



**INFRASTRUCTURE AND DEVELOPMENT BANK OF ZIMBABWE**

**MINISTRY OF PRIMARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION  
SCHOOLS INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMME FEASIBILITY  
STUDY REPORT PREPARATION BY REBEL (BV)  
INTERNATIONAL**



*Source of image: ADRA-Zimbabwe website*

**FEASIBILITY STUDY COMPLETION REPORT**

**IDBZ/IPD/PCR05/D2.2/122023**

**DECEMBER 2023**

## Document Control Sheet

|                          |   |  |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| Project Name             | MoPSE Schools Infrastructure Development Programme<br>Feasibility Study Preparation |  |
| Document Type            | Project Completion Report   | Document No.<br>IDBZ/IPD/PCR05/D2.2/122023 |
| Document Title           | MoPSE Schools Infrastructure Programme Feasibility Study<br>Completion Report       |  |
| EXCO Approval Date       | 05 June 2024  |  |
| IDBZ Board Approval Date | 08 July 2024  |  |

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <b>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....  | iii |
| <b>I. BASIC DATA</b> .....   | iv  |
| <b>(A) Report Data</b> .....   | iv  |
| <b>(B) Responsible Bank Staff</b> .....  | iv  |
| <b>1. At Project Completion</b> .....  | iv  |
| <b>2. PCR Preparation Team</b> .....   | iv  |
| <b>(C) Project Data</b> .....  | v   |
| <b>(D) Management Review and Comments</b> .....  | vi  |
| <b>II. PROJECT PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT</b> .....  | 1   |
| <b>(A) RELEVANCE</b> .....   | 1   |
| <b>1a. Relevance of Project Development Objective</b> .....  | 1   |
| <b>2. Relevance of Project Design</b> .....  | 2   |
| <b>1. Progress Towards the Project's Development Objective (Project Purpose)</b> .....                         | 4   |
| <b>5. Beneficiaries</b> .....  | 6   |
| <b>6. Unanticipated or Additional Outcomes</b> .....   | 7   |
| <b>7. Lessons Learnt Related to Effectiveness</b> .....  | 7   |
| <b>C. EFFICIENCY</b> .....   | 7   |
| <b>1. Timeliness</b> .....   | 7   |
| <b>2. Resource Use Efficiency</b> .....  | 8   |
| <b>3. Cost Benefit Analysis</b> .....  | 8   |
| <b>5. Lessons Learnt Related to Efficiency</b> .....   | 9   |
| <b>D. SUSTAINABILITY</b> .....   | 9   |
| <b>1. Financial Sustainability</b> .....   | 9   |
| <b>2. Institutional Sustainability and Strengthening of Capacities</b> .....                                   | 9   |
| <b>5. Lessons Learnt Relating to Sustainability</b> .....  | 11  |
| <b>1. Bank Performance</b> .....   | 11  |
| <b>2. Borrower Performance</b> .....   | 12  |
| <b>3. Performance of Other Stakeholders</b> .....  | 12  |
| <b>IV. KEY RECOMMENDATIONS (with particular emphasis on ensuring sustainability of project benefits)</b> ..... | 13  |

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

|          |   |
|----------|---|
| CRPD     | Credit and Policies Department  |
| DO       | Development Objectives  |
| ESIA     | Environmental Social Impact Assessment  |
| ESMD     | Economic, Strategy, & Performance Monitoring Department                       |
| EXCO     | Executive Committee of the IDBZ   |
| FMTE     | Finance and Treasury Department   |
| FS       | Feasibility Study   |
| GoZ      | Government of Zimbabwe  |
| ICT      | Information Communication Technology  |
| IDBZ     | Infrastructure and Development Bank of Zimbabwe                               |
| IPD      | Infrastructure Projects Department  |
| IPD2.0   | Infrastructure Projects Department 2.0 (Energy, Water, Transport and ICT)     |
| IPD2.2   | Infrastructure Projects Division for Implementation Monitoring and Evaluation |
| IP       | Implementation Progress   |
| LASD     | Legal Advisory Services Department  |
| MOPSE    | Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education                                   |
| OFID     | OPEC Fund for International Development                                       |
| PPDF     | Project Preparation and Development Fund                                      |
| PRMD     | Procurement Management Department   |
| PSOD     | Private Sector Operations Department  |
| RIMD     | Risk Management Department  |
| RMCF     | Resource Mobilisation and Climate Finance Department                          |
| SDG      | Sustainable Development Goals   |
| SEIA     | Strategic Environmental Impact Assessment                                     |
| USD      | United States Dollar  |
| WASH     | Water, Sanitation and Hygiene   |
| ZIMASSET | Zimbabwe's Agenda for Sustainable Socio-Economic Transformation               |
| ZWL      | Zimbabwe Dollar   |

## I. BASIC DATA

### (A) Report Data

|             |                |                  |                |
|-------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|
| Report Date | Date of Report | 14 December 2023 |                |
|             | Mission Date   | From: 12/10/2023 | To: 24/01/2024 |

### (B) Responsible Bank Staff

#### 1. At Project Completion

|   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| Chief Executive Officer                         | Zondo. T. Sakala |
| Director-Infrastructure Projects Department 2.0 | N. Chidhakwa     |
| Acting Head, CRPD                               | A. Mashonganyika |
| Acting Manager, IPD2.2                          | A Radman         |
| Principal Technical Officer – IPD2.2            | T. Mavudzi       |

#### 2. PCR Preparation Team

| Name   | Position and Division/Unit/Department  |                        |
|--|--|------------------------|
| A. Radman                                      | Acting Manager (IPD2.2), Team Leader   |                        |
| A. Mavudzi                                     | Principal Technical Officer (IPD2.2)   |                        |
| M. Mapepa                                      | Principal Procurement Officer (PRMD)   |                        |
| M. Nyabadza                                    | Chief Risk Analyst (RIMD)              |                        |
| V. Charambira                                  | Principal Projects Accountant (FMTE.1) |                        |
| W. Makhuyana                                   | Chief Legal Officer (LGLD)             |                        |
| M. Nherera                                     | Economist (ESMD)                       |                        |
| L. Machanzi                                    | Chief Gender Expert (IPD)              |                        |
| C Maseva                                       | Chief ESIA Expert (RMCF)               |                        |
| <b>Peer Reviewers</b>                          |  |                        |
| C. Berejena                                    | Business Development Manager (PSOD)    |                        |
| P. Chitsika                                    | Head (ESMD)                            |                        |
| Eng. F Madondo                                 | Manager (IPD2.1)                       |                        |
| <b>Final Review and Recommendation to EXCO</b> |  |                        |
| A Mashonganyika                                | Acting Head (CRPD)                     | Final Review           |
| N Chidhakwa                                    | Director (IPD2.0)                      | Recommendation to EXCO |

### (C) Project Data

|                                    |  |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Project name:</b>               | MoPSE Schools Infrastructure Development Programme Feasibility Study Preparation (“the Project”)   |
| <b>Project Number:</b>             | MoPSE/IDBZ/10/07/2016  |
| <b>Project type:</b>               | Consulting Services for detailed Feasibility Study and report for a pilot project on 100 schools across Zimbabwe’s ten (10) provinces under the MoPSE program for development and construction of schools’ infrastructure for 2,056 schools (primary and secondary). |
| <b>Project Owner</b>               | Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education (MoPSE)  |
| <b>Sector</b>                      | Education  |
| <b>Location:</b>                   | All provinces  |
| <b>Environmental Risk Category</b> | Not rated.   |

| Financing Source | Estimated Study Cost (US\$) | Study Contract Cost | Committed  | Disbursed Amount (US\$) | Percentage Disbursed (of total FS cost) | Undisbursed amount (US\$) | Percentage undisbursed |
|------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|------------|-------------------------|---|---------------------------|------------------------|
| MoPSE            | 830,685.00                  | 830,685.00          | 332,273.00 | 206,844.46              | 24.9%                                   | 623,841                   | 75.1%                  |
| IDBZ             | -                           |                     | -          | 125,479.29 <sup>1</sup> |   |                           |                        |
| <b>Total</b>     | <b>830,685.00</b>           |                     |            | <b>332,273.75</b>       | <b>40%<sup>2</sup></b>                  |                           |                        |

**Co-financiers and other external partners:** None

**Executing and implementing agency(ies):** Ministry of Primary and Secondary Schools (MoPSE)

**Consultants:** Rebel (BV) International

**Transaction Advisor:** IDBZ

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Documents Submitted by Consultant towards the Feasibility Study</b> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inception Report,</li> <li>2. Feasibility Study First Draft <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1 Analysis of Population Dynamics per province</li> <li>2.2 Norms and Standards for Schools Designs</li> <li>2.3 Second Draft Legal Due Diligence Report</li> <li>2.4 Second Draft Legal Due Diligence-Land &amp; Site Review</li> <li>2.5 Site Technical Due Diligence Report-Mashonaland East</li> <li>2.6 Site Technical Due Diligence Report- Harare</li> </ol> </li> </ol> |
|--|--|

<sup>1</sup> Funds disbursed by IDBZ although it was not a co-financier of the feasibility study. Refer to Section C2 Resource Use Efficiency, for a detailed explanation.

<sup>2</sup> Total disbursements inclusive of the funds disbursed by the IDBZ

**(D) Management Review and Comments**

| Report reviewed by | Name                 | Date reviewed   | Comments |
|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------|
| Acting Head-CRPD   | Alexio Mashonganyika | 02 January 2024 | Reviewed |
| Director-IPD2.0    | Nicodimus Chidhakwa  | 24 January 2024 | Cleared  |
| EXCO               | EXCO                 | 16 May 2024     | Deferred |
| EXCO               | EXCO                 | 5 June 2024     | Cleared  |

## **II. PROJECT PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT**

### **(A) RELEVANCE**

#### **1a. Relevance of Project Development Objective**

This intervention was in line with the Bank's Medium-Term Strategy (2016-2020) and the Government of Zimbabwe's Agenda for Sustainable Socio-Economic Transformation (ZIMASSET) (2014-2018) development plan. Under the Schools Infrastructure Programme, the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education (MoPSE) targeted to construct and/or rehabilitate two thousand and fifty-six (2,056) schools ("the Programme") across the ten (10) provinces of the country, using an innovative funding model. The Programme would start with a Feasibility Study on a pilot project to develop infrastructure for a combined one hundred selected (100) schools in the country's ten provinces. For that purpose, the Bank/IDBZ was granted a Financial Advisory Services Mandate on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of June 2016 by MoPSE ("the Ministry"), that included guiding the project development process, resource mobilisation, project implementation monitoring and general technical advisory service. In executing the mandate, the Bank, through an open international competitive bidding process, awarded the contract to Rebel Group International BV ("the Consultant") of Netherlands for conducting the Feasibility Study ("FS"/" the Assignment"/" the Study") and produce an FS Report. The FS was expected to be used to obtain funding under the OFID schools infrastructure window. The Contract between the Bank and Rebel Group International was signed on 26 June 2017. The Study, which was supposed to be funded through the MoPSE budget allocation, commenced on the 8<sup>th</sup> of March 2018 and was scheduled to end on the 30<sup>th</sup> of September 2018. There were delays in the submission of information by MoPSE and payment of the Consultant's fees. Therefore, the Consultants were granted extension of time for completion to the 31<sup>st</sup> of January 2019. The funding challenges affected the total number of pilot schools' sites that were visited. The Consultants were able to visit eighty (80) of the targeted one hundred (100) and on 21<sup>st</sup> November 2018, they submitted the first Preliminary Draft Report based solely on those visits. Work on the study stopped due to the apparent lack of interest by MoPSE to pursue the FS. The Bank has formally advised MoPSE that under the circumstances, continued participation by the IDBZ cannot be sustained, thus this PCR is to formally close out the Study until such time that MoPSE are ready to resume the Study.

At both the planning and implementation stages, the Project Development Objective (DO), which is to develop, rehabilitate, and improve learning facilities at primary and secondary schools across the country, was aligned to the Bank's mandate and its Medium-Term Strategy



(2016-2021) of facilitating infrastructure funding in the Education Sector. It is also aligned to the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4; Quality Education - Ensure inclusive and equitable education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all.

As part of the requirements for the assignment, the Bank emphasized that the across all sites choice of a school would be influenced by the most economical development costs without compromising the quality of infrastructure at so that it still achieves a uniform level of service delivery regardless of the socio-economic context of the respective schools. The intended beneficiaries also confirmed the need for improved learning facilities. The “*Report on the Consultative Process on the School Financing Policy (2018)*” produced by the Consultants following a stakeholder feedback exercise that involved 7,000 respondents confirms that.

|  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| <p><b>Relevance of Project Development Objective (DO) rating</b></p> <p>The development objectives were aligned to the Bank’s Medium-Term Strategy (2016-2021) under the Housing Sector Policy, the national development objectives, the SDGs.</p> | <p><b>4</b></p> |
|--|-----------------|

**1b. Relevance of Project Development Objective (DO) in Relation to Other Projects and Bank's Development Priorities (Coherence/Alignment).**

Apart from improved and modern school buildings, the proposed schools’ infrastructure would also include water and sanitation provision, electricity, and electronic connectivity (telephones, fax, and internet) in line with the Government and the Bank’s WASH and ICT policies focus areas.

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| <p><b>DO Coherence/Alignment rating.</b></p> <p>The development objectives were aligned to both the GoZ Policy and the Bank’s Housing Sector, WASH and ICT sector policies.</p> | <p><b>4</b></p> |
|---|-----------------|

**2. Relevance of Project Design**

The basis for the design review was the Norms and Design Standards for schools produced by the Department of Public Works of the Ministry of Local Government, National Housing and Public Works. This was the basis for costing of the different schools’ categories i.e., C1<sup>3</sup>, C2<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Primary or secondary schools with student population of 1001-1600

<sup>4</sup> Primary or secondary schools with a student population of 501-1000

and C3<sup>5</sup>. The optimised school model was based on an Output Specification instead of a set of rigid design standards.

The Output specification approach would result in greater innovation and cost effectiveness in the design and construction of the schools. This would include a phased approach which aligns the size of the school buildings with the enrolment whilst leaving room for expansion when enrolment is forecasted to increase. Each school site would have core education areas (classroom blocks), education support infrastructure (library, laboratories for schools offering science subjects), administration block, electricity (off-grid or on-grid), sports and recreation facilities, electronic connectivity (telephone, fax and internet) and perimeter security in form of a wall or mesh wire or barbed wire depending on the location (urban, semi-urban and rural respectively). The proposed design approach was informed by a detailed desktop study of available architectural designs and specifications, and physical site assessments made during the visits to eighty (80) of the one hundred (100) targeted sites.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Relevance of Project Design rating</b>   |   |
| The project proposed output specification design approach was meant to achieve innovation and cost effectiveness thereby improving project technical feasibility and bankability. | 4 |

### 3. Lessons Learnt Related to Relevance

| Key issues   | Lessons learnt   | Target audience   |
|--|--|---|
| Align design specifications with site specific requirements. | Detailed desk review of documents and site visits are critical in informing project design specifications. | MoPSE,<br>Local Government & Public Works,<br>IDBZ Management and Staff |

---

<sup>5</sup> Primary or secondary schools with a student population of 280-500

## (B) EFFECTIVENESS

### 1. Progress Towards the Project's Development Objective (Project Purpose)

The output was the submission of a Feasibility Study that would inform the construction of one hundred (100) schools as a pilot phase using a financing and implementation structure. Despite the submission of the First Draft of the Feasibility Study Report, the Assignment stalled mid-stream before the completion of the task.

The expected Feasibility Study Scope and Key Milestones were as follows: -

| Output   | Key Deliverables   | Status   |
|--|--|--|
| Inception Report   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of Education Sector in Zimbabwe</li> <li>• Review of Zimbabwe's economic and demographic context</li> <li>• Review of architectural designs and specifications</li> <li>• Review of legal considerations and issues</li> <li>• Update on site visits and findings including draft due diligence reports on the first set of site visits</li> </ul>   | Submitted  |
| First Draft Feasibility Report                               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs analysis identifying and prioritising the needs of the project requirements and outcomes (<i>inclusive of key socio-economic considerations, demography, and status quo of the Education sector</i>)</li> <li>• Institutional context (<i>roles, mandates, and key considerations</i>)</li> <li>• Prototype Designs for Norms and Standards of school infrastructure</li> <li>• Legal and Regulatory Assessment</li> <li>• Technical Assessment</li> <li>• Preliminary Financial model and viability assessment</li> <li>• Preliminary Funding assessment</li> <li>• Preliminary assessment of Solution Options (<i>inclusive of PPP modalities</i>)</li> </ul> | Submitted  |
| Second Draft Feasibility Study and Procurement Documentation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revised needs analysis</li> <li>• Revised Options analysis (<i>and preferred option selection</i>)</li> <li>• Revised Legal and Regulatory review.</li> <li>• Revised financial model and viability assessment.</li> <li>• Revised economic assessment.</li> <li>• Value for money assessment</li> <li>• Revised market testing</li> <li>• Initial management and procurement plan</li> <li>• Draft technical procurement documentation</li> </ul>  | Not submitted as Assignment did not progress this far. |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft legal procurement documentation templates</li> </ul>  |  |
| Final Feasibility Report and Procurement Documentation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final steps of the Second Draft Feasibility Study and Procurement Documentation</li> <li>• Final Viability Assessment and sensitivity analysis</li> </ul> | Not submitted as Assignment did not progress this far. |

Table 1. Feasibility Study Scope and Key Deliverables

Progression to each stage would be done following input and clearance from the MoPSE and the Bank on documents and information submitted by the Consultant. The First Draft Feasibility Report met all requirements.

## 2. Output Reporting

| Output indicators                                      | Baseline value (2018) | Most recent value (A) | End target (B) (expected value at project completion) | Progress towards target (% realized) (A/B) | Narrative assessment  | Core Sector Indicator (Yes/No) |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|--------------------------------|
| Final Feasibility Report and Procurement Documentation | Nil                   | First Draft submitted | Final Feasibility Study                               | 50% of target achieved                     | Consultant was able to submit the Inception Report and First Draft Feasibility Study Report | N/A                            |
| 100 schools pilot phase                                | Nil                   | 80 schools visited    | 100 schools   | 80%  | Due to funding challenges, only 80 of the targeted 100 schools were visited.                | Yes                            |

### 3. Outcome Reporting

| Outcome indicators (Contract)                          | Most recent value (A) | End target (B) (expected value at project completion)  | Progress towards target (% realized) (A/B) | Narrative assessment            | Core Sector Indicator (Yes/No) |
|--|-----------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 100 pilot schools' infrastructure developed and funded | Nil                   | 100 pilot schools' infrastructure developed and funded | 0%   | Feasibility Study not completed | Yes                            |

### 4. Development Objective (DO) rating

|  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| <p><b>Effectiveness of Project Development Objective (DO) rating</b></p> <p>The development objectives were not delivered. The Assignment was not carried to its conclusion as MoPSE could not continue funding the Study due to budgetary constraints, forex shortages and there also appeared to be waning interest, in the need for the Study, from MOPSE over time. The Assignment only achieved two (2) out of the four (4) expected outputs.</p> | <p><b>2</b></p> |
|--|-----------------|

### 5. Beneficiaries

| Actual (A) | Planned (B)   | Progress towards target (% realized) (A/B) | % Of girls            | Category (e.g., Farmer, student) |
|------------|---|--|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Nil        | 100 schools provided with adequate education and support infrastructure | 0%   | No disaggregated data | No disaggregated data            |
| Nil        | Number of students was to be informed by the detailed FS                | N/A <sup>6</sup>                           | N/A                   | students                         |

<sup>6</sup> Study was discontinued at First Draft stage.

## 6. Expected Additional Outcomes

| Description  | Type (e.g., Gender, climate change, social, other) | Positive or negative | Impact on project (High, Medium, Low) |
|--|--|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Increased Enrolment  | Social   | Positive             | High                                  |
| Staff Retention  | Social   | Positive             | High                                  |
| Improved pass rate   | Social   | Positive             | High                                  |
| Reduction in the prevalence of hygiene related diseases like typhoid and dysentery | Health   | Positive             | High                                  |

## 7. Lessons Learnt Related to Effectiveness

| Key issues                        | Lessons learnt   | Target audience                    |
|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| Delays in execution of Assignment | Availability of funding and strong commitment from the executing agencies is critical for timely execution of assignments.   | MOPSE, Local Govt, Bank Management |
| Lack of counterparty support      | Project partnerships may become untenable if one party fails to communicate with the other. MoPSE did not provide clarity on whether the assignment should continue. | MOPSE, Bank Management and Staff   |

## C. EFFICIENCY

### 1. Timeliness (Submission of First Draft of FS)

| Planned submission timeline – Months (A) | Actual effective implementation time – Months (B) | Ratio of planned versus actual implementation time (A/B) | Rating |
|--|---|--|--------|
| 4  | 8   | 0.5  | 2      |

The Assignment was scheduled to conclude within 6 months from commencement which date was to be triggered by the release of the contractual advance payment. The advance payment of US\$207,671 was paid in four (4) tranches beginning on 27 December 2017 with the final tranche on 22 January 2018. Furthermore, MOPSE delayed in submitting the preliminary data requested by the Consultant. The project commencement date was 8<sup>th</sup> of March 2018 and was

scheduled to be completed by end September 2018. According to the Inception Report, the First Draft FS report submission was planned for July 2018. However, the First Draft FS Report was only submitted on 20 November 2018. The Contract was extended to 31<sup>st</sup> January 2019. The assignment took eight (8) months to submission of the First Draft FS report. Going by the timelines set in the Inception Report, the First Draft FS Report was late by 4 months.

## 2. Resource Use Efficiency

| Median % physical implementation of Contract by all financiers (A) | Commitment rate (%) (B) | Ratio of the median percentage physical implementation and commitment rate (A/B) | Rating |
|--|-------------------------|--|--------|
| 40%  | 50%                     | 1.25   | 3      |

The funding for the FS was supposed to be provided by MoPSE in ZWL with foreign currency being sourced by the Bank through the RBZ Foreign Currency Auction System. Transfer of funds from MOPSE, slowed down overtime. In the spirit of the Financial Advisory Services Agreement between MoPSE and IDBZ and in a bid to keep the momentum of the FS assignment, the Bank paid the Consultant, US\$124,602.75 on 6 September 2019, equivalent to EUR110,263.00 in anticipation of a refund from MOPSE. The money has not been refunded to date. Funds disbursed by MOPSE and the payment from the Bank resulted in a total disbursement of 40% of the FS contract amount. An output of 50% of project milestones was delivered from 40% of the funding. The funding performance was however adversely impacted by waning interest in the FS by the MOPSE who eventually stopped providing funds.

## 3. Cost Benefit Analysis

The combined payment from MoPSE and the Bank resulted in 40% of the feasibility study cost being met for the agreed deliverables, in line with the Contract. The cost was in line with the expected benefit (deliverables).

## 4. Implementation Progress (IP)

The First Draft Report was completed in eight (8) months instead of estimated four (4) months. Delays in submission of background project information, payment of the Consultant's fees and the outbreak of Covid-19 pandemic, contributed to the delays.

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <b>Implementation Progress (IP) rating</b>  |          |
| Although there were delays in the implementation of the Assignment, the First Draft was submitted within the revised submission date. | <b>2</b> |

## 5. Lessons Learnt Related to Efficiency

| Key issues   | Lessons learnt   | Target audience   |
|--|--|---|
| Delays in submission of critical information leading to late start of Assignment | (i) For timely commencement of work, parties should ensure that all information is readily available on request.<br>(ii) Setting of Milestone schedules should consider potential delays in the submission of information by stakeholders. | MOPSE,<br>Local Government,<br>Bank<br>Management and Staff |

## D. SUSTAINABILITY

### 1. Financial Sustainability

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>Rating on Financial Sustainability</b>   |            |
| MoPSE through the GoZ was supposed to provide the funding for the FS. Although the fees for completed milestones were eventually settled, with part of the payment made by the Bank in anticipation of a refund from MOPSE, there were delays in payments due to unavailability funding from MOPSE. | <b>N/A</b> |

### 2. Institutional Sustainability and Strengthening of Capacities

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <b>Rating on Institutional Sustainability and Strengthening of Capacities.</b>   |          |
| The Assignment was executed under a mandate to the IDBZ by MoPSE. The Assignment assisted in the strengthening of Government's capacity to undertake future similar assignments, underpinned by the IDBZ Financial Advisory Services Agreement. The Bank and MOPSE gained invaluable knowledge on FS preparation and related skills through interaction with the Consultant who has vast knowledge and experience in the area. Through the guidance and support of the Bank, all parties fairly discharged their | <b>3</b> |



|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>responsibilities in the project resulting in the notable progress achieved up to the submission of the First Draft FS report, up until the assignment inexplicably did not get support from MoPSE. The draft FS report was delivered in line with the expected scope largely due to constant feedback and direction from both the Bank and MoPSE during the time when the project was funded.</p> |  |
|--|--|

### 3. Ownership and Sustainability of Partnerships

|  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| <p><b>Rating on Ownership and Sustainability of partnerships</b></p> <p>As part of the assignment, 80% of the targeted schools were visited including 7,000 beneficiaries and the relevant Government Departments, Local Authorities, Regulatory Agencies, and potential funders. The Bank and MoPSE started on a cordial and professional working relationship, with MoPSE diligently supporting the exercise. However, the MoPSE support inexplicably dissipated leaving the Bank in a limbo. The Bank met 37.8% of the committed amount, from its own capital in anticipation of a refund from MoPSE. The refund has not been made to date. All parties, i.e., the Consultants, IDBZ and MoPSE, despite the funding challenges, created a satisfactory working relationship that saw progress in the execution of the Assignment, up to the submission of the First Draft FS.</p> | <p><b>3</b></p> |
|--|-----------------|

### 4. Environmental and Social Sustainability

Since a total of one hundred (100) schools were proposed under the pilot phase, it was not feasible to undertake Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) studies for each of the selected schools and complete the studies within the contractual time frame. Instead, a Strategic Environmental Impact Assessment (SEIA) which provides a high-level consideration of potential impacts of the programme and how to manage them would have been ideal. All the same, the programme considered environmental issues as it employed an Environmental Consultant who visited each of the 80 sites and prepared notes on the baseline environmental conditions and on the suitability of each site for construction of classroom blocks. Therefore, there was no detailed environmental and social impact assessment for the sites.

|  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| <b>Rating on Environmental and Social Sustainability</b> | <b>Not Rated</b> |
|--|------------------|

## 5. Lessons Learnt Relating to Sustainability

| <b>Key issues</b>   | <b>Lessons learnt</b>   | <b>Target audience</b>                       |
|---|---|--|
| Budgetary support and forex allocations to meet funding obligations when due. | Consistent budgetary and forex allocation is key in meeting payments when they are due to ensure a smooth flow of assignment progress.  | MOPSE, RBZ, Bank Management and Staff        |
| Implementing Agency/Project Owner support                                     | Strong implementing agency support and commitment is critical for completion of assignments and/or projects. There was lack of funding support by MoPSE to have the remaining stages of the FS completed. | Government, MOPSE, Bank Management and Staff |

## III. PERFORMANCE OF THE BANK, THE PARTNERS, AND CO-FINANCIERS

### 1. Bank Performance

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <p><b>Rating of Bank performance</b></p> <p>In its advisory role, the Bank moderated the output expectations and checked deliverables against scope before approving disbursements. The Bank performed its role as per expectation. It also went a step further, by paying the Consultant's fees from its own capital, in anticipation of a refund from MoPSE, to ensure that the Study was concluded within the agreed timeframes and in time for submission for the OFID anticipated funding.</p> | <b>4</b> |
|---|----------|

**2. Borrower/Executing Agency Performance**

|   |                              |
|---|------------------------------|
| <p><b>Rating Borrower performance</b></p> <p>The project had no borrower. The funding for the Assignment was supposed to be provided by MoPSE through the National Budget allocations. The executing agency MoPSE’s performance was below expectation. Required data was not submitted on time and funding was not made available to facilitate completion of Assignment.</p> | <p><b>Not Applicable</b></p> |
|---|------------------------------|

**3. Performance of Other Stakeholders**

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| <p><b>Performance of other stakeholders rating</b></p> <p>Other key stakeholders, the schools, were supposed to provide information. The 80 schools visited by the Consultant, provided the information required for the Study.</p> | <p><b>4</b></p> |
|---|-----------------|

#### IV. KEY RECOMMENDATIONS (with particular emphasis on ensuring sustainability of project benefits)

| Key issues  | Lessons Learnt   | Key recommendation   | Responsible                          | Deadline |
|---|--|--|--------------------------------------|----------|
| Consistent Budgetary allocations                                  | Consistent budgetary and forex allocation is key in meeting payments when they are due to ensure a smooth flow of assignment progress.                       | All disbursements should be made as and when required for payment.   | GoZ,<br>MoPSE,<br>Bank<br>Management | Ongoing  |
| Lack of implementing agent/project owners' commitment and support | Implementing agency can pull out without informing the Bank of reasons thereof.  | Strong project owner support is critical in seeing the project/s through to finalisation.  | MoPSE,<br>Bank<br>Management         | Ongoing  |
| Delays in submission of key project information.                  | Unavailability of critical information can derail projects and jeopardise completion.<br><br>Information for specific projects may not be readily available. | Ready availability of key information required for a project should be confirmed before committing to specific execution timelines.<br><br>Project preparation time should budget for information gathering and a budget for information gathering should be provided for. | GoZ,<br>MoPSE,<br>Bank<br>Management | Ongoing  |

## V. OVERALL PERFORMANCE AND RATING

All the ratings in this report applied the following scale:

- 1 – Highly Unsatisfactory
- 2 – Unsatisfactory
- 3 – Satisfactory
- 4 – Highly Satisfactory

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| <b>Dimensions and Criteria</b>                                |             |
| <b>DIMENSION A: RELEVANCE</b>                                 |             |
| Relevance of project development objective                    | 4           |
| Relevance of project design                                   | 4           |
| <b>DIMENSION B: EFFECTIVENESS</b>                             |             |
| Development Objective   | 1.5         |
| <b>DIMENSION C: EFFICIENCY</b>                                |             |
| Timeliness  | 2           |
| Resource use efficiency                                       | 3           |
| Cost-benefit analysis   | Not Rated   |
| Implementation Progress                                       | 2           |
| <b>DIMENSION D: SUSTAINABILITY</b>                            |             |
| Financial sustainability                                      | Not Rated   |
| Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities  | 3           |
| Ownership and sustainability of partnerships                  | 3           |
| Environmental and social sustainability                       | Not Rated   |
| <b>OVERALL COMPUTED &amp; FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION RATING</b> | <b>2.81</b> |

The project's overall completion rating is **2.81** which denotes a weak satisfactory rating. Areas of improvement are as highlighted in the lessons learnt and recommendations section.