### Implementation Status & Results

**Mozambique**  
National Decentralized Planning and Finance Program (P107311)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation Name</th>
<th>Project Stage</th>
<th>Seq.No</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Archive Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Decentralized Planning and Finance Program (P107311)</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ARCHIVED</td>
<td>27-Oct-2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Product Line</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Lending Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>IBRD/IDA</td>
<td>AFRICA</td>
<td>Technical Assistance Loan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Implementing Agency(ies) | Ministry of Planning and Development |

### Key Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Approval Date</th>
<th>Original Closing Date</th>
<th>Planned Mid Term Review Date</th>
<th>Last Archived ISR Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness Date</th>
<th>Revised Closing Date</th>
<th>Actual Mid Term Review Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-Aug-2010</td>
<td>30-Jun-2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Development Objectives

**Project Development Objective (from Project Appraisal Document)**

The Project Development Objective is to improve the capacity of local government to manage public financial resources for district development in a participatory and transparent manner.

Has the Project Development Objective been changed since Board Approval of the Project?

- **Yes**
- **No**

### Component(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Name</th>
<th>Component Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving National Systems</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Participatory Planning and Budgeting</td>
<td>10.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing Management and Implementation Capacity</td>
<td>9.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Oversight and Accountability</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Management</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Project Management and Coordination</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Common-Fund Activities</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Ratings</th>
<th>Previous Rating</th>
<th>Current Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progress towards achievement of PDO</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Implementation Progress (IP)</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Risk Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Implementation Status Overview**

The project continues to face delays of implementation and slow disbursements, mostly caused by procurement and financial management issues linked to the use of country systems. In particular, the requirement of prior review and clearance of contracts by the independent control body (Tribunal Administrativo, or Administrative Tribunal) contributes to this delay. The Ministry of Planning and Development (MPD) is negotiating an exemption from this requirement, and we expect some improvement soon. In addition to this, again in 2012 the loading of Project expenditure plans onto the Government's IFMIS, e-SISTAFE, took longer than expected. The loading was only completed at the end of March, causing further delays in activities. If not addressed, it may be difficult to recover these delays. A full Supervision Mission, with the participation of all Development Partners, is taking place 28 May – 8 June, 2012.

**Locations**

No Location data has been entered

**Results**

### Project Development Objective Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Name</th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Unit of Measure</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Districts that report on District Performance in decentralized planning and finance through SMPD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>07-Jul-2010</td>
<td>31-May-2012</td>
<td>30-Jun-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>No data available at this time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Districts with annual PESOD execution reports publicly displayed and discussed in District Councils in accordance with guidelines</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>30-Mar-2010</td>
<td>31-May-2012</td>
<td>30-Jun-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>No data available at this time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Districts with more than 90% budget execution of their district operational plan (PESOD)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>07-Jul-2010</td>
<td>31-May-2012</td>
<td>30-Jun-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 out of a sample of 33 districts for which data are available at this time; not to be compared with baseline of 85 (out of 128).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct project beneficiaries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>30-Mar-2010</td>
<td>31-May-2012</td>
<td>30-Jun-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct beneficiaries are the following: -Local government official per district, of which x% are female. -Members of Conselhos Locais, of which y% are female.</td>
<td>No change at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Name</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Unit of Measure</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>End Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely submission of consolidated Project AWPB and monitoring reports</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>07-Jul-2010</td>
<td>31-May-2012</td>
<td>30-Jun-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation manual available</td>
<td>AWPB and monitoring reports delivered on time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best practices identified and disseminated</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>07-Jul-2010</td>
<td>31-May-2012</td>
<td>30-Jun-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change at this time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts that use at least 3 established Best Practices in decentralized planning and finance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>128.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>07-Jul-2010</td>
<td>31-May-2012</td>
<td>30-Jun-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change at this time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-DPFP web page in the government (MPD) portal updated at least 3 times per year with Best Practices and District Performance reports</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>07-Jul-2010</td>
<td>31-May-2012</td>
<td>30-Jun-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change at this time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts that inform their local consultative councils about the results of internal and external control exercises</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>128.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>07-Jul-2010</td>
<td>31-May-2012</td>
<td>30-Jun-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 out of 33 districts for which data are available. Not to be compared to the baseline of 20.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts with their accounts audited by the Administrative Court</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>07-Jul-2010</td>
<td>31-May-2012</td>
<td>30-Jun-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change at this time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts that submitted their annual financial statements to the Administrative Tribunal in accordance with current legislation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>128.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>07-Jul-2010</td>
<td>31-May-2012</td>
<td>30-Jun-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 out of 33 districts for which data are available. Not to be compared to the baseline of 7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts with an annual increase of at least 10% in local revenue collection and registration in e-SISTAFE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>07-Jul-2010</td>
<td>31-May-2012</td>
<td>30-Jun-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 out of 33 districts for which data are available. Not to be compared to the baseline of 65.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government technical staff integrated in civil service payroll (based on selected key-post pre-financed by the national project)</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52 staff in the 33 districts for which data are available. Not to be compared with baseline of 98.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of procurement contracts in public works executed by the districts with prior approval (“visto”) by the Administrative Tribunal</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 percent of contracts in 33 districts for which data are available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts with financial processes closed in e-SISTAFE at the end of the financial year</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18 out of the 33 districts for which data are available. Not to be compared to the baseline of 50.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Councils that operate in accordance with (selected criteria in) current legislation</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 out of 33 districts for which data is available. Not to be compared with the baseline of 7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts with an operational plan (PESOD) approved and disseminated in accordance with (selected criteria in) established planning guidelines</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 out of 33 districts for which data is available. Not to be compared with the baseline of 28.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial trainers accredited by IFAPA available for training district staff in decentralized planning and finance processes</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change at this time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of progress in developing and rolling out the Performance Monitoring System for decentralized planning and finance (SMPD)</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit of measure is actually percentage. Tool formally adopted by Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Districts that have received all final and all available updated of district process dossiers and implementation manuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>07-Jul-2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>31-May-2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128.00</td>
<td>30-Jun-2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data on Financial Performance (as of 25-May-2012)

Financial Agreement(s) Key Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Ln/Cr/Tf</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>Signing Date</th>
<th>Effectiveness Date</th>
<th>Original Closing Date</th>
<th>Revised Closing Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Disbursements (in Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Ln/Cr/Tf</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Currency</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Cancelled</th>
<th>Disbursed</th>
<th>Undisbursed</th>
<th>% Disbursed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P107311</td>
<td>IDA-47050</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>XDR</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disbursement Graph

Key Decisions Regarding Implementation

Restructuring History

There has been no restructuring to date.
Related Projects

There are no related projects.