



<b>1. Project Data:</b>		<b>Date Posted :</b> 04/02/2003	
<b>PROJ ID:</b> P007326		<b>Appraisal</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>Project Name:</b> Forest & Parks Ta (tal)	<b>Project Costs (US\$M)</b>	22.5	NA
<b>Country:</b> Haiti	<b>Loan/Credit (US\$M)</b>	21.6	NA
<b>Sector(s):</b> Board: ENV - Central government administration (38%), Forestry (33%), Micro- and SME finance (15%), Agricultural extension and research (14%)	<b>Cofinancing (US\$M)</b>		
<b>L/C Number:</b> C2920; CP648; CP959			
	<b>Board Approval (FY)</b>		97
<b>Partners involved :</b>	<b>Closing Date</b>	12/31/2001	12/31/2001
<b>Prepared by :</b>	<b>Reviewed by :</b>	<b>Group Manager :</b>	<b>Group:</b>
John R. Heath	Christopher D. Gerrard	Alain A. Barbu	OEDST
<b>2. Project Objectives and Components</b>			
<b>a. Objectives</b>			
"The overall objective of the project is to start the initial phase of intervention for the protection of critical remnants of Haiti's forest ecosystems and for slowing the pace of degradation of Haiti's natural resources " (Memorandum to the President, p. 14).			
<b>b. Components</b>			
(i) Institutional strengthening and reform, comprising support to the Ministries of Environment and Agriculture (estimated cost variously cited as US\$6.2 and US\$7.5m);			
(ii) Forest and parks management, including boundary marking, planning, monitoring (US\$3.3 and US\$3.9m, estimated);			
(iii) Support for buffer zone development, including provision of agroforestry and agriculture extension services to farmers on the edge of the protected area, and small -scale community investments (US\$7.8 and US\$9.1, estimated).			
<b>c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates</b>			
This was one of two parallel projects---the other being a structural adjustment loan ---in support of the Emergency Economic Recovery Program, in the immediate aftermath of the restoration of Haiti's first democratically elected government in 1994. The original intention was to follow-up this project with a Global Environment Facility operation. There are no data on actual project cost, owing to breakdown of dialog with government . Annex 2, Table 1 and pages 2-3 of the ICR present different figures for the estimated project cost (see section 2b above). About 80 percent of the credit was disbursed . The percentage allocation of costs by theme was as follows : Central government administration (38%); Forestry (33%); Micro and SME finance (15%); Agricultural extension and research (14%).			
<b>3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:</b>			
The project made tentative efforts to protect the forest ecosystem, but to no lasting effect . Planning and management collapsed when the project closed . There was little progress made in changing the behavior of farmers in the buffer zones.			
<b>4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts:</b>			
A draft legal and institutional framework for the co-management of the protected areas was prepared . The boundaries of the forest reserve and two national parks were drawn . Fourteen studies were completed .			
<b>5. Significant Shortcomings (including non-compliance with safeguard policies):</b>			
Quality at entry is rated unsatisfactory by the ICR, owing to the failure to adjust project design to the limited institutional capacity of the Borrower and the unrealistically high levels of counterpart funding expected from government. The insecurity of the project area made it impossible to carry out the field visits needed to assess any benefits flowing from the project. The government abruptly and unilaterally suspended all project operations in June 2001, did not respond to attempts by the Bank to conduct an orderly closure, and consistently failed in its fiduciary			

and contractual responsibilities.

6. Ratings :	ICR	OED Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
<b>Outcome :</b>	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
<b>Institutional Dev .:</b>	Negligible	Negligible	
<b>Sustainability :</b>	Highly Unlikely	Highly Unlikely	
<b>Bank Performance :</b>	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	The Bank is ultimately responsible for the unsatisfactory quality at entry reported in the ICR.
<b>Borrower Perf .:</b>	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
<b>Quality of ICR :</b>		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:**

It is not realistic to tackle ambitious environmental management objectives when governments are beset with fiscal crises and civil strife. Before proceeding with this sort of operation, political and governance issues need to be sorted out. Grant-funded technical assistance is probably more appropriate in these circumstances (APLs and LILs may also fit).

**8. Assessment Recommended?** ☐ Yes ☒ No

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

It does the best it can with the limited data available.