policy and institutional environment for rehabilitating, conserving and managing Mozambique's unique natural and biodiversity endowments, using the Transfrontier Conservation Area as the central organizing principle; and</p> <p>(ii) Help implement community-based natural resource management in three border areas of Mozambique .</p>			
b. Components			
<p>(i) Institutional and Policy Development (estimated cost US\$3.4 million, actual cost US\$2.3 million), comprising strengthening of national and provincial forestry and wildlife services, support for a Geographical Information System, action plans for private sector engagement, and strengthening of collaboration with neighboring countries;</p> <p>(ii) Habitat and Wildlife Management (estimated US\$1.7 million, actual US\$1.6 million), comprising zoning and demarcation of protected areas, building or rehabilitation of infrastructure, and development of long -term management plans;</p> <p>(iii) Community Mobilization and Pilot Programs (estimated US\$1.6 million, actual US\$0.8 million), comprising participatory natural resource management programs and grant -financed community development initiatives linked to biodiversity conservation; and</p> <p>(iv) Monitoring and Evaluation (estimated US\$0.3 million, actual US\$20,000), comprising monitoring of institutional strengthening, biological status, socio-economic and community behavior and project implementation .</p>			
c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates			
<p>The project was designed as the first phase of a 10-15 year program of donor assistance . A follow-on Bank-supported Transfrontier Conservation Area and Tourism Development Project (estimated cost US\$40 million) is now being prepared. For reasons not given in the ICR, the Swiss counterpart funding pledged at grant -signing was never received. There are no details in Annex 2 on either expected or actual counterpart financing by government .</p>			
3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:			
<p>(i) Policy and institutional environment (Partially Achieved). On the one hand, central government agencies responsible for forestry and wildlife were strengthened, protected areas were successfully zoned and demarcated, and a basis for collaboration with neighboring countries and donors was successfully established . Also, long-term planning capacity was strengthened . On the other hand, there was little engagement with, or strengthening of,</p>			

provincial and local governments, and only limited outreach to the private sector (a critical partner for tourism development). Geographic information and monitoring systems were not adequately developed .

(ii) **Community-based natural resource management** (Not Achieved). Although some protected area infrastructure was built or rehabilitated, there was no significant community involvement in developing and implementing conservation activities. This is because there were no ready made models that could be imported from elsewhere and because the NGOs contracted to work with communities lacked the necessary experience and capacity .

4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts:

The project was the first to establish and develop the concept of transfrontier conservation, a principle that has subsequently been embraced by other donors and development partners .The ICR says that this small project established a platform for future conservation and tourism programs, exceeding initial expectations .

As a result of the project, the concept of Transfrontier Conservation was endorsed in one international treaty and two agreements that were signed by the heads of state of Mozambique, South Africa, Swaziland and Zimbabwe .

The project has leveraged funding of protected areas from KfW, USAID and Ford .

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

The ICR states that quality at entry was unsatisfactory for the following reasons . First, the government showed little interest in the project when it was being prepared . Second, the project's objectives were overambitious given government's limited capacity and the country's recent emergence from a protracted civil war : specifically, the community mobilization component did not take adequate account of the very poor infrastructure in the three Transfrontier Conservation Areas and the lack of experience of the government and local NGOs in implementing community-based natural resource management programs . Third, the design of the project did not sufficiently address the prospect that some communities living in the protected areas might have to be resettled . Section 9 of the ICR also casts doubt on the ownership of the project concept : when consulted during the ICR mission some partners questioned whether the the principle of Transfrontier Conservation has spread wider than a handful of people in the capital of Mozambique .

There were also failings during project implementation . First, although the project did not lead to involuntary resettlement (there was no safeguard violation), during implementation, more attempt could have been made to explore the various policy options for addressing the needs of communities living in the protected areas . Second, the component for monitoring and evaluation, which the ICR describes as adequately designed, was not seen as a priority and was poorly implemented .

The potential linkage of biodiversity protection to tourism was only made halfway through implementation when (somewhat fortuitously, according to the ICR) the project unit was transferred from the Ministry of Agriculture to the Ministry of Tourism. However, the Borrower (Annex 8) queries the relevance to Mozambique of neighboring countries' experience in linking tourism to conservation : the most promising initiatives involve sport hunting of abundant wildlife which is not possible in Mozambique where the fauna were substantially depleted during twenty years of war. Doubts about the feasibility of community-based tourism were also expressed by some of the partners consulted during the ICR mission (Section 9 of the ICR).

6. Ratings:	ICR	OED Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
Outcome:	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	[The ICR's 4-point scale does not allow for a "moderately sat." rating]. For a rating of satisfactory the project would need to have substantially achieved its two stated objectives.
Institutional Dev .:	Substantial	Modest	There was little or no impact at the provincial or local level and no response by private investors.
Sustainability :	Likely	Unlikely	The prospect of further donor funding is not a sufficient guarantee of sustainability . The Lessons section notes that for long-term sustainability provincial and district governments need to be more

			explicitly involved in managing the conservation areas.
Bank Performance :	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	As the ICR acknowledges, quality at entry was unsatisfactory, because the project design was unrealistic and there was inadequate assurance of government commitment. While the ICR indicates Bank supervision missions provided high-quality technical assistance, the overall supervision effort is rated unsatisfactory because: project reporting was weak, with data on Bank inputs missing from July 1996 to December 2000; the recorded supervision cost is about US\$125,000 per year, roughly double the Bank average, absorbing 16 percent of the actual project cost; there were six task managers; no attempt was made to revise the overambitious project objectives; more attention should have been paid to the resettlement implications for communities in areas designated for protection.
Borrower Perf. :	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Quality of ICR :		Satisfactory	

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

7. Lessons of Broad Applicability:

- After a major civil war it is unreasonable to expect governments to give conservation objectives first priority; the immediate task is to rebuild, starting with the areas that are already populated or which can be settled rather than protected areas which are typically more thinly-populated.
- Addressing the needs of communities living in currently designated protected areas --or in areas slated to be so designated--needs to be given top priority, agreement being reached with all interested parties before the project is approved. Communities and local and provincial governments need to be involved in the project right from the beginning, particularly where resettlement may be involved.
- If communities are to help protect biodiversity their land rights need to be codified and their boundaries demarcated; land rights are a pre-requisite for communities to win a stake in the benefits that may eventually flow from eco-tourism. Communities with land rights will better placed to negotiate with government agencies and private investors seeking to promote tourism in their neighborhood.

8. Assessment Recommended? ☐ Yes ☒ No

9. Comments on Quality of ICR:

The ICR provides a sufficient level of detail to make it possible to rate the achievement of objectives (Table 1 is particularly helpful), even though there is a shortage of quantitative data owing to the failure to develop a monitoring system. The Lessons Learned section is very detailed but could perhaps have queried the appropriateness of launching a project of this nature in the immediate aftermath of war.