



<b>1. Project Data:</b>		<b>Date Posted :</b> 06/30/2003	
<b>PROJ ID:</b> P057459		<b>Appraisal</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>Project Name:</b> Sustainable Fisheries Management Project	<b>Project Costs (US\$M)</b>	6.0	0
<b>Country:</b> Argentina	<b>Loan/Credit (US\$M)</b>	6.0	0
<b>Sector(s):</b> Board: RDV - Animal production (80%), Central government administration (14%), Other social services (6%)	<b>Cofinancing (US\$M)</b>		
<b>L/C Number:</b> L4579			
	<b>Board Approval (FY)</b>		01
<b>Partners involved :</b>	<b>Closing Date</b>	12/31/2002	06/13/2002
<b>Prepared by :</b>	<b>Reviewed by :</b>	<b>Group Manager :</b>	<b>Group:</b>
Ridley Nelson	Patrick G. Grasso	Alain A. Barbu	OEDST
<b>2. Project Objectives and Components</b>			
<b>a. Objectives</b>			
To identify innovative and cost effective mechanisms for strengthening the ocean fisheries management capacity of the government, which could be expanded in harmony with the implementation of a "quota management system".			
<b>b. Components</b>			
1. Strengthened fisheries administration for a quota management system (US\$0.3 m). 2. Strengthened monitoring, control and surveillance (US\$7.2 m). 3. Pilot social assistance action centers for unemployed fisheries workers (US\$0.3 m). 4. Project coordination and evaluation (US\$0.7 m).			
<b>c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates</b>			
The project never became effective so there were no disbursements .			
<b>3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:</b>			
Since the project did not become effective the objectives were not achieved .			
<b>4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts:</b>			
Since the project did not become effective there were no significant outcomes or impacts . However, the PCN notes that an important piece of sector work was achieved during preparation .			
<b>5. Significant Shortcomings (including non-compliance with safeguard policies):</b>			
The PCN gives insufficient information to assess whether there were shortcomings in the preparation, appraisal, or early supervision process. However, the borrower failed to accommodate the agreed budget needs .			

<b>6. Ratings :</b>	<b>ICR</b>	<b>OED Review</b>	<b>Reason for Disagreement /Comments</b>
<b>Outcome :</b>	Not Rated	Not Rated	
<b>Institutional Dev .:</b>	Not Rated	Not Rated	
<b>Sustainability :</b>	Not Rated	Non-evaluable	
<b>Bank Performance :</b>	Not Rated	Not Rated	Not enough information in the PCN to rate performance by the Bank. There was lack of borrower ownership. Whether this could have been forecast given the rapidly deteriorating macroeconomic circumstances is unclear.
<b>Borrower Perf .:</b>	Not Rated	Unsatisfactory	While there may have been challenging macro economic circumstances, there were also apparently other problems of borrower commitment and internal agency

			conflicts.
<b>Quality of ICR :</b>		Unsatisfactory	

**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 probable that there are lessons for project preparation and appraisal but these are not identified in the PCN . There are certainly several questions . For example, why did the Fisheries Sub-secretariat not include the proposal in their budget submission? Did the Bank really do enough to understand the ownership issue? Can everything be put down to the macro-economic crisis?

**8. Assessment Recommended?**  Yes  No

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

The PCN gives little indication of whether preparation and appraisal, and also supervision over the period between approval and loan withdrawal, was satisfactory . The note is not informative and leaves a number of performance questions unanswered. Learning can often come from a PCN if the experience is carefully scrutinized .