



1. Project Data

Project ID P171114	Project Name ZIRP		
Country Zimbabwe	Practice Area(Lead) Urban, Resilience and Land		
L/C/TF Number(s) IDA-D5090	Closing Date (Original) 30-Jun-2023	Total Project Cost (USD) 72,490,629.98	
Bank Approval Date 16-Jul-2019	Closing Date (Actual) 30-Jun-2023		
	IBRD/IDA (USD)	Grants (USD)	
Original Commitment	72,000,000.00	0.00	
Revised Commitment	72,000,000.00	0.00	
Actual	72,490,629.98	0.00	
Prepared by Paul Robert Honeybone	Reviewed by Vibecke Dixon	ICR Review Coordinator Avjeet Singh	Group IEGSD (Unit 4)

2. Project Objectives and Components

a. Objectives

The Project Development Objective (PDO) was “to address the early and medium-term resilient disaster recovery needs of cyclone-affected people”.

The two-fold objective is consistent throughout, from the Project Appraisal Document (PAD) (e.g. page 1, p.15), in the Financial Agreement (Grant Agreement D509-ZW).



For the purpose of the analysis in this ICRR, the PDO will be parsed into the following two objectives:

1. To address the early resilient disaster recovery needs of cyclone-affected people; and
2. To address the medium-term resilient disaster recovery needs of cyclone-affected people.

b. Were the project objectives/key associated outcome targets revised during implementation?

No

c. Will a split evaluation be undertaken?

No

d. Components

The project had three components:

Component 1: Providing Immediate Support for Cyclone Recovery (Estimated cost at appraisal: US\$27 million. Actual cost at completion: US\$31.63 million.)

This component provided immediate, integrated livelihoods and healthcare solutions to cyclone-affected people, including: (a) restoration of livelihoods through conditional cash transfers for food assistance, and through unconditional cash transfers for the most vulnerable groups; (b) restoration of agricultural crop and livestock production, including distribution of agricultural inputs for small farmer households, and the restocking and treatment of livestock and poultry; and (c) provision of basic health services, including a basic package of health services, GBV and sexual exploitation and assault (SEA) support services, child protection measures, and education services. It also financed project management and overhead costs for these activities, such as needs and beneficiary assessments, preparation of technical designs, and technical quality control.

Component 2: Enabling Medium-Term Cyclone Recovery and Resilience-building (Estimated cost at appraisal: US\$33.40 million. Actual cost at completion: US\$32.48 million.)

This component supported the rehabilitation of critical community infrastructure, such as: water and sanitation systems, irrigation networks, community schools, and community roads; as well as community-level risk reduction efforts such as slope protection and environmental rehabilitation. It also financed project management and overhead costs for these activities, such as needs and beneficiary assessments, preparation of technical designs, and technical quality control.

Component 3: Providing Project Management and Technical Assistance (Estimated cost at appraisal: US\$8.60 million. Cost at completion: US\$7.89 million.)

This component included: (a) Project management support to the *United Nations Office for Project Services* (UNOPS) for overall coordination and oversight function and for centralized project services across all components, including monitoring and evaluation (M&E), environmental and social systems, technical quality assurance, grievance redressal, GBV/SEA and referral and protection systems, and for engaging independent verification assessment (IVA) services for project results validation; and (b) technical assistance, which included supporting community risk assessments, monitoring and preparedness planning,



community infrastructure damage assessments, displacement monitoring and targeting systems, health information and epidemic surveillance systems, project strategic communications, and citizen engagement.

Plus, an **Unallocated Amount** (allocation at appraisal:US\$3.0 million. Actual cost at completion: US\$0.0 million.) US\$3 million was unallocated (i.e. under 4.2% of the total grant was classified as unallocated at the outset). The July 2022 restructuring formalized this allocation.

Restructuring:

In July 2022 when US\$69.9 million was already disbursed, the project underwent one relatively minor restructuring. This rounded out allocations, rather than lead to a distinct shift in focus.

- a. Unallocated funds (US\$3 million). These funds were programmed as follows: (i) US\$2.5 million to Component 1 to scale up the livelihood activities implemented through the Project; and (ii) US\$0.5 million to Component 1 to scale up the health interventions implemented through the Project.
- b. Reallocation of funds between Components. The grant amount was reallocated between the three components to harmonize Project-level disbursements, expenditures, and commitments by component.

The restructuring refined the Results Framework (RF). This increased five targets and more precisely specified them as estimated ranges were formulated at approval. Two targets were revised downwards (90km of road rehabilitation rather than the original target range of 142 – 203kms; and 12-14 wards with risk mitigation infrastructure constructed rather than 14 – 20 wards). Three new intermediate indicators were added to capture the Project's investments in (i) health, (ii) gender-based violence (GBV) support services, and (iii) education. The Citizen Engagement indicator was also adjusted to better measure Project responsiveness and timeliness in redressing grievances. Since the changes to the RF increased five targets, and the downscaling of two indicator targets were relatively minor compared to the overall project, a split rating will not be done.

e. Comments on Project Cost, Financing, Borrower Contribution, and Dates

Project Cost

The total project cost of the Zimbabwe Idai Recovery Project (ZIRP) was US\$ 72.00 million (Original and Revised). The Actual disbursed cost was US\$ 72,490,630.

Financing

The Zimbabwe Idai Recovery Project (ZIRP) was fully financed by an IDA Grant.

Borrower Contribution

There was no borrower contribution (planned or actual) at appraisal.

Dates



The project was approved on July 16, 2019 (Grant Agreement signed July 22nd, 2019), with the project becoming effective on July 29, 2019. The MTR was conducted on September 9, 2021, while the original and actual closing date was June 30, 2023.

Other changes

As noted above (Section D, Components), there was one minor restructuring late in the project. This primarily resulted in final fund allocations to round-out disbursements, along with some improved target indicator specification.

3. Relevance of Objectives

Rationale

Context: Zimbabwe was in a state of fragility with ongoing vulnerability and increasing poverty prior to the regional disaster and humanitarian situation unfolding from the impact of Cyclone Idai. The cyclone made landfall in Zimbabwe on March 15, 2019. It heavily damaged properties, crops, livestock, and basic infrastructure in the eastern provinces. This resulted in several hundred deaths and 270,000 people in need of humanitarian assistance, including 129,600 children and 60,000 newly displaced people.

The Government of Zimbabwe (GoZ) declared an emergency on March 16, 2019; seeking emergency relief in a letter (dated April 11, 2019) requesting funding. They provided no objection to the direct channeling of funds outside of the Government e.g. through UN agencies. Zimbabwe was in non-accrual status (an inability to repay loans) since October 2000, making the country ineligible to receive funding from the IDA and the World Bank. The Bank agreed to mobilize emergency support across all sectors and to provide exceptional financing on grant terms from the IDA Crisis Response Window (CRW) to the *United Nations Office for Project Services* (UNOPS).

Alignment with Country Priorities:

The project objective furthered key priorities (e.g., water use efficiency) in Zimbabwe's National Climate Change Response Strategy from 2015, which remained in effect. It accorded with the GoZ's National Development Strategy 1 (2021-2025) (NDS1), which set ambitious targets, e.g., regarding rural water access. The objective also aligned with the GoZ's *Vision 2030*, which covered wide-ranging factors, e.g., sanitation infrastructure, health care, and gender equality.

Alignment to World Bank Strategies:

Given Zimbabwe's non-accrual status with the Bank, there was no World Bank *Country Partnership Framework* (CPF) or *Country Partnership Strategy* (CPS). However, the engagement was well aligned with World Bank strategic initiatives. Following the 2022 World Bank Zimbabwe *Country Economic Memorandum* (CEM), the project was consistent with the Bank's guidance on increasing productivity, jobs, and macroeconomic growth. The project was also aligned with the ambitions of the *Zimbabwe Reconstruction Fund* (ZIMREF).

Bank Experience:

With a humanitarian crisis unfolding and the country cut-off from direct development financing, the Bank was instrumental in advancing recovery finance. The Bank brought technical expertise in FCV contexts to



help design and operationalize the recovery programs. It acted as a trusted convener and provided support for GoZ-led coordination through outside technical assistance, grant resourcing, and through the Project's engagement and guidance mechanisms e.g. steering committees.

Regional Rationale and Priorities:

Following the regional states of emergency being declared, the Bank prepared a broader regional package comprising a set of operations totaling around US\$700 million in IDA resources. This included up to US\$545 million from the CRW to support response in Malawi, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe. This response was aimed at mitigating the crisis, negative spillovers, and population displacement to other countries to strengthen the effectiveness of IDA's humanitarian response. The operation met the emergency provisions under Section III Paragraph 12, Projects in Situations of Urgent Need of Assistance or Capacity Constraints of the Bank Policy: Investment Project Financing.

Level of the PDO:

Overall, the PDO focused on both immediate and medium-term disaster recovery needs, which is acceptable given the emergency situation and in a fragile post-disaster context.

The PDO formulation was relevant to the circumstances, and the overall rating is Substantial.

Rating

Substantial

4. Achievement of Objectives (Efficacy)

OBJECTIVE 1

Objective

Address the early resilient disaster recovery needs of cyclone-affected people.

Rationale

Theory of Change:

The PAD's Theory of Change (ToC) was logical, but largely limited to output specification. It focused on types of input allocation (labelled as activities) resulting in outputs (also activity description). The output of these activities (the number of people benefiting) were called outcomes. The objective was restated at the end of the results chain as a high-level outcome. The ToC in the ICR followed the same pattern, thus focusing on quantifying essentially output-level results. Objective 1 captures the initial wave of response activities. This was "immediate recovery and strengthening coping mechanisms for cyclone affected communities". This focused on three activity areas: (i) addressing food vulnerability, (ii) supporting agriculture and livestock production, along with (iii) basic social support services (i.e. health, GBV and education services). These activities were expected to lead to the following outputs: food assistance provided, seeds, tools and fencing distributed, Vaccinated/treated livestock, Healthcare, medicine, GBV and education services and training



provided. These outputs were in turn expected to lead to the following outcomes: people benefiting from conditional and unconditional cash transfers, households benefiting from provision of agricultural inputs and livestock support, people reached with accelerated basic package health, GBV and education services. These three outcomes were expected to feed into the objective of Immediate cyclone recovery and strengthening coping mechanisms for cyclone affected communities.

Outputs

Emergency Livelihood assistance for early recovery provided

- 239,324 people received cash transfers in the first 18 months, significantly exceeding the target range of 67-96,000. This included 5,776 people receiving cash-for work payments (no target).
 - Of the total 239,324 people who received cash transfers, 151,165 were women and girls, significantly exceeding the target range of 33-48,000.
- 142,864 female headed households benefitted from conditional and unconditional cash transfers for food, significantly more than the target range of 27-38,000.
- 1,645 displaced people benefited from conditional and unconditional cash transfers for food, substantially fewer than anticipated an 13-19,000. This reflected the reality that many Internally Displaced People (IDPs) left camps quickly to either integrate into host communities or move away from the affected districts.

Agricultural crop and livestock production restored

- 22,027 households benefitted from agricultural inputs and livestock support, achieving the target of 22,000, including:

Agricultural:

- 2,320 households benefited from the establishment of 64 community gardens
- 1,753 metric tons of drought tolerant rainfed crops and fertilizers provided to restore self-reliance and improving production yields

Livestock:

- 1,605 metric tons of cattle feed, 175,000 kgs of poultry feed, black soldier fly (BSF) production intensification services to 500 poultry farmers, and 1,260 goats supplied (with associated training and support led for improved productivity).
- 3,044,003 livestock treated/vaccinated, exceeding the original target range of 2,068,200 – 2,954,500 animals. This included: 483,256 cattle, 500,000 sheep and goats, and 2,178,234 birds received disease treatments (e.g. deworming and vaccinations), reduced six diseases and resulted in less tick-borne disease, death and increased productivity.

Accelerating the revitalization of basic package health, Gender-based Violence (GBV) and educational services



- 661,692 people provided with integrated healthcare support (coordinated by WHO, UNICEF, and UNFPA) exceeding the target of 619,074.
- 12,111 people reached through the mobile One Stop Centre with GBV services, exceeding the target of 8,600 people.
- 88,516 students, including 43,410 girls, benefiting from education services, achieving the targets (88,000 and 43,000 respectively).

Outcomes

The RF lacked indicators at outcome level beyond number of beneficiaries. The achieved outputs did however clearly contribute to the objective of early resilient disaster recovery. The outputs were comprehensively delivered and relevant in the given context, all targets were achieved or exceeded. Objective 1 is thus rated High.

Rating
High

OBJECTIVE 2

Objective

Address the medium-term resilient disaster recovery needs of cyclone-affected people.

Rationale

Theory of Change:

This objective captures the second wave of response activities focusing on the rehabilitation of damaged community infrastructure, including the construction of schools, community health facilities, community access roads, water supply systems, markets, and community risk reduction and protection work. The activities were expected to lead to the following four outputs: repaired water systems and sanitation facilities (WASH facilities), restored storm drains, contours, terraces, water ways among others, repaired schools including construction of new classroom blocks and sanitation facilities, and repaired roads, irrigation schemes and erosion control measures e.g. slope protection. These outputs were in turn expected to lead to the following outcome: people benefiting from rehabilitated community infrastructure and risk reduction interventions.

The ToC did not specify what kind of outcomes were to be expected from these outputs beyond number of beneficiaries. With the RF presented a range of relevant metrics as 'PDO indicators', these were essentially output-level reporting.

Outputs:

Rehabilitating communal WASH facilities



- 44,106 households benefitted from the rehabilitation of damaged communal WASH facilities (households with restored access to water and sanitation), exceeding the target of 35,000 (increased from the original range of 10,000 to 14,400 households).

Restoring communal irrigation schemes in support of agrarian livelihoods

- 6 damaged communal irrigation schemes were restored, where the target was 7–9 schemes. Some schemes were descope due to technical complexity, implementation risks, and time limitations. The irrigation schemes finished had commercial and O&M Plans completed.

Rehabilitate damaged community schools

- 5,921 students benefited from restored education services, exceeding the target of 3,200-4,500 students.
- This included 2,884 girl students, exceeding the target of 1,500-2,200 girls.

Rehabilitate damaged community and risk mitigation infrastructure

- 82.47 kilometers of roads were rehabilitated across 11 roads, short of the target of 90km of rehabilitated roads. Overall, 346,002 people benefiting from rehabilitated community infrastructure and risk reduction interventions. This exceeded the target of 270,000 people.

Number of wards with risk mitigation infrastructure constructed

- 13 wards had risk mitigation infrastructure constructed. This met the revised target of 12-14 wards, but fell short of the original target of 14-20 wards.

Additional achievements reported by the ICR but not included in the RF, and hence without target values, were:

- 94 sanitation facilities improved across 32 health facilities, and 482 communal water points were developed that contributed to water and sanitation systems
- 437 community latrine builders were trained
- 94 sanitation facilities improved across 32 health facilities, and 482 communal water points were developed that contributed to water and sanitation systems
- 150 community health volunteers and 451 village health workers trained on participatory health and hygiene education
- Community school rehabilitation included the rehabilitation of 7 schools, with 429 sanitation facilities also improved across 48 schools
- 26 farmer field schools were established for watershed planning and management
- 4 health facilities were rehabilitated, and 1 women's market was rehabilitated.

Outcomes

While some output targets were not achieved, most were achieved and some exceeded the targeted number of beneficiaries under this objective. The achieved outputs did however clearly contribute to the objective of



addressing medium-term resilient disaster recovery needs. However, the results framework lacked indicators at outcome level beyond number of beneficiaries. Since the objective was pertaining to medium term resilient recovery needs, the indicators could go beyond the people benefitting from rehabilitation measures and specifically include whether the rehabilitated works met any given resilient standards to demonstrate resilience. Given the shortcomings in achievement of some outputs, as well as lack of outcome indicators that adequately reflected medium-term resilience, Objective 2 is thus rated Substantial.

Rating
Substantial

OVERALL EFFICACY

Rationale

The first objective is rated High as all outcome targets were exceeded. The targeted number of beneficiaries for both immediate and medium-term support were exceeded. The second objective is rated Substantial due to shortcomings in achievement of some outputs, and for the lack of relevant indicators to adequately reflect that the outputs met the resilient standards. Overall Efficacy is rated Substantial.

Overall Efficacy Rating

Substantial

5. Efficiency

Economic efficiency:

The total ERR for all investments relating to the two components was estimated at 63 percent over a 15-year period. The NPV is estimated at US\$256 million at a 12 percent discount rate (US\$446 million at a 6 percent discount rate). A number of channels of impact were analyzed and sensitivity tested. Notably, the channel of emergency food, nutrition and livelihood produced an ERR of 73%, based on the NPV of US\$107 million at a 12% discount rate (ICR source 8.e, p 44).

The original PAD calculated ERRs in three key areas of activity at appraisal, namely:

(a) food and cash assistance at 28% – based on improved health and nutrition, and lives saved, including improved community infrastructure and skills acquired through for-for-assets.

(b) rehabilitating WASH services at 27% – based on the value of improved health outcomes and saved lives, premised on restored water and sanitation e.g. toilets in households, rehabilitation of water systems, and female and child-friendly toilets in schools and clinics.



(c) rehabilitating damaged community infrastructure at 33% – based on a PAD estimate of 216 km of road in poor and fair condition rehabilitated at an average cost of US\$40,000 per km.

Post-completion analysis presented substantially higher ERRs: (a) from 28% to 73%, (b) 27% to 47%, and (c) 33% to 63%. The actual number of project beneficiaries vastly exceeded the number used for the PAD analysis (e.g., 209,023 persons benefiting from the unconditional cash transfer program versus the 59,400 in the PAD).

Additional spillover effects and positive externalities are likely to be under-reported so as to take a conservative approach; and as data on wider economic impacts was not available. Further, without the project interventions to provide immediate relief for cyclone recovery, the economic cost of the disaster would have been considerably higher due to vastly higher death and illness rates and difficulties in accessing economic opportunities among beneficiaries. The costs of this potential ‘downward spiral’ were not calculated.

Administrative efficiency

Administrative efficiency was high, with a partnership-driven approach and resources reaching those in need ‘on the ground’. The project did not experience any noteworthy slippage due to Covid-19. Overall, the project disbursed resources in a timely fashion, and the project closed per the original closing date. There was TTL and key staff consistency through delivery. The results across the board provided a strong basis, supported by operational delivery performance, to produce a rating of high efficiency.

Efficiency Rating

High

a. If available, enter the Economic Rate of Return (ERR) and/or Financial Rate of Return (FRR) at appraisal and the re-estimated value at evaluation:

	Rate Available?	Point value (%)	*Coverage/Scope (%)
Appraisal	✓	0	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
ICR Estimate	✓	63.00	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable

* Refers to percent of total project cost for which ERR/FRR was calculated.

6. Outcome

Despite the lack of a CPS for Zimbabwe due to the country’s non-accrual status, the relevance of objectives is rated substantial given the alignment with the country's priorities and the regional context. Efficacy is rated Substantial. While the first objective to address immediate resilient disaster recovery needs is rated as High, the second objective related to addressing the medium-term disaster recovery needs is rated as substantial due to minor shortcomings in the achievement of outputs, as well as lack of project results at outcome level beyond



number of beneficiaries. Efficiency is rated High based on high economic returns and administrative efficiency. The overall outcome rating is thus Satisfactory.

a. **Outcome Rating**
Satisfactory

7. Risk to Development Outcome

Government Risk: The Government of Zimbabwe's (GoZ) ability to sustain the development outcome may be limited. While capacity building expenditure indirectly supported the GoZ e.g., healthcare outputs and related training helped to strengthen the country's healthcare system, and the GoZ's commitment was high to continue building on the outcomes of disaster recovery with continued longer-term resilience building, fiscal constraints remained significant, limiting service provision continuity. Additionally, many UNOPS staff departed the country at the conclusion of the project, reducing support to the operations.

Economic Risk: Zimbabwe's weak economic position presented a fundamental ongoing risk. The support for mitigation investment (e.g., flooding prevention and roading infrastructure), asset maintenance and service continuity is likely to be hampered by wider macro-economic circumstances. The continuance of high macroeconomic risk and inflationary pressures appeared enduring at completion.

Technical Risk: Due to Zimbabwe's resource and capacity-restricted Disaster and Risk Management (DRM) institutional context, technical risk continued to remain unabated by the project, given it only sought to be a stop-gap emergency response and initial recovery measure. There was some expectation that UN TA agencies would retain a presence and have a high commitment to ongoing support. The World Bank maintains an office in Harare, providing technical support through other Trust fund activities.

Institutional Risk: Institutional-level risks are not reported. They may continue to feature as barriers to progress towards long-run disaster resilience outcomes. Transitional arrangements were put in place for ongoing management and maintenance to help mitigate and manage this risk, but as noted under Government risks, it is likely to be difficult to sustain progress.

Political Risk: Volatility of the political system is likely to remain a risk due to (a) limited government investment in infrastructure and DRM systems progress, and (b) the likelihood of further unprecedented climate-related events occurring.

8. Assessment of Bank Performance

a. **Quality-at-Entry**

Emergency circumstances resulted in a fast establishment phase. Following Cyclone Idai and GoZ's request for assistance being received, the Bank utilized emergency procedures to prepare the project and received Board approval in three months. Channeling support directly to the people of Zimbabwe as part of a regional three-country approach (with Malawi and Mozambique) was deemed the best strategy.



The Bank undertook a remote Rapid Post Disaster Estimation and led a multi-sector Rapid Impact Assessment to quantify the extent of damages and losses, verify the need for emergency resources and inform the design of the project.

There was a clear understanding of the problems to be solved in light of the overarching risk present – namely inaction to provide support. A whole-of-Bank approach to preparation across sectors was important in achieving approval. The approach taken saw a team of 42 people across 9 technical disciplines in the Bank helped to facilitate the rapid startup. Technical, financial and economic aspects were well considered and benefited from the team approach.

Environmental and Social (E&S) safeguards were evident, although gender-related considerations were added after the delivery of the first component, introducing a weakness in the short-term response planning and delivery.

From a fiduciary perspective, given Zimbabwe's status, UNOPS was selected to be the implementing agency as the project recipient of the IDA grant, the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) and the technical coordinator. Speed was evident, with the grant being declared effective within two weeks of approval, and the first disbursement was released on August 8, 2019. Fiduciary competency and systems were a precursor to UNOPS engagement, and the Bank established a sound approach.

Given Zimbabwe's non-accrual status and institutional circumstances, the Bank ensured the government's involvement by mobilizing additional trust fund resources (US\$3 million technical assistance program through the Zimbabwe Reconstruction Fund (ZIMREF) for a Zimbabwe Recovery and Resilience Framework (ZRRF) and to help strengthen government-led systems for DRM and emergency responses. The Bank formed a Consultative Group (CG) during preparation to engage the GoZ in consultations. The GoZ endorsed the Bank's strategic multi-sectoral plan, enabling government coordination, input, and some influence on recovery and resilience during project implementation.

M&E arrangements with UNOPS ensured strong output management and delivery oversight. Outcome assessment appeared limited based on what has been reported. Overall, the Bank's capacity, including its inputs and processes, proved fit-for-purpose and flexible enough to handle establishing unconventional arrangements, i.e. UNOPS as recipient. Recognizing no GoZ funding was available, the project took a capacity building approach with the government. Prior DRM lessons were drawn upon in design and establishment. Despite this, due to the lack of relevant outcome indicators, the quality-at-entry, recognizing the difficult nature of the situation and the timeliness of the response achieved, is rated as Satisfactory.

Quality-at-Entry Rating

Satisfactory

b. Quality of supervision

Under the Banks' supervisory role, UNOPS assumed the role of grant recipient and implementing partner. The project was contingent on a high level of collaboration and dialogue with the Bank guiding and managing other key stakeholders such as the GoZ. With the project being the only Investment Project Financing (IPF) Bank project in Zimbabwe, it benefited from the support of Bank sectoral experts across



Agriculture, Disaster Risk Management, Education, Health, Social Protection, and Water Practices, working closely with their international counterparts.

The Bank provided implementation support through in country and virtual missions during the project operation. These were initially monthly, then reduced over the project life to bimonthly and quarterly frequencies. Nine ISRs were filed that systematically documented project performance. These highlighted challenges faced by the project and agreed steps to address them.

The Bank's Environment and Social (E&S) staff conducted technical missions and monthly progress meetings to ensure due diligence throughout. Task Team leadership changed once during implementation. The project was effectively restructured mid-term with good local and international teams coordination.

UNOPS provided data and input to the ICR. It also conducted its own evaluation, noting the operating model successful and replicable to address other potential future crises. When providing rapid cross-cutting project management and specific engineering services in post disaster and post crisis response, UNOPS had the ability to establish mechanisms to coordinate with national and local structures while retaining full fiduciary control. This aided Bank over-sight.

The community engagement focus that the Bank emphasized throughout the project helped foster local ownership for continued management of interventions. Starting just after the MTR, Bank sector specialists worked with UN partners to ensure sustainability programming in all UNOPS and TA interventions to guarantee proper mechanisms for post-closure maintenance and sustainability of assets. The Bank ensured training for Asset Management Committees (AMCs) with closure handovers of context-specific operational and maintenance manuals.

The quality of supervision is rated Highly Satisfactory.

Quality of Supervision Rating

Highly Satisfactory

Overall Bank Performance Rating

Satisfactory

9. M&E Design, Implementation, & Utilization

a. M&E Design

The project's PDO was clear and aligned to the emergency response need, ensuring both flexible short-run responsiveness and longer-run community-embedded resilience building. While the baseline performance levels were estimated in a rapid appraisal phase, the two objectives (short-term support and medium-term rehabilitation) were clear.



The Results Framework (RF) identified relevant output indicators. However, the indicators at the outcome level were limited to the number of beneficiaries without demonstrating and reporting on results beyond that, especially pertinent for the second objective regarding medium-term resilient disaster recovery needs.

Initial target estimates proved relatively accurate, given the crisis response circumstances. The recovery disbursement targets under Objective 1 were delivered (or exceeded) within 18 months of implementation and were not revised.

b. M&E Implementation

The indicators in the Results Framework were comprehensively measured and reported. As the agency responsible for M&E data provision to the Bank, UNOPS collected, verified and collated results from the TAs on a monthly basis, analyzing the data to produce monthly reports. Beyond the Banks' RF indicators, UNOPS monitored a total of 106 indicators at the activity and output level. UNOPS established the project's management information system (MIS) to integrate eight UN TA-specific M&E reports. This was upgraded in Year 2 to include a risks and issues log, procurement results, lessons learned, and the triangulation of programmatic and financial results. Data and reporting updates were submitted on a monthly basis for verification with the PIU, in addition to procurement, financial, and safeguards information.

The weakness in Objective 2 where resilience-building developments did not cover the delivery of health, GBV and education services, was corrected during implementation. However the consideration of outcome assessment and analysis (i.e. getting beyond the drive for a wide suite of appropriate output metrics) did not influence M&E implementation.

High levels of project engagement and consultation with beneficiaries helped to define, and in some cases refine, target indicators. The fiduciary and safeguards reports were provided by UNOPS. Targets were revised to better reflect viable results and realistic outputs at restructuring.

To ensure compliance and data quality, the project employed Independent Verification Assessments (IVAs). Seven IVA processes were carried out from July 2019 to June 2023 on a biannual basis. These served to further verify the collected M&E data and triangulate through field assessments. The first three IVA processes were carried out remotely due to COVID-19 pandemic related movement restrictions, with the final four performed in-country and with field visits. Owing to detailed field monitoring and reporting, the IVAs were able to verify the achievements of all outcome indicators and review the implementation of all E&S measures.

c. M&E Utilization

M&E findings were well communicated to key decision-making groups and wider involved stakeholders such as the Government of Zimbabwe. The M&E system provided data almost exclusively at either an output level, or on project performance to inform project management and decision making. It helped identify where progress was lagging in areas such as procurement, implementation, and activity results against expenditures. UNOPS submitted quarterly updates on overall project implementation to all stakeholders, facilitating decision making at Control Group meetings.



The system identified where beneficiaries could be maximized and where resources could be most quickly and effectively deployed. Results were updated monthly through the MIS, with clear geographical and site-specific information. This helped monitoring, including assessments of expenditure progress against results. It enabled CG meetings to focus on lagging activities or other issues needing attention.

The M&E system helped to shape restructuring, with information highlighting the need to revise targets and reallocate funds. It also highlighted areas where stronger connections could be made between the proximate activities of different UN TAs (such as ensuring that a new school constructed by one TA would be supported by infrastructure built by another TA). Based on the results and assessment findings of the seven IVAs conducted bi-annually, each IVA resulted in a series of recommendations for UNOPS and UN TAs.

However, data to provide evidence of achievement of outcomes was a weakness not remedied. In summary, the M&E system enabled a systemic tracking of project progress, and flagged issues for rapid remediation in the delivery of outputs. It provided a layer of verification and validation through the IVA process, that was used to inform decisions on project implementation, agency performance, and compliance. Outcome assessment which was especially pertinent for the second objective was limited, and thus the overall M&E rating is Substantial.

M&E Quality Rating

Substantial

10. Other Issues

a. Safeguards

Safeguards were managed through the World Bank's Environmental and Social Framework (2017), that sets out a suite of requirements for borrowers relating to the identification and assessment of environmental and social risks. Following this regime, Environment and Social (E&S) Risk was assessed as Moderate at the time of design. The project complied with all applicable ESF standards.

The E&S risk level throughout the project remained rated as Moderate. An operationalized Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) with an accompanying Environmental and Social Commitment Plan (ESCP), and Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) were completed, complying with requirements. The Assessment and Management of Environmental and Social Risks and Impacts at project close, was rated Satisfactory.

The ESMF was finalized and disclosed before Board approval. This was revised after six months of implementation to harmonize TA screening processes. A second ESMF revision took place in January 2021 as the project transitioned to medium-term recovery to optimize the monitoring and reporting facilitated by UNOPS's Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS).

The Bank conducted Environmental and Social Standards (ESS) capacity building to support this first-of-a-kind operation with UN entity delivering a complex emergency response. This included intensive Bank



support for ESS compliance owing to the lack of UNOPS staff experience, and Bank organized training on the ESMF for all implementing agencies.

The UNOPS Project Implementation Unit (PIU) employed an Environmental Specialist and a Social Officer to lead the implementation of the ESMF. To address requirements, UNOPS set up a Community of Practice (COP) that hosted quarterly meetings at TA focal points, a Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM), and incident management protocols, a Gender Action Plan (GAP), and Labor Management Procedures (LMP). From an operational perspective, each TA appointed an E&S focal person to coordinate the activities and ensure they were consistent with ESMF requirements.

Gender-based violence (GBV), child protection, and a female inclusion lens were applied to support mainstream sensitization and raise awareness about support services and protection. GBV interventions were scaled up through the project. It was reported that an emphasis on GBV concerns generated positive results in infrastructure prioritization, for example, with a more female-friendly latrine design adopted nationwide.

To address environmental and social risk compliance, a number of key activities were delivered given circumstances faced in the project. These included:

- E&S screenings of local projects – 360 screenings were reviewed by the PIU.
- “Moderate Risk” activities were reviewed by the Bank and GoZ with detailed ESMPs, resulting in all measures being implemented in full by the TAs. “High Risk” activities were not permitted.
- Occupational Health and Safety (OH&S) – a total of 43 occupational health and safety incidents were reported during implementation, which were managed and closed.
- Implementation Grievances – a total of 1,311 Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) cases were received, addressed, and closed (all but one was closed within 45 days). The GRM included: local help desks, suggestions boxes, direct TA personnel engagement, direct local leadership engagement, direct local government engagement, a toll-free phone line, and the dissemination of 10,000 GRM posters and 10,000 GRM cards.

Emerging issues management – 2 incidents were flagged, being the identification of asbestos waste and a livestock mortality event (goat deaths), where the responses were effective and in-compliance, i.e. an Asbestos Management Plan was developed and Best Practice Standards for livestock restocking were developed.

Overall, the project invested in ESF Framework compliance, addressing the Environmental and Social Standards. This led to a project-assigned Satisfactory rating. The moderate risk classification identified at project initiation was reviewed on a regular basis as required, remaining unchanged. In summary, the project was deemed to have complied with relevant ESF standards. The Assessment and Management of Environmental and Social Risks and Impacts at project close was rated Satisfactory.

b. Fiduciary Compliance

Procurement:



As permitted under the World Bank’s Alternative Procurement Arrangements (APA), UNOPS followed its procurement procedures. Moderate delays in procurement owing to external or macro factors such as the COVID-19 pandemic, inflation, and availability of supplies, were resolved. Measures taken to review and enhance procurement capacity, resulted in the allocation of more resources to procurement delivery, and consolidation to bulk-buy items with joint procurement across TAs, (e.g. Covid-19 personal protective equipment).

At the same time, in other cases where a consistent supply of specific construction materials was lacking, the project sped-up procurement by splitting purchasing into lots. The procurement teams worked with local trade associations to build a database of vendors with adequate experience and capacity to participate in tenders. They added optional site visits to the tendering process of major procurement activities to improve results.

The project worked to improve procurement reporting and clarified procurement performance during implementation, e.g., by tracking the stages of procurement at the component level. Procurement performance was rated Satisfactory or Moderately Satisfactory throughout the project.

Financial Management (FM):

UNOPS’s finance team was responsible for implementation, employing the Bank’s disbursement guidelines. They submitted Interim Financial Reports and cash flow forecasts regularly in form and content satisfactory to the Bank. Other FM arrangements, including budgeting, accounting, internal controls, and reporting were carried out by UNOPS. This included external auditing and reporting annually to the UN General Assembly. Supervision missions and interim financial report (IFR) reviews were conducted in accordance with UN Financial Regulations. Quarterly meetings reviewed financial performance, and following discussions with the Bank at MTR, it was agreed to organize FM at the component level, furthering the project’s flexibility and the associated financial expenditures. Additionally, it was noted that fluctuations in exchange rates between the USD and the SDR resulted in the Grant providing an additional \$490,629.98 to the project, which was fully utilized. The FM performance rating in the ICR at closure was Satisfactory, and the FM risk rating was moderate.

c. Unintended impacts (Positive or Negative)

--

d. Other

--

11. Ratings

Ratings	ICR	IEG	Reason for Disagreements/Comment
---------	-----	-----	----------------------------------



Outcome	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Efficacy was rated based on a high rating of one objective and a Substantial rating of the other.
Bank Performance	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	While the project was well designed, prepared and supervised, quality-at-entry is rated satisfactory due to a lack of relevant outcome level indicators under Objective 2. Overall Bank Performance is thus Satisfactory, noting quality of supervision was Highly Satisfactory.
Quality of M&E	High	Substantial	Despite a good quality M&E, the lack of relevant outcome indicators beyond number of beneficiaries under objective 2 limited the quality of evaluative performance.
Quality of ICR	---	Substantial	

12. Lessons

If strong coordination mechanisms that emphasize a collaborative operating culture are fostered, this can help lift the quality of multi-stakeholder crisis responses. The project adopted a “One Project, One Team” approach and emphasized a culture of inclusivity and respect in all interactions, recognizing the need to work together in trying circumstances. With a total of eight implementing UN Technical Agencies, alongside government agencies, local communities, and other parties, managing, synchronizing, and coordinating the project’s activities was critical for operational effectiveness and efficiency. Regular well-managed meetings and leadership modeling exemplary inclusion provided a strong platform for a highly collaborative response.

Monitoring and Evaluative transparency can assist cooperation and outcome achievement. An open and transparent M&E system enabled stakeholders to witness how their efforts toward achieving collective outcomes were better realized through coordinated action. This was supported by TAs complying with the project framework and the Project Operational Manual (POM), using the agreed results measurement yardsticks, communicated and utilized results for programming, developing approaches for sustaining project impacts, sharing integrated and harmonized beneficiary databases, and maintaining clear division of responsibilities in interventions and geographic distribution.

If a country’s government is not the direct recipient of World Bank funds and resources, focused engagement can contribute to offsetting missed learning opportunities. Partnering with government stakeholders and agencies – particularly in a country with non-accrual status when project funds are provided to an intermediary such as UNOPS – can transfer learning that can have longer-run benefits to the country. By working together with GoZ counterparts alongside UNOPS and familiarizing them with the projects activities, processes, and systems, the Bank-led project



strengthened the capacity of GoZ, the districts, and the communities for their longer-term improvement.

Participatory involvement in community asset decisions and design, may improve the quality of disaster recovery interventions in an FCV context. The project consistently supported activities to engage affected communities e.g. regular communications. This generated a strong partnership between beneficiaries, the GoZ, and project implementers. This was particularly valuable in the fragile environment post-disaster, with services provided by non-government actors. Rather than imposing infrastructure designs on the communities externally, a participatory approach resulted in infrastructure that was fit-for-purpose e.g. water point locations and sanitation design that involved women end-users in the design process. The project built strong ownership of daily-use infrastructure (e.g. water pumps) and static structures (e.g. gabion walls for flood prevention). Ensuring that villages had annual maintenance plans in place with trained responsible people identified, helped ensure effective longer-term risk reduction.

13. Assessment Recommended?

No

14. Comments on Quality of ICR

Overall, the ICR provided a comprehensive overview of the project. It provides a coherent explanation of the project's development objectives, the Results Framework and achievements (including through video resources in Annex 7). This demonstrated the delivery of timely emergency response in the immediate term (e.g., cash disbursements), as well as to address medium-term resilient disaster recovery needs. The report is detailed and includes salient lessons learned and reflections. It reported the project's importance as the primary response to the crisis, in the context of Zimbabwe's financial position and ability to respond, with detailed output-level results. Overall the quality of the ICR is Substantial.

a. Quality of ICR Rating

Substantial

