



1. Project Data:		Date Posted : 06/15/2004	
PROJ ID: P003318		Appraisal	Actual
Project Name : (PCN) Park Rehab & Conserv	Project Costs (US\$M)	75.0	NA
Country: Zimbabwe	Loan/Credit (US\$M)	62.5	1.5
Sector(s): Board: ENV - Water supply (24%), General information and communications sector (23%), Power (23%), Roads and highways (23%), Central government administration (7%)	Cofinancing (US\$M)	5.0	0
L/C Number: C3083			
	Board Approval (FY)		98
Partners involved : GEF	Closing Date	09/30/2005	06/25/2002
Prepared by :	Reviewed by :	Group Manager :	Group:
Peter W. Whitford	John R. Heath	Alain A. Barbu	OEDST
2. Project Objectives and Components			
a. Objectives			
Basic objective: to assist the Government of Zimbabwe's ability to protect wildlife populations and their habitats and to develop the parks and wildlife sectors :			
Global environment objective: to improve biodiversity conservation in the Gonarezhou National Park and nearby South East Lowveldt areas .			
b. Components			
I. Institutional strengthening: policy development; organizational development; fund management; planning unit strengthening; park management planning; interpretive and extension capacity; research, monitoring and evaluation; training and equipment.			
II. Infrastructure: road and water supply rehabilitation, maintenance equipment, staff housing, and administrative facilities in nine national parks .			
III. GEF - Gonarezhou National Park: infrastructure rehabilitation; consultative process for local communities and other stakeholders; community-based sub-projects outside the park; and, monitoring and applied research .			
A fourth component, to repair cyclone-damaged infrastructure, was prepared in 2000, but the amendment to the Development Credit Agreement was not finalized by the time of project cancellation .			
c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates			
Key to project feasibility was the creation in 1996 of Parks and Wildlife and Conservation Fund, to receive the revenues for parks and to control their use, with the ability to service a large IDA credit . The project cost estimate, financing plan and implementation schedule appear to have been reasonable for the situation at the time of appraisal.			
3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:			
Beginning in 1999, a difficult economic and political crisis was accelerating and the country started having problems servicing its international debts . By March 2000, the government had defaulted on its loans to the Bank Group and the Bank suspended disbursements on all projects in Zimbabwe on May 16, 2000. The project was closed and all undisbursed balances cancelled on June 25, 2002.			
At the time of suspension, implementation progress was estimated at 10% and only 3.4% of the IDA Credit was disbursed, mainly for equipment and operating costs for the Project Implementation Unit . Implementation of civil works had not yet begun . For the GEF component, a draft procedures manual had been prepared but no funds were disbursed from the GEF grant.			
Therefore, essentially no progress was made in achieving the project objectives .			
4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts:			
For the reasons outlined above, there were no significant outcomes, though the preparatory work done and the first steps towards implementation would possibly have value if the project concept were to be revived at a future date .			

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

While the economic and political events that led to suspension and then cancellation were clearly beyond the control of the project agency, the Project Completion Note (PCN) also records problems with early implementation, including: a period of nine months to achieve effectiveness (specific reasons not given); delays in appointing key personnel; and shortages of counterpart funds. These events, together with the fact of six substantive conditions of effectiveness, may indicate that appraisal was premature, although the PAD does note that project preparation was unduly long, because of the time needed to agree on the Parks and Wildlife Conservation Fund. The PCN does not explain why counterpart funding remained a problem despite creation of the Fund. The PAD may have underrated project risks as "Modest".

At appraisal, the project was rated 'B' on environmental safeguards, which was appropriate, given the mainly rehabilitation nature of the project works. An Annex to the PAD summarizes the environmental analysis carried out by consultants, which constitutes a kind of Framework Environmental Assessment, with specific EAs for project works to be developed after appraisal. Some capacity building was planned. While the description of the framework EA is a bit less than comprehensive, it was generally satisfactory.

On social safeguards, there was only a statement that the project would not involve resettlement or impacts on indigenous peoples. We are not told if any populations have encroached on park boundaries or make their livelihood from park natural resources, which is a common picture in Africa, though perhaps less so in Zimbabwe at the time of appraisal.

6. Ratings:	ICR	OED Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
Outcome:	Not Rated	Not Rated	
Institutional Dev .:	Not Rated	Not Rated	
Sustainability:	Not Rated	Not Applicable	
Bank Performance:	Not Rated	Satisfactory	
Borrower Perf .:	Not Rated	Highly Unsatisfactory	Overall. Implementing agency performance, however, might be rated as (marginally) 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:

Even though the economic logic of investing in conservation is (rather, was) particularly high in Zimbabwe, due to the importance of eco-tourism, the challenges of preparing and beginning the implementation of this large operation were major. A smaller initial project might have had earlier success on which a more ambitious operation could have been built.

8. Assessment Recommended? ☐ Yes ☒ No

9. Comments on Quality of ICR:

While a PCN for a failed project offers little incentive for detailed treatment, this one is particularly brief - 3 pages of text plus two tables. While it includes the basic facts on the project and the reasons for its cancellation, the PCN might have explored a little further subjects like:

- the adequacy of the project design and the choice of a large initial project
- the treatment of potential social impacts
- whether appraisal was premature
- whether the institutional changes related to project preparation and implementation (especially the Fund) will have lasting value in the absence of IDA/GEF funding
- how much of the project design could be salvaged if the conditions which led to cancellation were to be reversed