



Operational review and institutional assessment of the African Water Facility



Project assessments report

DRAFT FINAL VERSION – RESTRICTED CIRCULATION



HYDROCONSEIL

Consulting Engineer: water supply,
environment, public services



Title: Operational review and institutional assessment of the African Water Facility
Status of the report: Project assessments report (annex to main report) – Draft final version
Client: African Water Facility
Consultant: Association WEDC-HYDROCONSEIL (leading company: HYDROCONSEIL)
Effectiveness of contract: 30 October 2009
Date of submission: 20 July 2010 via e-mail (English version)
Version revision number: 3
Contributors: Laura Hurter (Ms), Alain Morel (Mr), Kevin Sansom & Bruno Valfrey-Visser (Mr)
Coordination, editing & quality control: Bruno Valfrey-Visser (Mr)
For any query or question regarding this report: hydroconseil@hydroconseil.com

Table of content

Introduction.....	5
Lake Victoria Commission Water and Sanitation Initiative, January 2010	6
Integrated study and project preparation for COFAMOSA irrigation project – Mozambique, February 2010.....	23
Preparation of the National Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Program - Mozambique, February 2010.....	25
Ethiopia Water Information and Knowledge Management Project, March 2010	38
Water and Sanitation Services for the Urban Poor in Kagugube, Kampala, Uganda, March 2010.....	53
Evaluation du projet “Etude de réhabilitation et d’extension des systèmes d’AEPA de Brazzaville et Pointe Noire” – Mars 2010	63
Evaluation of the GEO-AQUIFER project – Amélioration de la connaissance et de la gestion concertée du Système Aquifère du Sahara Septentrional (SASS) par l’utilisation de l’imagerie satellitale – February 2010.....	76
Evaluation du projet “Appui à la création de l’Autorité du Bassin de la Volta” – Janvier 2010	89
Project assessment guide	100

Abbreviations and acronyms

AFD	French Development Agency
AfDB	African Development Bank
AMCOW	African Ministers' Council on Water
AU	African Union
AWF	African Water Facility
CDF	Constituency Development Fund
COFAMOSA	Committee for the Facilitation of Agriculture between Mozambique and South Africa
CSO	Country Status Overview
DAC	Development Assistance Committee (within OECD)
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
EAC	East Africa Community
EADB	East Africa Development Bank
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EIB	European Investment Bank
EUWF	European Union Water Facility
EUWI	European Union Water Initiative
EWRIS	Ethiopian Water Resources Information System
GoK	Government of Kenya
GUWASCO	Gussi Water and Sewerage Company
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
KEWASCO	Kericho Water and Sewerage Company
LVBC	Lake Victoria Basin Commission
LVSWSB	Lake Victoria South Water Services Board
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MWI	Ministry of Water and Irrigation
MoWR	Ministry of Water Resources (Ethiopia)
MZO	Mozambique Local Office
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NWRM	National Water Resources Management
NWSC	National Water and Sewerage Cooperation (Uganda)
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OWAS	Operations Water and Sanitation (department within AFDB)
PRONASAR	National Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Program (Mozambique)
RBO	River Basin Organization
REC	Regional Economic Community
RMC	Regional Member Country
RWSSI	Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Initiative
SADC	Southern Africa Development Community
SAP	Systems, Applications, and Products for data processing
SC	Steering Committee
STS	Short-Term Staff
TA	Technical Assistant (or Technical Assistance)
TOR	Terms Of Reference
TWRM	Transboundary Water Resources Management
UFW	Unaccounted For Water
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WAN	Wide Area Network
WEDC	Water and Engineering Development Centre
WSP	Water and Sanitation Program

Introduction

As part of the Operational review and institutional assessment of the African Water Facility, the consultant performed an on-field assessment of 8 projects that have been funded by the AWF. These projects were selected together with the AWF so as to be representative of the Facility's portfolio in terms of geographic spread and areas of intervention. Another criteria was that the projects be either completed or due to be completed very soon.

Indeed the rationale of the assessment was to evaluate the impact of projects financed by AWF, and to analyze AWF's role throughout the project cycle. However, owing to the delay incurred by some projects, it has sometimes proved difficult to carry out the whole assessment when outputs and outcomes were too limited to be properly assessed.

The methodology used by the consultant is briefly outlined at the beginning of each report. In order to produce consistent results, the consultant drafted an assessment guide which can be consulted at the end of this report. This document has been used as a guideline by all the consultants involved in this assessment exercise, in order to ensure maximum consistency in the way the projects were assessed and progress rated.

Lake Victoria Commission Water and Sanitation Initiative, January 2010

1. Introduction

The Lake Victoria Basin Commission Water and Sanitation Initiative project overall objective is to prepare an investment plan for 15 centres in the 5 countries of the EAC (Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Rwanda and Burundi).

The project follows a first phase implemented by UN-Habitat between 2004 and 2007 for an amount of USD20M in 7 towns. In 2007 an agreement was signed with AfDB to prepare a second phase, subject of this project. The AWF was then identified to fund the pre-investment study.

The EAC Secretariat received an AWF grant of €994,000, with a €4,500 EAC in-kind co-funding, approved on 2 March 2008, and implemented by LVBC as executing agency in collaboration with UN-Habitat, for a duration of 7 months.

The overall objective of the project is to identify an integrated package of interventions for the long term development of WSS and environmental management services in 15 high priority secondary towns/centres in the lake Victoria basin, including water supply and sanitation improvements, solid waste management, and drainage improvements in key areas.

The activities implemented are (i) needs assessment and impact appraisal of options; (ii) formulation and validation of an investment plan; (iii) preparation of detailed designs and tender documents for immediate works; (iv) preparation of implementation and financing plan; and (v) capacity building.

The project includes 3 main components: (i) short term intervention plans, (ii) long term investment plans, and (iii) capacity building.

2. Assessment of the project

The project assessment methodology for the review is set out in the consultant's preliminary report (November 2009) and the subsequent AWF project assessment guide. This methodology is structured using a broad project cycle framework:

- Project design, appraisal and approval
- Project implementation
- Operation and use of facilities, outputs and systems created
- Project monitoring and evaluation
- Next steps, emerging projects and the leverage effect

Under each of these headings the issues identified in the AWF project assessment guide have been explored with a variety of project partners and stakeholders. The primary respondents for each section of the assessment are reminded in italics below each heading in the following sections.

Some questions on specific issues where a rating is requested on a scale of 1 to 4 are also included, as a mean of doing a comparative analysis between the projects assessed.

An “output to outcome review” was also conducted as a mean of assessing the extent to which the project outputs/outcomes have been achieved, or the likelihood that outputs/outcomes will be achieved. The output to outcome review is developed in the last section of the report.

2.1. Project performance summary

The scoring system and approach for the AWF project output to outcome review is a simplified version of the DFID output to purpose review approach. It includes a scoring system to indicate the likelihood of achievements of both the project outcomes and the project outputs. Table 1 is the proposed project rating scoring system to be used to rate the likelihood of achievement of the project outcomes and outputs in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 1. Project rating scale for likelihood of project objectives being achieved

Rating number	Criteria for rating
1	Likely to be completely achieved. The outputs/ purpose are well on the away to completion (or are completed).
2	Likely to be largely achieved. There is good progress towards purpose completion and most outputs are likely to be achieved, particularly the most important ones.
3	Likely to be partly achieved. Only partial achievement of the purpose is likely and/or achievement of some outputs.
4	Only likely to be achieved to a very limited extent . Purpose unlikely to be achieved but a few outputs likely to be achieved.
5	Unlikely to be achieved. No progress on outputs or purpose.
X	X. = It is impossible to say whether there has been any progress towards the final achievement of outputs or purpose. This score should not be used unless they meet at least one of the following criteria:

For the Lake Victoria Basin Commission Water and Sanitation Initiative project in Kenya the likelihood of the outcomes and outputs being achieved is summarised in tables 2 and 3 using the above rating system.

Table 2. Output to outcome project scoring assessment (purpose level)

<p>Goal statement:</p> <p>To assist the high priority secondary towns in the Lake Victoria Basin identify their immediate and long term needs in water and sanitation taking into consideration the ecological demands of the lake and its tributaries and to define solutions in terms of detailed designs and investment program for financing with the aid of regional Governments and external support agencies.</p>

Outcome 1 statement Detailed designs for immediate works available.			
Outcome 1 OVIs	Progress	Comments	Rating score (see table B)
Detailed designs accepted by the respective towns - Within 6.5 months of start of work	Detailed design of short term action plan still pending.	At the time of the review (Jan 2010), the design report was expected shortly.	3
Outcome 1 average score and justification	Still being discussed, was subject to several variations, and a number of components are questioned by partners. Largely delayed.		3
Outcome 2 statement The investment plans for long term development consisting of description physical interventions (in the form of preliminary designs) and capacity building programmes for each selected town as well as the estimated costs and implementation schedule.			
Outcome 2 OVIs	Progress	Comments	Rating score (see table B)
Investment plans reviewed and validated through stakeholder workshops - Within 6.5 months of start of work	Investment plan for long term has been produced. Capacity building programme is still pending.	The capacity building program is weak and does not address adequately the expectations.	2
Outcome 2 average score and justification	Investment plan is completely achieved (rated 1), but the capacity building programme is likely to be only partly achieved (rated 3).		2

Table 3. Output to outcome project scoring assessment (output level)

Output	Indicator (OVI)	Progress and likelihood of being achieved	Rating score
1. Sector context of the project understood and documented	Report acceptable to key stakeholders - By week 5	Good detailed socio-economical survey implemented	1
2. Consensus reached on Immediate needs of the priority towns	Proposal accepted by stakeholders - By week 13	The consensus is not there, and the content and immediate needs still discussed	3
3. Detailed Specifications of immediate works available for tendering	Proposal accepted by stakeholders - By week 24	Not yet available, but likely to be in a short time	2

Output	Indicator (OVI)	Progress and likelihood of being achieved	Rating score
4. Feasible solutions developed into investment plans at the town and project levels with timeframe and cost budget.	Proposal accepted by stakeholders - By week 22	Completely achieved, though estimated overambitious by partners	1
5. Institutional Development requirements well understood	Proposal accepted by stakeholders - By week 26	Not addressed adequately at local level for water companies and municipal councils	4
6. Impacts of the selected solutions better understood and rated acceptable.	Impacts assessments accepted the National Environmental Agencies and other stakeholders - By week 26	Social and environmental impact assessment study implemented and accepted by partners	1
7. Detailed <i>financing and implementation</i> plans developed and available	Plans Accepted by stakeholders - By week 27	Financing is only partially secured and not yet detailed for each town. Implementation plans have not been developed	5
8. A performance monitoring and evaluation and reporting framework available and in use by the sector agencies	Framework accepted by Stakeholders - By week 30	M&E Framework not developed under the project. The project will be covered by national mechanisms	4
Total average output score and justification	Output ratings are based on what was expected for each component in the Appraisal Report. A higher average score would have probably been achieved if the definition of short term actions and planned scope were better defined during preparation. Delays have been experienced in implementation. Given the constraints, the LVBC has generally performed well in managing this project preparation project.		2,6
Outcome attribution To what extent can the achievement of the outcomes be attributed to the delivery of the project outputs?		The outcomes are partially achieved, directly linked to the projects outputs.	

2.2. Project design, appraisal and approval

Expected primary respondents: lead project partner staff (LVBC and UN-Habitat)

Logical framework

The latest version of the logframe is the one in the final appraisal document of August 2008.

Generally, the activities planned in the logframe are adequate, but the time provided for implementation was underestimated, and the sequence, definition and volume of the activities should have been better designed. The risk analysis is weak on the political aspects and there are a number of repetitions in the output/outcome.

The logframe should be prepared more in details and should be used as a monitoring tool. On the activities implementation, if better defined, the logframe could have been used to anticipate the delays and variations. Also, the consultant should have initiated stakeholders forum in each city, and this could have been incorporated in the logframe.

Regarding the capacity building component, the needs assessment should have been done more in details. Also the timing for this activity should have been earlier in the implementation timeframe. At the 26th week after inception, this is very late. The capacity building program is seen as too generic, and should take more into account the needs to engage with the direct beneficiaries and users, who could have potentially even been included in the capacity building program. GUWASCO was involved in the Lake Victoria Basin Initiative Phase 1, and participated in the capacity building program. Most of the time, the capacity building content of phase 2 was just a repeat.

The logframe should separate very clearly the identification of needs and detail design for the short term interventions from the rest of the work, in order to finance and implement easily the quick impact interventions.

2.3. Project implementation

Expected primary respondents: lead project partner staff and other key project partners (LVBC, UN-Habitat, LVNWSB, Water companies)

Latest progress on the project

The project is implemented under the control and supervision of the Steering Committee, comprising LVBC, UN-Habitat and LVSWSB. The project supervision and follow-up is adequate, but the main problem was delays in inception and delays in completion. At end 2009, a lot is still left to be designed on the short term intervention plans and the long term investment plans. The status of each of the three components is the following:

Component (i) - Short term intervention plans: The identification phase for the short term investment plan was done and report produced in October 2009, but the detailed design is not yet there.

Component (ii) - Long term investment plans: For the long term investment plan, the report is still being produced. A workshop organized recently in Kisumu to validate the draft investment plan.

Component (iii) - Capacity building: The capacity building component was not implemented, but the needs assessment was done. End of November 2009, the CB component was therefore not fully addressed.

What are the main reasons for any delays?

During the preparation phase, the post election violence period in Kenya between January and April 2008 affected severely the region of Kisumu and delayed the finalisation of the project formulation. Then, the preparation of the grant agreement took 5

months, and one of the reasons was the VAT exemption that was difficult to get from the Ministry of Finance.

Once the grant agreement was signed on the 1st August 2008, the recruitment of the consultant took a period of 9 months from August 2008 to April 2009, and the two main causes of delays reported were the obligation of publicity, and the non objection from AWF that takes always one month to get granted at each step.

Regarding the TA to the LVBC, the final evaluation for recruitment was done on 16 Apr 08, before the signature of the grant agreement, and the non objection was given in June 08. Nevertheless, the TA only started in April 09, once the consulting firm was finally recruited.

During implementation, delays were linked to the work planning and demand for time extension. This is due to the fact that the consultant recruited to implement the work was not comfortable with the TOR and the way the work was structured, and reopened discussions once the contract was signed to narrow down the technical scope and discuss budget increase. In addition, the field surveys implemented by the consulting firm were not well prepared, and this resulted in delays for data collection. Delays were reported for example in Keroka to find the existing drawings and maps. In terms of staffing, the successive replacements of the Team Leader were also chaotic and cause of delays.

Among other factors, it is recognised that the poor work planning of the consulting engineering firm was one of the main source of delays. This caused a lot of anxiety during implementation phase, and this was amplified since the engineering company did not have good contacts with each of the 5 governments.

Was the project implemented according to the agreed project logframe and project agreement, if not what variations were introduced and why?

The variations concern revision of the scope of work for the consultancy, which was reduced. This is linked to the grouping of all activities into one package, including needs assessment and detailed design, which led to a confusing scope of work for the consultant, the first (needs assessment) affecting a lot the second (detailed design). For example, designing a dam is not the same work load than designing a borehole.

Because of this lack of clarity, there were many discussions with the consulting firm on the type of solutions to be envisaged, and the definition of priority actions for the short term intervention phase. The definition of "short term interventions" was not clear in the TOR and left room for a lot of interpretations and discussions. Definition and selection criteria for potential solutions were not properly spelled out. This should have been clarified as "quick wins impact" solutions only, but the consulting company finally did only what they were able to do, and ultimately, part of the short term intervention are new investments to be made.

This lack of clarity generated a lot of tensions and led to arguments during all the implementation phase. In addition, the consultant did not interview the right categories of persons (politicians, elders, groups with specific interests...) to clarify properly the priorities. The short term intervention should have been better defined and restricted to quick wins actions. The approach adopted is too much oriented on the conventional works design.

The capacity building component was also underestimated and poorly defined, and the socio-economic survey was implemented after the definition of the investment plan, while it should have been done before. The investment plan should have been anchored in the

results of the socio-economic survey and the needs assessment phase and the capacity building needs evaluation should have been done at the beginning.

For the short term intervention, as well as for the long term investment plan, the consultant should have prepared specific documents for each town instead of a general document for the all project covering the 5 countries. This would have allowed for each town to have its own project plan and would have fostered ownership.

The project was not implemented according to the logframe, and there are still a lot of arguments on the variations, where the consulting firm is requesting for more money and more time (Ref to the SC meeting of the 28 January 2010).

What were the main project constraints and how were they dealt with?

The main project constraint was the lack of agreement on the scope of work for the consultancy. This was reported in the quarterly progress reports, but was only addressed partially through tough discussions between the consultancy firm and the LVBC.

The timing for implementation was also too tight considering the procurement constraints and the uncertainties on the scope of the study.

On the financial and administrative side, problems were faced by LVBC for disbursements. Because of the sequence of payments of the consultancy, the money available on the bank account was not enough to pay certain invoices, but cannot be replenished since less than 50% of the previous replenishment was not spent. This leads to a blockage situation. The time needed to get money for each disbursement is also delaying the implementation. It is felt also the thresholds requirements for non objection are too low and create constraints for implementation. Safeguard can sometimes be an impediment to implementation.

The procurement procedures and conditions for consultant recruitment are considered cumbersome and can be a bottleneck for implementation.

Now the project is finishing, LVBC feels there is need to bridge the TA assignment to prepare for the next steps leading to implementation, and considers this would help for the timely implementation of the works.

What are the main project achievements, including aspects that may not have been including in the original project design or logical framework?

Broadly, the information expected was produced, and the project achieved its objectives in terms of outputs. The long term investment plan is being finalized with a very comprehensive investment proposal, the short term intervention plan is there, but the solutions adopted are sometimes perceived as not adequate. The capacity building component was not properly addressed.

The project has also produced a comprehensive situational analysis with a lot of information collected and analyzed, and a good socio-economic survey.

What are the project achievements and potential areas for improvement and how has the project contributed to each of the main AWF areas of intervention – substantial, significant, moderate, minimal or none?

Strengthening water governance is rated moderate to significant, since some aspects were adequately covered (UFW, illegal connections...), but it was not properly addressed in the capacity building component.

Investments to meet water needs is rated clearly substantial. This is the main objective of the project, and potential funding are already identified. There are plans to finance the short term action plan by June 2010 (GoK and CDF)

Strengthening the financial base is rated moderate to significant, significant for potential revenue collection, but still moderate for investment funding. AWF did not guide the implementing agency, and the sector finance aspects were forgotten despite the huge potential in the region and particularly in Kenya (Infrastructure bonds guaranteed by the GoK, counterpart contribution...). Consultations were missing also on who else is acting in the same area for potential co-financing.

Improving water knowledge is rated moderate. The project generated closer work with the local authorities, with more information sharing and consultation.

To what extent (using a rating system of substantial, significant, moderate, minimal or none) have the AWF cross-cutting issues been addressed by the project, for each of the following:

Capacity building at local, national, basin and regional level: Moderate. It would be good to broaden the CB component.

Gender mainstreaming including policies and methodologies to mainstream practices that promote equality between men and women: Significant. There was a gender specialist part of the consultant team, and significant work was done on this. Women groups are being involved to manage water kiosks.

Poverty reduction: Moderate. Though the project is contributing to improve access to basic services, no specific attention was given by the project on how to target the urban poor.

Environmental sustainability: Substantial. Environment issues are taken into account with soil erosion limitation, tree planting, drainage, solid waste collection, and fencing dumping site.

Good governance: Substantial. Development of a value for money approach (cost/benefit analysis).

2.4. Operation and use of facilities, outputs and systems created

Expected primary respondents: lead project partner staff and other key project partners, plus users of project facilities/outputs/systems. (LVBC, UN-Habitat, LVNWSB, Water companies)

To what extent are the facilities, systems, outputs, practices or capacities created by the project, being used and maintained, in comparison to the project design?

The main outputs of the project are the short term and long term investment plans, and they are being used to develop projects.

For the future facilities, O&M questions are being addressed in the project.

What could be done to improve the use, operation and maintenance of the facilities, systems, outputs, practices or capacities created?

The short term intervention and the long term investment plans should have been specific documents for each town instead of a general document covering the 5 countries. This

would have allowed for each town to have its own project plans and would have increased ownership and usage.

The design for solutions is over-ambitious and could have been kept more realistic, to increase the likelihood of full implementation.

The capacity building component is too weak and does not integrate capacity strengthening for Operation and Maintenance of facilities.

2.5. Project monitoring and evaluation

Expected primary respondents: lead project partner and other key project partners, plus users of project facilities/outputs/systems. (LVBC, UN-Habitat, LVNWSB, Water companies)

What project monitoring and reporting has been done and how could it have been improved?

In terms of TA resources, it is felt the capacities were not adequate to monitor closely the 5 countries, especially that the consultant firm had deployed two teams, one based in Uganda to follow Uganda, Rwanda and Burundi, and one in Tanzania, to follow Tanzania and Kenya.

In terms of reporting, the system in place to follow-up on project implementation was adequate, with appropriate reporting, performance indicators and milestones. The reporting frequency during the project was adequate, with monthly, quarterly and annual reports.

The Steering Committee was very present and was meeting on a quarterly basis, but AWF could have been more present through their field office. Project monitoring was moderate from AWF/OWAS.

At country level, the quality of input of the PMU in each country was very uneven. It was good in Kenya and Uganda, but weak in Tanzania and almost inexistent in Rwanda and Burundi.

How was project monitoring information used to inform changes in the project design and implementation?

The first draft of final report was rejected because of a number of gaps. Issues were not well identified with proper indicators to be adequately followed.

What base line data was collected or what situation analysis was prepared at the start of the project that can be used to compare the 'before' and 'after' project situation?

Regarding the base line data, the very good situational assessment survey conducted by the consultant provided very comprehensive baseline info.

Base line data are there, but there is no monitoring system, or the existing sector monitoring systems are not used. The base line data collection should have made a better use of the existing data and existing M&E systems in place in the 5 countries.

2.6. Next steps, emerging follow on projects and the leverage effect

Expected primary respondents: lead project partner and other key project partners. (LVBC, UN-Habitat, LVNWSB, Water companies)

What are the proposed new projects or concepts that are emerging from this project? Please provide brief descriptions.

For each town, the two proposed projects are the short term action plan on one side and the long term investment plan on the other side. The short term action plan does not directly address the MDGs in terms of coverage increase, but is targeting quick improvement of the quality of service for people already covered. The long term investment plan covers development of sewer lines, water network extension and connections, increase of water production (dam, boreholes), and storm water ditches/channels.

On the content, is considered by a number of partners, that the projects to come should include alternative approaches/solutions to serve the poor. The delegated management approach should be considered, following the model developed in Kisumu (Nyalenda) by the LVSWB, and other options for sanitation than sewer lines should be considered.

The capacity building component should cover/ articulate resources protection (environment), service provision (human needs) and sustainability (facilities and users). It is also important to train the right people, and therefore to think properly who will be train, in order, ultimately to employ the right person and right skills.

Expectations from beneficiaries are very high. On the other side, development project like this one need political sustainability, and there is need to keep some kind of continuity. Ideally, the implementation phase should start without delay. In this regard, it is important to have continuity for the TA to LVBC.

What are the indicative costs of those new project proposals?

All the cumulated funding requirements for the short term intervention and the long term investment represent a big requirement, in the region of USD150M. And the short term intervention plan is still not very well defined.

Are there potential funders for such emerging projects, who are they and what stage have discussions or project developments reached in each case?

It is not clear for the time being who will finance the short term intervention plan, and this issue is supposed to be addressed immediately. This could have been handled from the beginning by considering it as the counterpart contribution, and this would have constituted a well defined envelop, making it clear for the scope of intervention. Then this would have presented an additional advantage of no gap between the study phase and the implementation phase.

On the longer term, the projects are likely to be implemented by AfDB. The project was designed to be financed by AfDB. Assuming it is a grant, it is better to have phases. The immediate needs are more of rehabilitation for quick wins than expansion that is usually tricky for budget. Funding should be phased for the 3 components, so that benefits will be immediate and would provide a good platform for implementing the next steps.

At the local level, water companies like GUWASCO are ready to contract loans with commercial banks to implement part or all of the investment plan. Microcredit systems could also be developed, like it was done in Kissii, Homa Bay, Bondo to support on-site sanitation under the first Lake Victoria Basin Initiative. The possibility to make use of the infrastructure bonds prepared by the GoK is also a possibility.

At the international level, the donor conference was organized just after the project formulation. This timing was not appropriate, and the way forward should be to have a second donor conference in March – April 2010 now that the project is clear, but there is

unfortunately no fund for that. Small donors could take some components, provided they are adequately articulated. EU has expressed willingness to support the project, and AfDB meetings have been organized.

Regarding capital investment, somebody needs to take the lead to secure the funding. A meeting was organized in Entebbe in April 2009 with the 5 ministers in charge of water. AfDB should take the lead and organize a second conference in 2010.

Where new project proposals are being considered by potential funders, what is the likelihood that these projects will be implemented – very likely, likely, uncertain or remote possibility?

The prospects to finance the implementation phase are very high. AfDB is very keen from the inception, but EIB has already expressed interest, as well as the EADB, who is a member of the SC. In addition, the Dutch government is interested, and projects in medium towns are being prepared by AFD and KfW in the framework of the clustering study.

It is very likely that the implementation phase of the project will be funded because regional projects are now a priority, funds are already earmarked on the side of AfDB for USD80M, and contacts have already been initiated with the EIB for co-financing. Regional projects are popular with donors, and this increase the likelihood for the project to get financed.

Solid waste management component will be difficult to finance (uncertain), but it is likely for the rest.

For implementation of the investment part, LVBC could be the political coordinator, and the day to day technical coordination could be done by UN-Habitat. The capacity building component should be implemented at the regional level while the investment and engineering part should be implemented at the national level. Also, the investment project implementation might be a bit different from the study, and this needs to be dealt with at the time of the implementation preparation.

3. Assessment of AWF's role in the project

3.1. Problems experienced during the process of AWF project application, screening, preparation, appraisal and approval.

The first application was submitted by the EAC secretariat in 2007. The project application phase was not problematic. It was conducted by UN-Habitat without particular difficulty and therefore there was no need for specific assistance. UN Habitat was strongly involved at this stage, and they did not request for AWF assistance, probably because they are familiar with this type of work and the expected content of documents.

After application, AWF sent a consultant to prepare the project, and AWF came for appraisal. The consultant provided valuable ideas for the project, and particularly the proposal to get TA to assist the LVBC during the study implementation. There was at this stage a disagreement between UN-Habitat and the AWF on the approach to be adopted for the implementation of the study. UN-Habitat wanted to put together a team of experts as individual consultants, to keep some flexibility, while AWF wanted to package the all studies into one single contract with a consulting firm. The second solution was adopted for the project, against UN-Habitat opinion.

From there, AWF took some time to respond on the document produced. Generally, partners mentioned a recurrent problem of bureaucracy with AWF. It is also felt there are

too many intermediaries between AWF and the beneficiary towns (AWF → EAC → LVBC → LVSWSB → Water companies)

Once the project was approved, a regional meeting was organised in March 2008 with the 5 ministers of water of the 5 countries. The grant agreement took 5 months to be prepared and finalized and was signed between AWF and EAC on 1st August 2008.

The sequencing for project implementation was not spelled out properly at the preparation phase, and this generated delays on implementation, on the TA mobilisation and on the selection of towns.

The TA was recruited first, but came on board only one year later, after a number of administrative conditionality was solved and the financing finally released.

On the selection of towns to be included in the project, this should have been done at the preparation stage. The consulting firm has been appointed while the towns to be included in the project were not agreed on. Kericho was included in the list in early 2009, and there was many changes done before the list was finalised with three towns in Kenya (Kericho, Keroka and Isebania).

3.2. Strengths, weaknesses and areas for improvement for the AWF during the process of AWF project development, application, screening, preparation, appraisal and approval

On the administrative side, it is felt the process between application and first disbursement was cumbersome and difficult with regard to the relatively small amount of funds involved. One source of delay was the VAT exemption requirement from AWF, since it takes long for the Ministry of Finance to approve. The grant agreement took also too long to be finalised after the appraisal (one year between the appraisal mission and the grant agreement signature). Partners felt maybe AWF needs additional human resources to fasten the projects evaluation process.

AWF communication is perceived as weak and should be improved, both in terms of content and volume. AWF did not attend the first Steering Committee meeting and do not communicate adequately on their services and funding opportunities. There is a lack of communication from AWF, and generally, the governments do not know much about AWF, and they don't know what is possible to finance or not.

On its content, the project strength was to keep the focus on the logframe and close to the ground to answer needs, though the logframe should have been better designed at the preparation phase. AWF procedures should be better communicated and knowledge transfer should be strengthened with more trainings planned from the preparation. The scope of work might have been both over-ambitious and not adequately well defined at the same time.

3.3. Support provided by AWF during in the project development, appraisal and approval process

AWF was very supportive during the project preparation phase, and they hired a consultant for the project preparation and appraisal mission.

For the preparation stage, there is consensus among the partners on the very good cooperation with AWF/AfDB and the adequate support received from AWF. AWF did very well at the preparation stage, until the grant approval. From there, it has been confusing between AWF and OWAS, and it was not clear who was in charge of the project, and then everybody is referring to AfDB instead of AWF.

3.4. What are the strengths, weaknesses and potential areas for improvement for the AWF in terms of their support to project implementation, bearing in mind the project budget?

The beneficiary municipalities felt they were not enough involved in the project implementation. There was no contact between AWF and the beneficiaries, and when they were invited to meetings gathering the 5 countries covered, there was no budget to cover their participation. The municipal councils were engaged during the process, but not very much supported.

LVBC would have appreciated to receive more support on the AWF administrative and financial procedures. There was need to address variations, contract and procurement issues, delays, but they felt they did not receive adequate assistance for that. They would have needed a booklet and training for this. Such project needs a lot of back-stopping from AWF. It would have been appropriate to have a methodology for AWF support. The SC and the countries PMU should have received specific training on AWF procedures and project implementation, because they make decisions on project management. The AWF should be a little more flexible during implementation to avoid blockage situations.

AWF is stretched for supervision, and they were following up, but too remotely and they have not been seen on the ground. As a result, they did not provide enough comments and field visits, and consultation with line ministries was weak. Several partners commented they should have made a better use of their field office in Nairobi. The AfDB country office was not involved during the preparation phase and it is the TA, when he arrived, who pushed for the country office to be involved. It would be good to define a frame for country office intervention, to spell out the role and responsibility in the project implementation, and eventually preparation. This would benefit a lot for the project, since staff on the ground have a better knowledge of the sector and know the latest developments.

3.5. How would you rate the support provided by AWF during project implementation – very good, good, adequate or inadequate?

There is consensus within the stakeholders consulted to say that AWF support during implementation was inadequate. The follow-up was weak with little outreach, even through telephone calls. The feeling is that AWF did not engage in the implementation phase.

Annexes

Persons met or interviewed

Name	Organization	Contact (including e-mail)
Dan OWORE	LVBC	owore@lvbcsec.org – (+254) 722 756 929
Nelson BOSUBEN	KEWASCO	nelsonbosuben@yahoo.co.uk – (+254) 722 899 097
Richard ONYARI	GUWASCO	(+254) 722 354 827
Laban ONONGNO	UN-Habitat	laban.onongno@unhabitat.org (+254) 722 722 929
Gerson FUMBUKA	LVBC	fumbuka@lvbcsec.org (+254) 721 760 221
Samuel GICHERE	LVBC	gichere@lvbcsec.org (+254) 722 880 913
Michael OCHIENG	LVSWSB	michael.ochieng@lvswaterboard.com (+254) 725 526 609
Gatere KURIA	MWI	kuriagatere@yahoo.co.uk (+254) 720 366 003

Name	Organization	Contact (including e-mail)
John SIFUMA	AfDB	j.sifuma@afdb.org (+254) 733 708 619
Robert GOODWIN	UN-Habitat	robert.goodwin@unhabitat.org (+254) 720 920 103

Documents consulted

AWF Project Assessment Guide final – January 2010

AWF Preliminary Report v5 – December 2009

Operational programme 2008-2010

TOR for consultancy services for a project to prepare investment plans for 15 secondary urban centres under the Lake Victoria Basin Water and Sanitation Initiative in Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Burundi & Rwanda - August 2008

EAC AWF Funding Proposal - Lake Victoria Project latest – October 2007

LWATSAN Appraisal Report - November 2007

Statement to the EAC LVBC Consultative Forum Entebbe - December 2007

Grant agreement – August 2008

Lake Victoria water initiative Change Agents Training Report – June 2009

Logical Framework (Results-Based Logframe)

HIERARCHY OF OBJECTIVES	EXPECTED RESULTS	REACH	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	INDICATIVE TARGETS TIMEFRAME	ASSUMPTIONS / RISKS
<p>Goal:</p> <p>To assist high priority secondary towns of the Lake Victoria Basin to develop water supply and sanitation infrastructure and so contribute to improvement in the health and livelihoods of residents and quality of the Lake water.</p>	<p>Impact:</p> <p>National agencies charged with responsibility for asset holding in the selected towns in the Lake Victoria Basin will have the capacity to secure funding for and execute the development of physical infrastructure and human and institutional capacity and hence ensure that they meet the MDG targets in terms of improve health and livelihood of the population and improved quality of water in the Lake Victoria.</p>	<p>Beneficiaries:</p> <p>WATSAN Service Providers Municipal Authorities Sector professionals</p> <p>Basin population.</p>	<p>Impact Indicators:</p> <p>Funding available for the 15 centres</p> <p>Immediate works executed in all the 15 towns</p> <p>Project Towns meet MDG targets for WATSAN and Health Lake Water Quality Improved.</p>	<p>Progress anticipated</p> <p>Funding available within one year of completion of studies</p> <p>Execution of immediate works begins within 6 months of funds being available.</p> <p>MDG targets met by 2015</p> <p>Acceptable levels from project towns by 2015</p>	<p>Adequate funding is made available to execute the resulting projects and system extensions thereafter.</p>
<p>Project purpose:</p> <p>To assist the high priority secondary towns in the Lake Victoria Basin identify their immediate and long term needs in water and sanitation taking, into consideration the ecological demands of the lake and its tributaries and to define solutions in terms of detailed designs and investment program for financing with the aid of regional Governments and external support agencies</p>	<p>Outcomes:</p> <p>Detailed designs for immediate works available The investment plans for long term development consisting of description physical interventions (in the form of preliminary designs) and capacity building programmes for each selected town as well as the estimated costs and implementation schedule.</p>	<p>Beneficiaries:</p> <p>NGOs and CBOs. WATSAN Service providers Policy makers. Municipal Authorities Sector professionals.</p>	<p>Outcome indicators:</p> <p>Detailed designs accepted by the respective towns Investment plans reviewed and validated through stakeholder workshops.</p>	<p>Progress anticipated in the medium term:</p> <p>Timeframe: within 6.5 months of start of work</p>	<p>Assumption statement:</p> <p>Competent Consultanta selected for the Work. Adequate support and facilitation to consultants in terms of inputs.</p>

<u>Activities:</u>	<u>Outputs:</u>	<u>Beneficiaries:</u>	<u>Output indicator:</u>	<u>Progress anticipated in the short term:</u>	<u>Assumption statement:</u>	
Recruit Consultants						
Review the sector and policy context in countries and project area	Sector context of the project understood and documented	WATSAN Service providers, Policy makers and prospective funding agencies.	Report acceptable to key stakeholders	By week 5	Continued political commitment by national governments to support the project formulation process.	
Identify of urgent and critical needs to address with immediate effect	Consensus reached on Immediate needs of the priority towns ..		Proposal accepted by stakeholders.	By week13	Continued interest and willingness of the local stakeholders to be engaged in the project formulation process.	
Prepare detailed designs of immediate works	Detailed Specifications of immediate works available for tendering		Proposal accepted by stakeholders	By week 24		
Identify long term demands	Feasible solutions developed into investment plans at the town and project levels with timeframe and cost budget.		Proposal accepted by stakeholders	By week 22		
Analyse and Select solutions from alternatives						
Prepare Investment Plan Outline						
Prepare Statement of Work and Cost Estimates						
Evaluate and Validate of the Investment Plan					By week 26	
Institutional Analysis, Capacity Building and Training	Institutional Development requirements well understood			Proposal accepted by stakeholders	By week 26	
	Impacts of the selected solutions					

<p>Analyse the project in terms of : <i>Institutional Capacity and Training, Financial and Economic ,Social and Gender aspects, Environmental Impact, a Sustainability and Risks</i></p> <p>Prepare a Project Financing and Implementation Plan.</p> <p>Design a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework</p> <p>Convene Validation Workshop and Donors Conference.</p> <p>Total cost EUR 998,500 AWF Grant EUR 994,000</p>	<p>better understood and rated acceptable.</p> <p>Detailed <i>financing and implementation</i> plans developed and available</p> <p>A performance monitoring and evaluation and reporting framework available and in use by the sector agencies.</p>		<p>Impacts assessments accepted the National Environmental Agencies and other stakeholders</p> <p>Plans Accepted by stakeholders</p> <p>Framework accepted by Stakeholders.</p>	<p>By week27</p> <p>By week 30</p>	
--	--	--	---	------------------------------------	--

Integrated study and project preparation for COFAMOSA irrigation project – Mozambique, February 2010

1. Introduction

This project assessment has been undertaken as part of the overall Operational review and institutional assessment of the African Water Facility (AWF), that is being conducted by Hydroconseil and WEDC. The same assessment methodology has been agreed and used for the review of seven other AWF projects in Africa, as a means of effective comparison, with a view to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of AWF projects. It is important that the results and emerging lessons from AWF projects are assessed and documented for wider dissemination.

Section 2 of this report is an assessment of the project in Mozambique, while section 3 summarizes an assessment of AWF's support to the project during each of the main stages of the project cycle.

The COFAMOSA project consists in a feasibility study of an irrigation scheme that will involve South African and Mozambican farmers that will grow cane in order to produce either sugar or ethanol on a 29,000 ha surface.

2. Assessment of the project

This assessment report is structured using the same broad project cycle framework as used for the other projects' assessments. However, the project has just started in 2010, which makes it impossible to analyze outputs, project monitoring and evaluation, and next steps to be foreseen.

As a result, this document only reports on the following phases of the project:

Project design, appraisal and approval

Project implementation

2.1. Project design, appraisal and approval

The project has been identified in 2003 by COFAMOSA (Committee for the Facilitation of Agriculture between Mozambique and South Africa). Mozambique GoM contacted the AfDB in order to fund the feasibility study. A field mission was set up in December 2006 by the AfDB, the OSANO department conducted the mission on behalf of the AWF and informed the GoM of Mozambique on the proceedings for elaborating an AWF proposal.

The project was deemed eligible in March 2007 and the appraisal document was finalised in August 2007. The grant agreement was signed in December 2007 for a total of EUR 1,178,367.

No screening information was collected for this project. However, the objective of the project being to elaborate a feasibility study for an irrigation project, the funded project is clearly responding to various AWF main areas of intervention:

Water for productive uses (investment to meet water needs);

Attracting and benefiting from private sector Investments (Strengthening the financial base);

Transboundary water resources management (Strengthening water governance).

The project consists in a feasibility study of a 29,000 ha cane growing scheme developed in 3 phases and managed by a group of South African and Mozambican farmers. The feasibility study shall produce the following deliverables:

- Water Resources Assessment and Management study
- Water Resources Engineering Study – Infrastructure Designs and Costs
- Irrigated Agriculture and Marketing Study
- Institutional Management and Capacity Building Needs Assessment
- Economic and Financial Analyses
- Environmental and Social Impact Assessment
- Stakeholder Consultation Workshops

The appraisal was conducted by the agricultural department from the bank (Osano) and followed classic AfDB procedures (no real AWF procedures could be identified) according to Cesar Tique the MZRO Agricultural and Rural Development Specialist. The appraisal was done on behalf of the AWF which guided the team, the supported provided by the AWF is rated as adequate for this phase.

A Logical Frame Work was developed during the project appraisal phase, due to the fact that the project is only starting implementation now (in 2010) there is no possible evaluation of the LF's relevancy.

2.2. Project implementation

The grant was signed in December 2007; the project consisted in one study to be elaborated by a consulting company and a consultative workshop. The GoM mobilized and filled all the conditions for the first grant disbursement of 400,000 \$ in April 2008.

The procurement started, and this is when delays started to occur mainly in the waiting time for no-objection from the AWF team. Although there is no detailed date to support this, the MZRO task manager enumerated a 4 months waiting time for the no-objection for shortlist approval (from June to November 2008) and then again 4 months waiting period for the approval of the bidding procedures results.

Due to these delays, the private company that is part of the funding scheme of the study reviewed the terms of reference which took a long time and incurred additional waiting time for the respective no-objection from the AWF.

All in all, the contract was signed in January 2010. In the project appraisal, the performance plan is forecasting the contract signature date for December 2007.

No more information could be collected due to the fact that the consultant is just starting the study; no inception report was produced yet.

Preparation of the National Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Program - Mozambique, February 2010

1. Introduction

This project assessment has been undertaken as part of the overall Operational review and institutional assessment of the African Water Facility (AWF), that is being conducted by Hydroconseil and WEDC. The same assessment methodology has been agreed and used for the review of seven other AWF projects in Africa, as a means of effective comparison, with a view to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of AWF projects. It is important that the results and emerging lessons from AWF projects are assessed and documented for wider dissemination.

Section 2 of this report is an assessment of the project in Mozambique, while section 3 summarizes an assessment of AWF's support to the project during each of the main stages of the project cycle.

2. Assessment of the project

This assessment report is structured using a broad project cycle framework:

- Project design, appraisal and approval
- Project implementation
- Operation and use of facilities, outputs and systems created
- Project monitoring and evaluation
- Next steps, emerging projects and the leverage effect

2.1. Project performance summary

Methodology

The scoring system and approach for the AWF project output to outcome review is a simplified version of the DFID output to purpose review approach. It includes a scoring system to indicate the likelihood of achievements of both the project outcomes and the project outputs. Table 1 is the proposed project rating scoring system to be used to rate the likelihood of achievement of the project outcomes and outputs in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 1. Project rating scale for likelihood of project objectives being achieved

Rating number	Criteria for rating
1	Likely to be completely achieved. The outputs/ purpose are well on the way to completion (or are completed).
2	Likely to be largely achieved. There is good progress towards purpose completion and most outputs are likely to be achieved, particularly the most important ones.
3	Likely to be partly achieved. Only partial achievement of the purpose is likely and/or achievement of some outputs.

Rating number	Criteria for rating
4	Only likely to be achieved to a very limited extent . Purpose unlikely to be achieved but a few outputs likely to be achieved.
5	Unlikely to be achieved. No progress on outputs or purpose.
X	X. = It is difficult to say whether there has been any progress towards the final achievement of outputs or outcomes. This score should not be used if at all possible.

Table 2. Outcome project rating assessment (outcome level)

Goal statement:			
Improve health condition and quality of life and reduce poverty of rural population in Mozambique			
Improve water service delivery in the rural areas			
Outcome 1 statement			
Mobilization of funds for the RWSS			
Outcome 1 OVs	Progress	Comments	Rating score (see table B)

1. Investment plan for the RWSS ready, approved and divulgated	The investment plan is ready and has been approved.	The investment plan is part of the RWSS Program document, however it has not been detailed at the local levels yet (provincial and district levels)	1
2. US\$ 340 millions of mobilized funds	US\$ 85 million of project under implementation	After launching of the PRONASAR, US\$ 10 million have been secured for SWA for the year 2010	2
3. Implementation of the Phase I of RWSS	Phase I has not yet started	The implementation plan for phase I of the PRONASAR shall be updated first week of April 2010. Financing gap is around US\$ 40 million	2
Outcome 1 average score and justification	<p>After a late start, the program has been launched. The objectives of Phase I have been reduced in terms of number of outputs and refocused on creating an enabling environment for the next phase of the program.</p> <p>All the information is available what is now missing is concrete commitments from the donors. There are already US\$ 10 million secured for SWA for year 2010 and there are good reasons to believe that this is just a start and that other donors will come in and make further commitments along the years.</p>		1.7
Outcome 2 statement			
RWSS program management facilitated and well coordinated			
Outcome 2 OVIs	Progress	Comments	Rating score (see table B)
1. RWSS implementation manual approved and divulgated	The implementation manual has been approved but is not yet divulgated	The implementation manual will be divulgated once the program is approved	1
2. Approval and launching of RWSS by GoM	Done on the 24 th of March 2010	The program is launched and the detailed implementation plan of Phase I shall be finalized in April 2010	1
3. Existence of country coordination of the RWSS	Not yet	This shall be put in place once the program is launched	1

4. Signature of Code of Conduct	Done by GoM, DNA and some donors	AfDB has not signed yet this CoC	1
Outcome 2 average score and justification	The program implementation has not started yet; however all the conditions are met in order to have a proper coordination.		1
Outcome 3 statement			
Provision of Water and Sanitation services to the rural population of the country on track for the MDGs			
Outcome 3 OVI	Progress	Comments	Rating score (see table B)
1. On track for reaching 70% of rural water access	54% in January 2010 it was 42% in 2006	The logical frameworks specifies that the water service coverage shall reach 55% in 2009 and 70% in 2015	2
2. On track for reaching 50% of rural sanitation coverage	40% in January 2010, it was 39% in 2006	The logical framework specifies that the water service coverage shall reach 40% in 2009 and 50% in 2015.	2
3. Detailed plan ready up to 2015	The PRONASAR implementation plan has not been updated yet, the implementation plan for phase I shall be finalized on the first week of April 2010	Detailed plan for Phase I shall be ready in April 2010. This Phase I will create the enabling environment for an efficient program implementation.	2
4. Financing gap to reach the MDGs	US\$ 10 million is committed for SWA for year 2010, above the expectancies of the study	Phase I financing gap has still not been filled. The MoU regarding common funding has still not been finalized because of conditions to be fulfilled by the Mozambican Government, this could delay the rate of funding commitments and thus the filling of the financing gap to reach the MDGs	2
Outcome 3 average score and justification	The coverage rates are more or less on track compared to the LFW, one should consider that these results are not linked to the PRONASAR. With the effective launch of the program, there is a good probability that Mozambique will reach the MDGs within the delay. However, one major constraint is the financing gap and the fact that all conditions have still not been met in order to have a		2

	large adherence of the financiers to the SWA, this might slow down the funding commitments and affect the overall results of the program.	
--	---	--

Table 3. Output project rating assessment

Output	Indicator (OVI)	Progress and likelihood of being achieved	Rating score
1. RWSS situation analysis report prepared	Approved document	Completed at the national level.	1
2. Draft National RWSS Strategy and Investment Program prepared	Approved document	Completed	1
3. Draft Document for National RWSS Program – phase I prepared	Approved document	Completed	1
4. National RWSS Implementation Manual prepared	Approved document	Completed	1
5. RWSS investment requirement revised and updated	Approved document	Completed	1
6. Institutional framework with clear roles and responsibilities defined	Approved document	Completed	1
7. Capacity building and institutional support requirements elaborated	Approved document	Completed but at national level, there is a need to prepared these documents at provincial and districts levels	1
8. Strategy and action plan for realignment of current projects and programs elaborated	Approved document	This activity has not started yet, there will be some resistance from some of the implementing partners (according to DNA) that will slow down the process	2
9. Financing mechanism elaborated	Approved document and signed	The final draft MoU for common funds is ready however it has not been signed by the various parties; the program plans also for separated funding	1

Output	Indicator (OVI)	Progress and likelihood of being achieved	Rating score
10. Existing programs, projects and technical support harmonized and integrated into the NRWSSP	Commitments from the on-going projects	Even though the strategy is not ready (Output n°8), some major projects (such as Unicef initiative 1,000,000 and MCC rural water project in Nampula and Cabo del Gado provinces) have committed to harmonize themselves with the program	2
11. Outline a plan for TA to districts	Approved document	The plan has not been elaborated yet but shall be one of the first outputs of Phase I implementation	1
Total average output score and justification	The project being completed most of the outputs are already achieved. However, the PRONASAR has just been launched and therefore the last outputs have not been achieved yet because they are mostly linked to the implementation of the program (outputs n°8, 10 and 11).		1.2
Outcome attribution To what extent can the achievement of the outcomes be attributed to the delivery of the project outputs?	<p>The project consists in the elaboration of a program which main objectives are to reach the MDGs by 2015.</p> <p>The three outcomes are related to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funds mobilization for the program Enabling environment for the program implementation Provision of services online with MDGs plan <p>The first outcome achievement can partially attributed to the delivery of the project outputs as fund mobilization is partly linked to available information (provided by the project) that justify additional funding but as well linked to specific funding conditions (for instance for the SWA, common fund) that should be met by the Mozambican government but totally unrelated to the project outputs.</p> <p>The second outcome achievement can be clearly attributed to the delivery of the project outputs.</p> <p>The last outcome achievement is not related to the project outputs as the project has no physical outputs that can contribute to the last outcome.</p>		

2.2. Project design, appraisal and approval

The elaboration of the National Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Program (that has been launched under the name of PRONASAR) is among the first projects being funded by the AWF. The initial contacts occurred between the DNA (through the planning department) and the AWF team. At the time of the project design, appraisal and approval, the AfDB Mozambique local office (MZO) was being set up and thus not operational.

The project was approved in November 2006 and the grant agreement signed on the 4th of April 2007 for a total of 486,223 €.

There is no screening information due to the fact that this project has been funded during the early stage of the AWF when the screening procedures were not yet in place. However, the objective of the project being to elaborate a Rural Water Supply and

Sanitation Program in order to reach the MDGs, there is no doubt about the pertinence of such project and the adequacy to the core AWF areas of intervention.

The project consists in designing a program up to 2015 in order to meet the MDGs for the rural water sector. The program shall outline:

The needs in order to reach the MDGs in the rural water sector, not only in terms of coverage but as well in terms of capacity building at the local administrative level, decentralized planning, sustainability issues and better policy implementation; A harmonized approach to be respected by the donors (in line with the various international agreements signed by the donors, such as Accra, Paris etc...) that shall culminate with a common fund and Sector Wide Approach; An investment plan up to 2015 and a detailed investment phase from 2009 up to 2011. There are no information coming from the Mozambique AfDB office during this phase of the project, however, the DNA staff rated the support provided by the AWF as good during the project preparation. There were many exchanges during this phase and the AWF helped in orienting the definition of the project. At the level of the DNA, the planning department started the initiative supported by the rural water department who elaborated the proposal and transmitted it to the AWF through their planning department.

The Logical Frame Work developed while the project appraisal phase has been used since and was particularly well designed at the light of the project implementation. The fact that the project is quite straight forward helped in designing an appropriate LFW right from the beginning.

2.3. Project implementation

The grant was signed on the 4th of April 2007, the project consisted in one study to be elaborated by a consulting company and a series of workshops (3 workshops at the regional level and 1 at the central level) in order to share the program elaboration process and make it a participative process.

The contract with the consultant was signed in August 2007 and was supposed to last 9 months. However, the completion date is 31st of September 2009. Many delays occurred during implementation. Nevertheless, the project is completed to a satisfactory level, all the planned deliverables have been submitted and were of expected quality and all the project funds have been disbursed.

The implementation delays are coming from various parties:

The consultant experienced some delays at the beginning of the project as they lost their team leader and took some time before replacing it. However, the new team leader showed a great commitment and enabled the project to come back quickly on track; The DNA took some time for setting up the special conditions of the AWF and get acquainted with the procedures for fund disbursement: the Grant agreement was signed on 4th of April 2007, the special account opened on May 2007 but the first disbursement request was submitted in February 2008, thus the advance payment to the consultant was disbursed in February 2008 (with a contract starting date of August 2007); The AWF took some time in providing no-objections, sometimes for very small issues but nevertheless that were constraining the implementation (according to Carlos Laisse, one N.O. took 6 months and regarded the reallocation of funds to the amount of US\$ 600); the DNA comments in the Project Completion Report are that the disbursements from AWF took a lot of time and involved too much bureaucracy and that AWF took a long time in responding to correspondence, emails and formal letters.

The project was implemented according to the agreed project LFW, no variation was introduced. The main project achievement is clearly the designed Rural Water Supply

and Sanitation Program including all the annexed deliverables such as the phase I investment plan, the implementation manual of the program and capacity building plan.

The main constraint met during the project implementation has been the delays incurred during the study. This constraint was overcome by asking the AWF an extension of the grant validity period in order to be able to disburse up to the end of the study.

The officer of the AfDB local office as well as the DNA implementation team rated the support from the AWF as adequate. The task managers at the AWF are reactive and responsive to the requests of the various partners, however this openness is mitigated by the fact that the task managers were not often available, took time in responding to the requests and that there was no clear task sharing between the OWAS and the AWF at the AfDB level.

An interesting and relevant point is that for most of the met actors, they do not make any difference between the AWF and the AfDB and more especially the OWAS. They just consider that either departments or institutions are from the bank and that the difference comes from the origins of the funds. Therefore there is recognised added-value or strength coming from the AWF as such.

In terms of implementation, the potential areas for improvement for the AWF are the following:

- Communication to clearly differentiate the differences between the AWF and the OWAS and thus the necessity of having specific procedures (particularly for the financial issues);
- Manual of procedures for the implementation of AWF projects to be divulged at the level of local office and beneficiaries (meaning the implementing actor);
- Better efficiency in providing no-objection related to the project implementation;
- Dedicated monitoring mission from the AWF team.

Methodology

The scoring system and approach for the AWF project output to outcome review is a simplified version of the DFID output to purpose review approach. It includes a scoring system to indicate the likelihood of achievements of both the project outcomes and the project outputs. Table 1 is the proposed project rating scoring system to be used to rate the likelihood of achievement of the project outcomes and outputs in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 1. Project rating scale for likelihood of project objectives being achieved

Rating number	Criteria for rating
1	Likely to be completely achieved. The outputs/ purpose are well on the way to completion (or are completed).
2	Likely to be largely achieved. There is good progress towards purpose completion and most outputs are likely to be achieved, particularly the most important ones.
3	Likely to be partly achieved. Only partial achievement of the purpose is likely and/or achievement of some outputs.
4	Only likely to be achieved to a very limited extent . Purpose unlikely to be achieved but a few outputs likely to be achieved.
5	Unlikely to be achieved. No progress on outputs or purpose.
X	X. = It is difficult to say whether there has been any progress towards the final achievement of outputs or outcomes. This score should not be used if at all possible.

The project achievements according to the AWF main areas of intervention are the following:

AWF main areas of intervention	Project achievement	Potential areas for improvement	Contribution of the project
Strengthening water governance	The project defines a road map in order to increase the service coverage in the rural areas. There are no concrete outputs, but the project creates all the conditions for achieving the MDGs goals for the rural areas.	Given the fact that the MDG target time is 2015, a longer horizon program could have brought a higher inputs for national planning	Substantial
Investments to meet water needs	The project outline a detailed investment plan for achieving the MDGs in the rural areas as well as strengthening the local capacities, improve the sustainability of the water and sanitation services.	None	Substantial
Strengthening the financial base	The project by identifying the investment needs is creating the conditions in order to mobilize the necessary government funds as well as external funds. Moreover, the project is creating a momentum in order to increase the funds availability by clearly identifying the needs and creating additional alternative for donors disbursement (common fund, sector wide approach)	The momentum created by this project could have been better used in order to reach concrete commitments for the donors	Substantial
Improving water knowledge	The project lay out a monitoring and evaluation system that contributes to this main achievement, as well through the advocacy of decentralized planning it is improving the information management.	The project states a comprehensive information system, however there is no proper evaluation of the feasibility of such information system (especially in the light of existing local capacity).	Significant

AWF cross cutting issues	Rating	Rational for rating
Capacity building at local, national, basin and regional level	Significant	The project defines a clear plan for local administration capacity building.
Gender mainstreaming including policies and methodologies to mainstream practices that promote equality between men and women	Minimal	There is no special focus on this issue, just the usual “politically correct” references.
Poverty reduction	Significant	The project creates all conditions for reaching the MDGs and thus participate significantly to the poverty reduction
Environmental sustainability	Moderate	The project is mostly focused on the extension of water and sanitation services to the rural population, in a sustainable way but with no special focus on environmental issues
Good governance	Minimal	The project creates conditions for local planning

2.4. Operation and use of facilities, outputs and systems created

The project was concluded in March 2009, the corresponding program (PRONASAR) has been launched on the 24th of March 2010:

The Code of conduct in the water sector has been signed in March 2008 by the DNA, the MOPH and various development partners, this code of conduct intention is to promote the Paris declaration on Aid effectiveness¹;

A draft MoU for a Rural Water Supply and Sanitation common fund was prepared in February 2009 but has not transformed into a definitive one;

The delay in launching the program created a lack of momentum which is not related to the project as such or to the AWF, however, as it will be said in the conclusion, there is a feeling that the AfDB could have supported a lot more this AWF project and carry on with the momentum created during the time of the program preparation.

2.5. Project monitoring, supervision and evaluation

The monitoring of the project consisted in progress reports provided by the lead project partner as well as monitoring missions from the AfDB. The comments from the DNA implementation team is that even if there were monitoring missions from the AfDB Mozambique task manager, the monitoring missions were not focused on the AWF project and just a mean of forwarding the various requests from the implementation team to the AWF team members. Thus an obvious improvement proposed is to have specific AWF monitoring missions in order to favor direct interactions between the implementation team and the AWF.

The baseline data collected in order to evaluate the project impact is merely the country situation presented in the project appraisal stating the level of service coverage in the rural areas (on a national scale) and presenting a series of constraints that the DNA is facing in order to reach the MDGs. The project being the elaboration of a Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Program in order to reach the MDGs such general baseline data will be difficult to use in order to compare the “after” project situation. One could do it discriminating the specific increase of service coverage due to the implementation of the program. However, since the program has not been approved yet and therefore has not been implemented, there is no possible evaluation of the project impact. The project appraisal shall have provided more detailed baseline information (such as financing gap, lack of planning, lack of capacity building etc...) to which the project is actually responding.

There has been no project evaluation so far.

As said before there has been no direct AWF supervision mission and this has been felt by the implementation agency (DNA) as an important constraint as they could have better explained through direct contact their requests for the moment and would probably have received a better guidance in the search of ways out. However, it must be noted, that the project has never suffered a total paralysis due to lack of AWF orientation, this can explain as well why there has been no direct monitoring mission from the AWF (always relying on the AfDB task manager missions), the project was not in such need (compared to other projects).

¹ The code of conduct was signed by the following financers: Canada, England, France, Holland, Portugal, Switzerland, Unicef and World Bank

The DNA produced a Project Completion Report in April 2009, thus 1 month after the Project completion date. However, the PCR is still at the draft level as the AWF has not produced any comments yet.

There was no saving on the project budget.

2.6. Next steps, emerging follow on projects and the leverage effect

The project is now completed, it has created an important tool in order to reach the MDG in the rural water sector and set up a clear road map. According to the DNA planning director, this project triggered a very wide coordination process between the implementing partners and between the implementing partners and the government. There is now a common understanding on the necessity of projects harmonization, global planning and coordination through the PRONASAR.

However, up to now, there has been no measurable impact in the field as the PRONASAR designed by the project has just been launched and therefore has not been put into implementation. The reason for the delay is most likely the busy government agenda in 2009 (presidential election that occurred in October 2009) that must have pushed forward all pending issues.

Some progress has been met regarding the Code of Conduct that formalize the harmonization of the aid in the rural water sector, the SWA is on the way but not yet formalized as the MoU for common funds is at the final stage but has not been signed by the various parties yet.

Regarding the financing gap, US\$ 10 million are committed for year 2010 for SWA, this is an improvement compared to the prevision stated in the report study (annex 8 of the final report). There are some ongoing projects and a line of credit that will contribute to the phase I of the PRONASAR however, these funds were not triggered by the elaboration of the program as the projects were already in implementation and shall be gradually integrated in the phase I.

Phase I has been refocused more on “soft actions” with the objective of creating an enabling environment (Technical Assistant plan at the district level, baseline information, monitoring conditions ready) rather than physical outputs.

The PRONASAR has provided a very important tool in order to put back Mozambique on the track of the MDG for the rural water sector, this project will clearly have important leverage effect on emerging projects and funding commitments. However, funding commitments (and especially for the common fund) are not only relying on the PRONASAR implementation or design but as well on financial and transparency conditions to be fulfilled by the Mozambican government after the fiduciary assessment has been completed.

This evaluation brings one comment that supports comments from the director of the Mozambique office of AfDB and the DNA planning director: the low support of the AfDB on the PRONASAR

The AfDB has not signed the CoC yet;

The AfDB has not committed any funds for the RWSS Program;

As the director of MZO says, the AfDB had a great opportunity to make profit of the momentum created by the AWF funded project and up to now has not showed clear sign. This is a clear sign that the AWF is not as integrated in the AfDB as most of the people think but as well a clear lack of synergy between the AfDB and its Water Facility.

The DNA planning director shares the same view point: although the elaboration of the program was funded by the AWF and supported by the AfDB, there were little evidences after the end of the study that AfDB was supporting this program; it was in fact the financing partner who re-injected momentum in the process.

People met

AfDB

Alice Hammer: Resident Representative

João Mabombo: Project officer of the RWSS study

Carlos Laisse: Consultant temporarily task managing the RWSS study for the bank

DNA:

Jorge Joaquim: DAR director

Vicente Macamo: Project coordinator at the DAR level

Mr. Alvaro: Planning department director

Mr. Mesias: in charge of database for rural water and sanitation infrastructure

UNICEF:

Angelina Xavier: Water and environmental sanitation specialist

Ethiopia Water Information and Knowledge Management Project, March 2010

1. Introduction

This project assessment has been undertaken as part of the overall Operational review and institutional assessment of the African Water Facility (AWF), that is being conducted by Hydroconseil and WEDC. The same assessment methodology has been agreed and used for the review of seven other AWF projects in Africa, as a means of effective comparison, with a view to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of AWF projects. It is important that the results and emerging lessons from AWF projects are assessed and documented for wider dissemination.

Section 2 of this report is an assessment of the project in Ethiopia, while section 3 summarizes an assessment of AWF's support to the project during each of the main stages of the project cycle.

The Water Information and Knowledge Management Project in Ethiopia is aimed at improving resource management, water supply services and increasing food security through the rational use of water for agriculture as a result of improvement in water data and information generation and management as well as targeted applied research. The project activities can be grouped into the following five components.

- Component 1: Support to the establishment of an integrated National Water Information System;
- Component 2: Strengthen Water Quality Data Generation and Management;
- Component 3: Reinforce Water Research and Knowledge Management;
- Component 4: Support the Establishment of Groundwater Database;
- Component 5: Upgrade and Expand ICT Infrastructure Capacity.

Component 4 was deleted from the project due to limited funds. It has been supported by another donor. The project was submitted to the African Water Facility by the Ministry of Water Resources (MoWR) in Ethiopia for financing and an appraisal mission was conducted in May 2006. The ceiling set on the project budget contribution from AWF was €500,000. Following the signing of the grant agreement the first disbursement was received in July 2007 and the project was expected to be complete in 18 months. Further project delays have been experienced and completion is expected in 2010.

2. Assessment of the project

This assessment report is structured using a broad project cycle framework:

- Project design, appraisal and approval
- Project implementation
- Operation and use of facilities, outputs and systems created
- Project monitoring and evaluation
- Next steps, emerging projects and the leverage effect

But first of all a project performance summary is presented in the next section, with an overview of the project achievements and a project rating table using a project output to outcome methodology.

2.1. Project performance summary

Overview

This is a strategically important water information system project for the Ministry of Water Resources in Ethiopia that will lead to the development of future systems of water information gathering, analysis, storage and dissemination. This is essentially a project preparation project with mainly consultancy studies, and some limited IT upgrading and piloting of small systems. While there have been delays on the project and one unrealistic study report, the MoWR have used good judgement to carefully adapt the project design and terms of reference for the main outputs in the light of experience, within the limited budget. The changes in the project design, however, have not really been reflected in the project progress reports. The ceiling set on the project budget of €500,000 proved to be too little for the project scope, so some aspects of the project have not been implemented. There was a reallocation of funds between the various project components to fund a larger component 2 in particular. Refer to Annex 3 for a breakdown of the revised budget.

Component 1: Support the establishment of an integrated National Water Information System

This was a scoping study completed in November 2008 entitled: The Ethiopian Water Resources Information System (EWRIS) proposals by New Millennium Engineering. The basic concept was a single complex integrated IT system for the whole water sector (water supply, sanitation, WRM, irrigation, hydropower etc), with wide area networks (WANs), all stakeholders contributing data, with data brokers, collaboration engines, web interfaces etc.

The report focused on an elaborate architecture and expensive IT systems, but such a system was not justified in the report, while data gathering and software issues were not really addressed. Indeed as internet connectivity is very limited in Addis Ababa and Ethiopia in general, it is difficult to envisage such a system working for some considerable time.

The final report was completed but was over ambitious and the proposed approach was not supported by key Ministry staff as a viable way forward. The scoping study proposals are considered not to be 'sellable' or implementable at present. Workshop consultations on the report were undertaken, but the various sub-sectors are now implementing their own M&E systems, ignoring these proposals. For example the rural water and sanitation sub-sector are implementing a promising inventory approach that also examines functionality and usage of facilities. It is better for the review and analysis of sub-sector data to be done by the key institutions in each sub-sector.

Realizing the limitations of the scoping study outlined above, the MoWR expanded the scope of component 2 on water quality to include many water resource management aspects such as hydrology, water quantity and sedimentation issues. In effect, the Component 2 consultancy outputs have become the main proposals for a water resource management information system.

Component 2: Strengthen Water Quality Data Generation and Management (including aspects such as hydrology, water quantity and sedimentation?)

The scope of this study was broadened to cover water resource management monitoring systems for water quantity, quality, hydrology, hydrometry, groundwater and sedimentation. The study reports include, system proposals, capacity building proposals, technical guidelines, detailed estimates and tender documents, which were produced by BRL consultants in October 2009.

A careful review and amendment process was undertaken by the MoWR together with BRL during 2009 to arrive at implementable proposals and outputs. Senior MoWR staff consider that these proposals to be a good basis for implementing an effective water resource information system in Ethiopia. Although there is not an Executive Summary in the main report. They now need to seek funding for these proposals, but careful thought is required on how best this can be done. AWF could potentially provide valuable support for developing a project proposal to implement the proposed systems, that would be attractive to potential donors.

Component 3: Reinforce Water Research and Knowledge Management;

This component was made up of two sub-components, the first being the support of research projects with local universities; the second being the development of a Knowledge Management (KM) system strategy of the Ministry of Water Resources, as outlined below.

3a) Reinforcing water research – with 5 research projects commissioned

The original proposal was for 10 research projects but budgets could not be agreed with 5 of the proposed research partners and the spare funds were reallocated to other project components. Good progress is reported on the 5 research projects that have been commissioned and are expected to be completed in 2010. Refer to Annex 2 for an overview of each project. There are insufficient project funds for a dissemination workshop or the production of brief research summaries, so the universities will have to find other dissemination opportunities. Potentially this is a missed opportunity for AWF to disseminate findings from research it has funded.

3b) Formulation of the overall Knowledge Management (KM) system strategy of the Ministry of Water Resources and pilot KM strategy at the Research Department

The formulation of the overall Knowledge Management (KM) system strategy of the MoWR was completed in June 2009 by Getachew Alem, a Water Sector Knowledge Management Consultant and Bizuneh Bekele a Information Technology (IT) Consultant. The MoWR research department agree with all the proposals in this report and are in the process of implementing, although they are not able to implement all the IT proposals.

In terms of piloting the KM strategy in the MoWR Research Department, progress is hampered due to a lack of availability of funds and a lack of some IT equipment. Some training and installation of equipment remained to be done in March 2010.

Component 5: Upgrade and Expand ICT Infrastructure Capacity

This is important for the MoWR who generally have inadequate internet connectivity and ICT equipment. Following a needs assessment by Bizuneh Bekele, a Information Technology (IT) Consultant, they have procured all the equipment. Installation is expected to start by April 2010. The improvements include: upgrading the capacity of the leased line from 128 KB to at least 512 KB, upgrading the LAN server to a higher capacity, plus appropriate training. Due to the limitation of funds the equipment could only

be procured for the ministry offices, not the regional offices, as was planned in the appraisal report. Improvements in the metadata analysis were also not undertaken.

Project rating summary

Methodology

The scoring system and approach for the AWF project output to outcome review is a simplified version of the DFID output to purpose review approach. It includes a scoring system to indicate the likelihood of achievements of both the project outcomes and the project outputs. Table 1 is the proposed project rating scoring system to be used to rate the likelihood of achievement of the project outcomes and outputs in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 1. Project rating scale for likelihood of project objectives being achieved

Rating number	Criteria for rating
1	Likely to be completely achieved. The outputs/ purpose are well on the way to completion (or are completed).
2	Likely to be largely achieved. There is good progress towards purpose completion and most outputs are likely to be achieved, particularly the most important ones.
3	Likely to be partly achieved. Only partial achievement of the purpose is likely and/or achievement of some outputs.
4	Only likely to be achieved to a very limited extent . Purpose unlikely to be achieved but a few outputs likely to be achieved.
5	Unlikely to be achieved. No progress on outputs or purpose.
X	X. = It is difficult to say whether there has been any progress towards the final achievement of outputs or outcomes. This score should not be used if at all possible.

For the Water Information and Knowledge Management Project in Ethiopia the likelihood of the outcomes and outputs being achieved is summarised in tables 2 and 3 using the above rating system.

Table 2. Outcome project rating assessment (outcome level)

Note the outcome statements below assume that a water knowledge management system in Ethiopia was implemented. This was not really intended, this is essentially a project preparation project with consultancy studies, limited IT upgrading and piloting. Performance against the outcomes cannot therefore be assessed as implementation has yet to take place. However, performance against the main project outputs or components has been completed. Essentially the project logframe should have been revised to ensure objectives were achievable..

<p>Goal or impact statement:</p> <p>Contribute to poverty reduction through more efficient water resources planning, management and development with the availability of reliable data and information.</p>
<p>Outcome statements</p> <p>Improved decision making on water issues, enhanced planning and design of water sector activities through the availability of reliable and timely data as well as planning and design models; <i>This is really a Goal statement as it cannot be achieved by the project.</i></p>

<p>Effective implementation of Ethiopian IWRM Plan, through a better coordinated information and knowledge environment. <i>This is really a Goal statement as it cannot be achieved by the project.</i></p> <p><i>See the note above this table about the suitability of these outcome statements.</i></p>		
Outcome OVIs	Comments	Rating score (see table B)
<p>Water Information System established and operational</p> <p>With % increase in the use of improved data and information system</p>	<p>The Water Information System in Ethiopia has yet to be implemented and established, so the level of achievement cannot be assessed at this stage. Implementation can be done eventually, based on this proposals contained in the studies completed during this current project. This is only a project preparation project with consultancy studies, limited IT upgrading and piloting.</p>	<p>X – not able to assess the project against these outcome or indicator statements</p>

Although achievement against each outcome could not be reviewed at this stage, an assessment of what is likely to be achieved against each output or component is set out in table 3. However, many of the output indicators had to be changed because they included statements such as database established, when this is clearly not the case. Suitable indicators for the project preparation aspects of the project have been included in table 3.

Table 3. Output project rating assessment

Output or component	Indicator (OVI)	Progress and likelihood of being achieved	Rating score
----------------------------	------------------------	--	---------------------

Output or component	Indicator (OVI)	Progress and likelihood of being achieved	Rating score
<p>Support to the establishment of National Water Information System;</p> <p>Integrated water information system study by New Millennium Eng.</p> <p>Proposals include a single complex integrated IT system for the whole water sector (water supply, and sanitation, WRM, irrigation, hydropower etc. Proposals focus on elaborate IT systems, but not justified.</p> <p>WRM M&E study (quality, quantity, hydrology and sedimentation) including guidelines and tender docs by BRL consultants – originally just for component 2</p> <p>(This is in effect an integrated water information system for water resource management, so therefore contributes to component 1)</p>	<p>Output a) Report produced and proposals agreed by Ministry of water resources</p>	<p>Final report completed but over ambitious, not agreed by key Ministry staff.</p>	4
	<p>Consultation and consensus achieved with key stakeholders</p>	<p>Consultations undertaken but sub-sectors implementing their own M&E systems, ignoring these proposals.</p>	4
	<p>Likelihood of being successfully implemented</p>	<p>Proposals not sellable and not implementable at present. Alternative proposals and systems being developed by each sub-sector.</p>	4
	<p>Output b) Report produced and proposals agreed by Ministry of water resources</p>	<p>Thorough collaboration and agreement between the Min of Water and the consultants.</p>	1
	<p>Consultation and consensus achieved with key stakeholders</p>	<p>More consultation with a broader range of stakeholders could have been done.</p>	3
	<p>Likelihood to be successfully implemented</p>	<p>Proposals, guidelines and tender documents are perceived to be well drafted and appropriate. Funding for implementation still needed. More advice needed on how to package new project</p>	2

Output or component	Indicator (OVI)	Progress and likelihood of being achieved	Rating score
<p>Strengthen Water Quality Data Generation and Management; (same as 1b) above:</p> <p>WRM M&E study (quality, quantity, hydrology and sedimentation) including guidelines and tender docs by BRL consultants (focus on water quality aspects)</p>	<p>Output 2 Report produced and proposals agreed by Ministry of water resources</p>	<p>Thorough collaboration and agreement between the Min of Water and the consultants.</p>	1
	<p>Consultation and consensus achieved with key stakeholders</p>	<p>More consultation with a broader range of stakeholders could have been done.</p>	3
	<p>Likelihood to be successfully implemented</p>	<p>Proposals, guidelines and tender documents are perceived to be well drafted and appropriate. Funding for implementation still needed. More advice needed on how to package new project</p>	2
	<p>Water quality training by consultants conducted</p>	<p>Not done due to limited project funds</p>	4

Output or component	Indicator (OVI)	Progress and likelihood of being achieved	Rating score
<p>Reinforce Water Research and Knowledge Management; 3a) Reinforcing water research – with 5 research projects commissioned</p> <p>3b) Formulation of the overall Knowledge Management (KM) system strategy of the Ministry of Water Resources and pilot KM strategy at the Research Department</p>	<p>Output 3a) research Water sector research documents archived catalogued and available to users</p>	<p>Only partly done</p>	<p>3</p>
	<p>Organise a stakeholder's forum to validate and prioritise critical water research topics.</p>	<p>Done, but only 5 out of 10 research projects commissioned due to limited project funds</p>	<p>2</p>
	<p>Undertake research of prioritised research topics.</p>	<p>Research commissioned, contracts with Universities, funds dispersed, research to be completed in 2010.</p>	<p>2</p>
	<p>Organise a workshop to present and disseminate results of research findings.</p>	<p>Insufficient project funds for workshop, will rely on other dissemination opportunities</p>	<p>4</p>
	<p>Output 3b) Collection of research documents from key actors in the sector;</p>	<p>Only partly done, funds limited</p>	<p>2</p>
	<p>The formulation of the overall Knowledge Management (KM) system strategy of the MoWR</p> <p>Piloting the KM strategy at the Research Department</p>	<p>KM strategy report by KM and IT experts has good proposals and is agreed by the Ministry research department</p> <p>Piloting has started but there is a lack of availability of funds and lack of some IT equipment</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Support the Establishment of Groundwater Database,</p>		<p>This component was deleted from the project due to limited project funds and funds transferred to other components.</p>	
<p>Upgrade and Expand ICT Infrastructure Capacity.</p>	<p>ICT strategy report produced and agreed by MoWR</p>	<p>A 'very strong report' was produced and agreed</p>	<p>1</p>
	<p>Procurement and installation of ICT equipment including LAN and WAN, with 3 year service agreement</p>	<p>Equipment procured and soon to be installed. Training to be provided. Insufficient funds for WAN for regions. Only 1 year warranty obtained.</p>	<p>2</p>

Output or component	Indicator (OVI)	Progress and likelihood of being achieved	Rating score
Total average output score and justification	Output ratings are based on what was expected for each component in the Appraisal Report. A higher average score would have probably been achieved had adequate funds been allocated to this project, or if the planned scope was reduced. Delays have been experienced in implementation. Given the funding constraints, the Ethiopia MoWR have generally performed well in managing this project preparation project.		Average 2.6

<p>Outcome attribution</p> <p>To what extent can the achievement of the outcomes be attributed to the delivery of the project outputs?</p>	<p>The outcome statements in the logframe are not realistic, as explained above. But the Ethiopia MoWR have adopted a flexible approach to achieve reasonably good outcomes from this project preparation project, despite having limited project funding.</p>
---	--

Particular issues that emerged during each stage of the project cycle are briefly discussed in the sections below.

2.2. Project design, appraisal and approval

The MoWR considered that the AWF were helpful during project preparation period, although decisions seemed a little rushed. On reflection the ceiling set on the project budget of €500,000 proved to be too little for the project scope; more flexibility would have been appreciated. The MoWR would have valued some expert advice from AWF on certain issues such as hydrological databases, before embarking on this complex project.

2.3. Project implementation

The MoWR are generally satisfied with the consultancy outputs for 3 of the 4 components implemented. The project should have been completed in 2008 according to the original schedule, but completion is not expected until later in 2010. There have been various delays such as changes in the MoWR project coordinator position, delays in procurement and lack of hard currency for international procurement. MoWR senior staff have acknowledged that some of the delays were due to coordination problems in the Ministry. Support from AWF on procurement issues could have been quicker on some occasions. On other MoWR projects there has been provision for payment of Ministry staff time, which was not included in this project. The main project achievements and the remaining work is outlined in section 2.1 above.

Contribution to AWF areas of intervention

The project achievements for each of the AWF main areas of intervention are outlined as follows.

Strengthening water governance – substantial contribution

The consultancy studies in components 2, 3 and 5 have good prospects for enhancing the decision support systems for the MoWR and the wider water sector in Ethiopia, provided the proposals are effectively funded and implemented.

Investments to meet water and sanitation needs – minimal contribution

No direct investments in water or sanitation service provision.

Strengthening the financial base - moderate contribution

If the proposals in the consultancy outputs for component 2 on WRM information systems are included as larger project that addresses larger water source vulnerability issues, it could attract significantly more funding.

Improving water knowledge – significant contribution

There are 5 small research projects and a water sector knowledge management strategy from this project that could enhance water knowledge in Ethiopia and possibly elsewhere, providing the key lessons are well analyzed, documented and disseminated. WSP in Nairobi have stated they are interested in the outcomes from the overall project

Contribution to AWF cross-cutting issues

The project achievements for each of the AWF main cross-cutting issues are:

Capacity building at national level – moderate contribution

The consultancy outputs and associated dialogue and consultations have developed the capacity of MoWR staff and some associated agencies, to some extent.

Gender mainstreaming – minimal contribution

Gender issues have not been specifically addressed on this project, although the head of the MoWR hydrology department is a women and she played an active part in component 2.

Poverty reduction - moderate contribution

Poverty reduction has not been directly addressed as part of this project, but if the studies are implemented in the future, this can contribute to improved water services for poor households.

Environmental sustainability - significant contribution

The consultancy study outputs from component 2 have good prospects for enhancing the decision support systems for the MoWR and the wider water sector in Ethiopia, which can lead to better environmental sustainability.

2.4. Project monitoring, supervision and evaluation,

Brief quarterly progress reports have been produced and the last report was dated June 2009, so another report needs to be produced. The progress reports have not really captured the problems experienced with the output from component 1 - the Ethiopian Water Resources Information System (EWRIS) proposals by New Millennium Engineering, which proposed a single complex integrated IT system for the whole water sector. The progress reports have also not really captured the rationale for changing the scope of the other components 2, 3 and 5.

Four AWF supervision missions to the Ethiopian MoWR have taken place and enabled limited dialogue on this project and other potential projects. More AWF support on procurement issues would have been appreciated. More generally, it would be useful to have consolidated annual project reports to give a more complete picture of the project

and how it has changed. The quarterly progress reports just tend to focus on activities in the previous quarter and some planned activities in the next quarter.

2.5. Next steps, emerging follow on projects and the leverage effect

Much of the ICT equipment has been procured but had not been installed in early March 2010. This is expected to happen soon. Senior MoWR staff are using or planning to implement nearly all the consultancy outputs from the project. For the 5 research projects in component 3, there are insufficient project funds for a dissemination workshop or the production of brief research summaries. Potentially this is a missed opportunity for AWF to disseminate findings from research it has funded.

The outputs for component 2 - water resource management monitoring systems for water quantity, quality, hydrology, groundwater, sedimentation etc are well regarded in the MoWR. The estimated total cost is US \$10 million. They now need to seek funding for these proposals, but careful thought is required on how best this can be done. AWF could potentially provide valuable support for developing a project proposal or concept note to implement the proposed systems, that would be attractive to potential donors. This could be done by linking these new water resources information systems to other components such as improving the capacity of water resources for vulnerable groups and improving resilience against climate change. It is *likely* that these water resource management monitoring systems proposals will eventually be funded, even though no specific donor has been identified to date. There has been some discussions with AWF about a possible follow on project, but before this is discussed further, AWF want to see the project completion report.

3. Assessment of AWF's role in the project

The project executing agency MoWR considered the AWF process of project application, screening, preparation, appraisal and approval, was relatively quick, even if the maximum amount of funding was insufficient. They rated AWF's support during the project development and approval process as good, although more expert technical advice on project preparation would have been useful.

During project implementation some delays were experienced in the AWF approval of changes in the project design and budget for each component and in the project procurement process. The MoWR rated AWF's support during the project implementation phase as generally good, with a number of AWF visits to the Ministry. On future projects, closer collaboration between AWF and the project executing agency could reduce delays on matters such as project design and budget changes as the project is implemented. AWF could also provide more support in developing larger follow on projects, in order to maximizing the leverage effect of their projects.

Annex 1 - People met as part of the project assessment

Prior to visiting Addis Ababa to undertake the project assessment from 1st to 5th March, Kevin Sansom of Hydroconseil/WEDC had a telephone discussion about the project with the AWF task manager for this project, Peter Akari, following a review of the project documents. The people met as part of the project review include:

Dr Markos Wijore, project coordinator, Ministry of Water Resources, Ethiopia

Mr Wilbeshet Tefera, Director water resources information, Ministry of Water Resources

Mr Abiti Getaneh Director, water research & development directorate, Ministry of Water Resources

Ms Samunesh, head of hydrology department, Ministry of Water Resources

Mr Florian Schaeffer, ODI fellow, Ministry of Water Resources

Mr Paul Deverill, UNICEF Chief of water, sanitation and hygiene, Ethiopia

Mr Mark Hodgson, DFID senior adviser to the Ministry of Capacity Building, Ethiopia.

Annex 2 - Component 3a) research projects, part of AWF Ethiopia water information systems and knowledge management project

S.No	Project Name	University where the research is managed	Project Cost (ETB)	Current Stage	Commnet
1	Estimation of Ground water Recharge in the lake Alemaya	Haramaya University	61097	Near Completion	The Lake by now is disappeared and some important output was recorded from the research for future care in another water bodies in the country (policy or Ministerial briefing is to be prepared)
2	Evaluation of infield Water harvesting techniques for crop production in the semi arid areas of Eastern Ethiopia	Haramaya University	306,656	Near Completion	The research is undertaken at four sites and Farmers' day was organized to demonstrate the research output and they were happy to the technology at their field level.
3	Integrated Research in Rural Water Supply	Addis Ababa University (Technology faculty)	75,035	Not yet completed	We expect optimization model for rural water supply as an output from this study
4	Recycling option of textile industry wastewater and useful chemicals using membrane separation technology	Addis Ababa University (Technology faculty)	190,321	Not yet completed	The output will be used by the textile factories in the country and for policy updating as well
5	Water quality study of Ambo Area	Jimma University (Ambo College)	72,000	Near Completion	Some of the finding from this research will be used in the design of water quality monitoring & evaluation guideline development and the actual exercise in the ministry

			705,109		
--	--	--	---------	--	--

Annex 3 – Financial Report for project components – August 2009

Component	Total Allocation – Revised Budget (Euros)	Commitments to Date – 30 June 09 (Euros)	Consultancy Activities and Estimated Costs (Euros)	Goods Required and Estimated Costs (Euros)	Training Requirements and Estimated Costs	Other Expenditure Categories and Estimated Costs
C.1 - Water Sector Information System	49,600	53,220.26	Design of water sector information system (≤ 48,000)	N/A	N/A	Workshop (≤ 5,000)
C.2 - Strengthening Water Quality Data Generation and Management	156,900	119,450	Design of water quality data management system (≤ 119,400)	Details to be determined during design phase (costs c.30,000)	<i>Included under consultancy work</i>	
C.3.1 - Reinforcing Water Research	142,000	52,000	N/A	N/A	N/A	Grants to researchers to conduct priority research (c.52,000)
C.3.2 Knowledge Management		26,000	Design of knowledge management system (≤ 25,000)	Details to be determined during design phase (costs c.60,000)	Training (c.5,000)	
C.4 - Establishment of Groundwater Database	0	<i>(Funds to be reallocated to other components)</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	

C.5 - Upgrade and Expand ICT Infrastructure Capacity	151,500	157,145	ICT infrastructure needs assessment (≤ 12,500)	Details to be determined during design phase (c.140,000)	Needs to be determined during design phase (costs c.5,000)	
TOTAL COST	500,000	407,815 (81.5%)	Circa 204,900	Circa 230,000	Circa 10,000	Circa 57,000

Water and Sanitation Services for the Urban Poor in Kagugube, Kampala, Uganda, March 2010

1. Introduction

This project assessment has been undertaken as part of the overall Operational review and institutional assessment of the African Water Facility (AWF), that is being conducted by Hydroconseil and WEDC. The same assessment methodology has been agreed and used for the review of seven other AWF projects in Africa, as a means of effective comparison, with a view to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of AWF projects. It is important that the results and emerging lessons from AWF projects are reviewed and documented for wider dissemination.

A summary of the assessment of the Water and Sanitation Services for the Urban Poor in Kagugube, Kampala, Uganda is set out in this report. Section 2 summarizes the assessment findings of the project in Uganda, while section 3 gives an assessment of AWF's role on the project during each of the main stages of the project cycle.

National Water and Sewerage Cooperation (NWSC) is the executing agency for the establishment of sustainable water supply and sanitation services for the low-income community of Kagugube Parish, an informal settlement in Central Division of Kampala City. The project commenced in 2007 and was due to be complete in 2009, but remaining works are expected to be complete in 2010. The grant total figure is €865,575 with AWF's contribution being €800,000. The main project consultants were Winsor Consult for the software aspects and project coordination, Alliance Consult managed the technical aspects.

2. Assessment of the project

This assessment report is structured using a broad project cycle framework:

- Project design, appraisal and approval
- Project implementation
- Operation and use of facilities, outputs and systems created
- Project monitoring and evaluation
- Next steps, emerging projects and the leverage effect

But first of all a project performance summary is presented in the next section, with an overview of the project achievements and a project rating table using a project output to outcome methodology.

2.1. Project performance summary

Overview

The Water and Sanitation Services for the Urban Poor in Kagugube project is nearly complete and has very good prospects for being successful and achieving its objectives. This is despite some delays in the AWF approval of changes in the project design, following community consultations. Delays were also experienced in the process of

procuring the services of local consultants. On future projects, closer collaboration between AWF and the project executing agency could reduce such delays.

For the water supply component it was decided to just have pre-paid water kiosks, which seems to be a popular and flexible way to provide and pay for water. Consumers pay for credit on reusable tokens that are used to activate the water flow at the kiosk for as long as it takes to fill their container. Credit is only deducted from the token based on the water dispensed and there is little wastage of water. Even children can use this system to fill their small containers. As all water consumption is prepaid at a subsidized price (at approximately USD 0.5/m³), there is very good cost recovery and the use of the pre-paid meters is growing in a number of areas of Kampala. 26 pre-paid water kiosks have been installed as part of this project with a further 7 more planned this year, with the remaining project funds. The maintenance of the pre-paid meters and the system for putting credit on the tokens is the responsibility of the Urban Poverty Planning Unit (UPPU) in the NWSC, who will be taking over the office in Kagugube used by the community mobilization consultants.

The original proposals for the sanitation component included Ecosan toilets, but following community consultations only one Ecosan toilet was constructed, due to limited demand. But 30 good quality community toilet blocks have been provided with a total of 83 cubicles or stances, plus 35 shower cubicles. A further 4 toilet blocks are planned this year, using the remaining project funds. Care has been taken in arranging the long term management of the toilet blocks. Nearly all the shared toilet blocks will be managed by private landlords who have 20 year agreements with the Kampala City Council (KCC). Ownership remains with the community committees who are linked to the KCC.

There has been good community mobilization work by the consultants Winsor Consult with the community WatSan steering committee being positive about their role in supporting them to effectively participate in the project. One clear indicator of this was the fact that no compensation was paid for loss of land or inconvenience as a result of providing the new infrastructure, even though some funds were set aside for this purpose. The community WatSan steering committee were active in negotiating with tenants and landlords to agree to the location of the facilities and providing access for construction. The distinctive features of the Kagugube project included:

The project process was software led rather than hardware led, in order to achieve community commitment and increased capacity to support the project.

The community development consultants focused on developing the capacity and commitment of the community steering committee, as well as collaboration with other key stakeholders. This was reinforced by the community mobilisation consultants having a temporary office in the community to enhance communications.

For water supply innovative pre-paid water kiosks were promoted and provided in agreed locations with the collaboration of the community. The kiosks are proving to be popular with consumers and good rates of cost recovery are being achieved.

For sanitation, effective collaboration was achieved between the utility (NWSC), the community committee, private landlords and the city council to enable more sustainable management of the shared sanitation facilities.

Such features should be borne in mind in the development of similar future projects including a scaled up programme that is being considered by the utility NWSC.

Project rating summary

The scoring system and approach for the AWF project output to outcome review is a simplified version of the DFID output to purpose review approach. In addition to a

structured project assessment it includes a scoring system to indicate the likelihood of achievements of both the project outcomes and the project outputs. Table 1 is the project rating scoring system to be used to rate the likelihood of achievement of the project outcomes and outputs in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 1. Project rating scale for likelihood of project objectives being achieved

Rating number	Criteria for rating
1	Likely to be completely achieved. The outputs/ purpose are well on the way to completion (or are completed).
2	Likely to be largely achieved. There is good progress towards purpose completion and most outputs are likely to be achieved, particularly the most important ones.
3	Likely to be partly achieved. Only partial achievement of the purpose is likely and/or achievement of some outputs.
4	Only likely to be achieved to a very limited extent . Purpose unlikely to be achieved but a few outputs likely to be achieved.
5	Unlikely to be achieved. No progress on outputs or purpose.
X	X. = It is difficult to say whether there has been any progress towards the final achievement of outputs or outcomes. This score should not be used if at all possible.

For the Water and Sanitation Services for the Urban Poor in Kagugube, Kampala project the likelihood of the outcomes and outputs being achieved is summarised in tables 2 and 3 using the above rating system.

Table 2. Outcome project rating assessment (outcome level)

Goal or impact statement: Improved social, economic, health and living conditions for the urban poor.		
Outcome statement 1 Increased institutional capacity for provision and O&M of water and sanitation services by the utility and community level, working with the private sector.		
Outcome OVIs	Comments	Rating score (see table B)
Urban Poverty Planning Unit (UPPU) operational in project area for the water supplies	UPPU in the utility have been successful in supporting O&M and cost recovery in a nearby similar project in Kisenyi, including the prepaid water kiosks, with good growth in revenues. UPPU has started to support the prepaid water kiosks services in Kagugube	1
MoU in place for management of community toilet blocks	Nearly all the shared toilet blocks will be managed by private landlords who have 20 year agreements with the Kampala City Council (KCC). Ownership remains with the community committees who are linked to the KCC.	1
Outcome statement 2 Improved health education and sanitation practice.		
Kagugube population with basic knowledge and good	Community WatSan committee reported good progress in this area, but not able to verify changes in hygiene practice as part of this project	2

hygiene practice	assessment	
Kagugube population with basic knowledge and good sanitation practice	Community WatSan committee reported good progress in this area. Areas visited now have good shared sanitation provision, but not able to verify changes in sanitation practice as part of this project assessment	2
Outcome statement 3 - Improved health conditions – note this objective should be at goal level, as it is difficult to attribute health improvements directly to a water and sanitation project		
100% of residents have safe access to safe water and sanitation	The project funds were not sufficient to provide water and sanitation services to all parts of Kagugube. This was in part due to an underestimate of project costs at the project appraisal stage	2
60% reduction in water and sanitation related diseases	Note this indicator should be at goal level, as it is difficult to attribute health improvements directly to this project	X
Average outcome rating		1.6

Table 3. Output project rating assessment

Output	Indicator (OVI)	Progress and likelihood of being achieved	Rating score
1. Improved water and sanitation facilities	25 prepaid water kiosks provided and 100 shared yard taps	32 prepaid water kiosks will be provided which are preferred to the yard taps. Project funds were not sufficient to provide water services to all parts of Kagugube	2
	250 Econsan toilets, plus a further 250 in phase 2.	34 shared community toilet blocks are being provided instead, following community consultations. Project funds were not sufficient to provide sanitation services to all parts of Kagugube	2
2. Improved access to water and sanitation facilities	Maximum distance to a piped water point is 200 metres	This was achieved in areas of Kagugube visited, project funds were not sufficient to provide water services to all parts of Kagugube	2
	100% of households have access to sanitation facility within 30 metres	Good quality sanitation provision but project funds were not sufficient to provide sanitation services to all parts of Kagugube	2

Output	Indicator (OVI)	Progress and likelihood of being achieved	Rating score
3. Improved management of water and sanitation systems	At least 95% billing efficiency	With the prepaid meters this can be expected to be achieved	1
	98% increase in revenue collection	Not easy to verify, but this can be expected to be largely achieved	2
	Private operator/CBOs in place to manage sanitation facilities	All toilet blocks have signed management agreements, with good prospects for sustainable management	1
Total average output score and justification	Good quality water and sanitation facilities are being provided, following a careful process of community mobilization, with good prospects for sustainable outcomes. Insufficient project funds meant that all of Kagugube could not be provided with services to the stated standard. This was in part due to the fact that some of the cost estimates for the project appraisal report were too low.		1.7
Outcome attribution To what extent can the achievement of the outcomes be attributed to the delivery of the project outputs?		The project outcome 1 is attributable to the project outputs, plus the ongoing support of the various stakeholders NWSC, KCC and the community steering committee. Outcome 3 that refers to improving health should be a project goal, as it is difficult to attribute health improvements directly to a water and sanitation project. Some hygiene promotion work was carried out, this should have been included in the project logframe.	

Particular issues that emerged during each stage of the project cycle are briefly discussed in the sections below.

2.2. Project design, appraisal and approval

The process of AWF project application, screening, preparation, appraisal and approval, generally was relatively quick and smooth. However, the fact that the AWF contribution to the project was limited to €800,000, meant that it was not feasible to improve water and sanitation services to the agreed level in all of the Kagugube settlement. NWSC felt that the AWF task manager during the appraisal stage pushed too hard for mainly Ecosan toilets when previous Ecosan programmes in Kampala had not worked well. However, the project design was eventually amended to respond to the local context and user preferences.

Potential improvements in project logical framework are mentioned in the project rating summary above. It would have also been better to have separate water and sanitation outputs.

2.3. Project implementation

The 26 pre-paid water kiosks have been installed and some have been working satisfactorily for a number of months. At the time of the project assessment, payment tokens were being distributed so that households in Kagugube could use the remaining

water kiosks. A further 7 more water kiosks are planned for 2010, with the remaining project funds.

A total of 30 good quality community toilet blocks have been provided with 83 cubicles or stances, plus 35 shower cubicles. A further 4 toilet blocks are planned this year. The application for spending the remaining project funds (exchange rate savings) has been made but not approved by AWF, as of February 2010.

The main changes in the project design were that all prepaid water kiosks were provided instead of some shared yard taps, because the utility NWSC considers that better cost recovery can be achieved from the prepaid water kiosk (PPWKs). The PPWKs are also well received by the community. Community toilet blocks were also generally preferred to Ecosan toilets, although one shared Ecosan toilet has been constructed.

Delays have been experienced in this two year project that was due to be completed in 2009. For example, there were delays in the AWF approval of changes in the project design, following community consultations. The project area is also a difficult working environment to keep to project schedules. Delays were also experienced in the process of procuring the services of local consultants by NWSC the executing agency. On future projects, closer collaboration between AWF and the project executing agency could reduce such delays.

Contribution to AWF areas of intervention

Overall this project has good prospects for being a sustainable and effective project. The project achievements for each of the AWF main areas of intervention are outlined as follows.

Strengthening water governance – significant contribution

Both for water supply and sanitation the technical options and the longer term management arrangements have good prospects for sustainability and replication. Assuming that these approaches are replicated or scaled up further, then this project can contribute to water and sanitation governance for low income urban communities. What was new about this project for NWSC in Kampala was that it was software led in terms of working with the community.

Investments to meet water and sanitation needs – substantial contribution

The main project outputs are focused on providing adequate and sustainable water and sanitation services. A substantial contribution to this AWF area of intervention can be expected, particularly if further replication occurs.

Strengthening the financial base - moderate contribution

Both for water supply and sanitation there are good prospects for achieving effective longer term cost recovery. Where good cost recovery can be demonstrated, there are better prospects for attracting new investments.

Improving water knowledge - moderate contribution

As the approaches for water supply, sanitation and community mobilization on this project seem to be effective, important contributions to water knowledge can be made, provided that the lessons emerging from this and other related NWSC projects are written up well and disseminated.

Contribution to AWF cross-cutting issues

The project achievements for each of the AWF main cross-cutting issues are outlined as follows.

Capacity building at local level - significant contribution

Good capacity building of the WatSan community steering committee in Kagugube was evident. But also local government and utility staff benefited from the process of participating in a successful project.

Gender mainstreaming – moderate contribution

While good community processes were used to engage women in the project and women had significant roles in the project, this was not a significant focus of what is a relatively small project.

Poverty reduction – significant contribution

Improved and adequate water and sanitation services, such as those provided for this project, have many benefits such as time savings, improved health that reduce poverty of households in the community. In addition, water sold at the prepaid water kiosks is at a price of \$0.5 per M3, which is considerably cheaper than the prices typically charged by water kiosks vendors (>\$5.0 per M3) who have been prominent in many informal settlements in Kampala.

Environmental sustainability - significant contribution

The new community sanitation blocks in Kagugube have good sustainability prospects and should lead to much less faecal pollution of the settlement, particularly if these VIP toilet blocks are emptied in good time. The prepaid meters tend to have less wastage of water than other water service options such as standposts, so reduced water erosion and less potential sites for mosquito larvae can be expected.

2.4. Operation and use of facilities, outputs and systems created

The pre-paid water kiosks (PPWKs) have been installed and some have been working satisfactorily for a number of months, with good feedback from consumers. As part of the project assessment a visit was made to the Urban Poverty Planning Unit (UPPU) office of the NWSC that is based in Kisenyi. The pre-paid water kiosks were observed to be working well in Kisenyi and the UPPU is now managing 460 PPWKs across Kampala. The UPPU payment collections from PPWKs has been rising and is now over 11 million shillings per month.

Good quality PPWKs and community toilet blocks have been created with good prospects for sustainable use. The project completion report will be written once the outstanding work is complete.

2.5. Project monitoring, supervision and evaluation,

The formal AWF progress monitoring reports have been completed by NWSC for most quarters. These reports tend to be rather brief and mainly focus on project activities in the last quarter and plans for the subsequent quarter. It would have been beneficial to have described the project processes or approaches in more detail on this community based project. This enables lessons to be drawn on project approaches for future replication.

In fact good progress reports that describe approaches used were produced by Winsor Consult the project coordinators and software consultants. These were sent to AWF by post because of their large size of the files with all the photographs included, but the AWF task manager was not aware of these reports and complained about the lack of

reporting on project processes! AWF needs to place more attention to monitoring and supporting such projects in the future.

2.6. Next steps, emerging follow on projects and the leverage effect

For the sanitation aspects, drawing on the close collaboration the project has had with Kampala City Council (KCC), the software team subsequently scheduled a project mainstreaming event to be attended by division councillors, technical staff and NWSC. The workshop addressed mainstreaming project deliverables, especially sanitation facilities, into the KCC development planning processes.

For the water supply aspects the UPPU and the NWSC plan to expand the use of the pre-paid water kiosks throughout the informal settlements of Kampala. The NWSC project co-ordination department would like to have a scaled up larger project that builds on the approaches used in the Kagugube project. They envisage a €10 million project that could be funded by donors such as AfDB, KFW, World Bank etc. However, they realise that they need a well presented project write up of the Kagugube and Kisenyi projects and a good project concept note, in order to attract funding for such a proposal. If this is done there are good prospects for future funding, although it is dependent on the policies of donors who are willing to support the Uganda urban water and sanitation sector.

Refer to Annex 1 for the list of people met during the assessment. Annex 2 contains a picture of a prepaid water kiosk and pictures of some of the new community toilet blocks in Kagugube.

3. Assessment of AWF's role in the project

The project executing agency NWSC considered the AWF process project application, screening, preparation, appraisal and approval, was relatively quick and smooth. They rated AWF's support during the project development and approval process as good. However, NWSC felt that the AWF task manager during the appraisal stage pushed too hard for mainly Ecosan toilets when previous Ecosan programmes in Kampala had not worked well. It would have been beneficial to have some flexibility over the total AWF project budget before the appraisal stage, in order to achieve the project objectives.

During project implementation some delays were experienced in the AWF approval of changes in the project design and budget for each component. This was in part due to the changes in the AWF task manager for this project and the resulting lack of continuity of support provided by AWF. The local water and sanitation advisor in the local AfDB office in Kampala has been supportive, but it would have been better if he had more authority to approve variations in the project. No AWF supervision missions occurred during the project. NWSC rated AWF's support during the project implementation phase as 'adequate'. NWSC stated that they would appreciate support from AWF in writing up the project with a view to seeking funding for a larger scaled up project.

Annex 1 – People met as part of the project assessment

Prior to visiting Kampala to undertake the project assessment from 1st to 5th February, Kevin Sansom of Hydroconseil/WEDC had a telephone discussion about the project with the AWF task manager for this project, Lone Badstue, following a review of the project documents. The people met as part of the project review include:

Andrew Mbiro, water and sanitation advisor, AfDB, Kampala.
Paddy Twesigye, project manager, NWSC, Kampala
Denis Taremwa, project engineer, NWSC, Kampala
Amayo Johnson, head of projects department, NWSC, Kampala
Nakiboneka Goreti, environmental officer, Central Division, Kampala City Council
Isabiye Hassan, Councillor, Kampala City Council
John Matende, head of health section in Central Division, Kampala City Council
Joseph Ssunna, managing director, Winsor Consult
Augustine Bapenda, Winsor Consult
Jimmy Muwuluke Zikusooka, sanitation expert, Winsor Consult
Betty Nankya, administrator, Winsor Consult
Leonard Kabgyore, Winsor Consult
Joseph Kabanga, manager, Alliance Consulting
Paul Ssekadde, Alliance Consulting
Selbi Ngabirano, Armpass technical services (contractor)
Herbert Kibinge, Public relations, Kagagube community project steering committee
Isaac Jingo, Kagagube community project steering committee
Robert Kakinda, Kagagube community project steering committee
D. Ssebadduke, Kagagube community project steering committee
Fred Muyeeya, Kagagube community project steering committee

Annex 2

Figure 1 – A prepaid water kiosk in Kampala



Figure 2- Selected Sanitation Site Progress Photographs June 2009

Present Sanitation Facility	New Sanitation Facility	Present Sanitation Facility	New Sanitation Facility
 <p>Mazzi Betty 1 – Industrial Area Zone</p>	 <p>Proposed Allocation (6/2 VIP) I.D No. NWSC/Kg,be - 01</p>	 <p>Kagugube Police Post - Industrial Area Zone</p>	 <p>Kagugube Police Post – (4/2 VIP) I.D No. NWSC/Kag,be - 02</p>
 <p>Aliyo Grace – Industrial Area Zone</p>	 <p>Aliyo Grace (4/2 VIP) I.D No. NWSC/Kag,be – 03</p>	 <p>Nakayiza Teddy – Industrial Area Zone</p>	 <p>Proposed Allocation (3/1 VIP) I.D No. NWSC/Kag,be -05</p>

Evaluation du projet "Etude de réhabilitation et d'extension des systèmes d'AEPA de Brazzaville et Pointe Noire" – Mars 2010

1. Introduction

L'objectif général de l'Etude de réhabilitation et d'extension des systèmes d'AEPA de Brazzaville et Pointe Noire est de mener un diagnostic institutionnel et technique et de préparer les travaux prioritaires pour l'alimentation en eau potable, l'assainissement et le drainage des eaux de pluie à Brazzaville et Pointe Noire pour l'atteinte des ODM de 2015 et des objectifs de la Vision Africaine de L'Eau en 2025. Le Gouvernement du Congo a reçu une subvention FAE de 1 418 235 €, complétée par un financement en nature du Gouvernement du Congo de 71 000 €, approuvée le 11 juillet 2007, et mise en œuvre par le Ministère de l'Energie et de l'Eau comme agence d'exécution pour une durée de 10 mois.

Les activités mises en œuvre couvrent : (i) évaluation de la situation actuelle ; (ii) étude de faisabilité des différentes options ; (iii) étude détaillée et préparation des différentes options, avec une étude d'impact environnemental et un plan d'investissements prioritaires ; (iv) la mobilisation des financements ; et (v) le renforcement des capacités des institutions du secteur.

La méthodologie d'évaluation des projets pour la revue est décrite dans le rapport préliminaire du consultant (novembre 2009) et le guide d'évaluation des projets FAE qui a suivi.

Ce guide d'évaluation des projets des 8 pays visités est structuré suivant un cadre classique de cycle projet:

- Conception, évaluation et approbation du projet
- Exécution du projet
- Exploitation et utilisation des ouvrages, produits et systèmes créés
- Suivi et évaluation du projet
- Etapes suivantes, suite possible du projet et effet de levier

Pour chaque section, les thématiques identifiées dans le guide d'évaluation des projets FAE ont été abordées et discutées avec les différents partenaires du projet et intervenant du secteur.

Quelques questions sur des aspects particuliers pour lesquelles une notation est demandée sur une échelle de 1 à 4 sont aussi incluses, comme moyen d'établir une analyse comparative entre les projets évalués.

Une évaluation des « produits » et « impacts » et aussi faite séparément, sur la base du cadre logique développé pour le projet, de manière à évaluer dans quelle mesure les produits et résultats attendu du projet ont été atteints. La revue « des produits aux résultats » est présentée dans la première partie du rapport.

2. Evaluation du projet

2.1. Synthèse de la performance du projet

Le système de notation et l'approche pour la revue "des produits aux résultats" pour les projets FAE est une version simplifiée de l'approche DFID "des produits aux objectifs". Elle inclut un système de notation indiquant la probabilité d'atteinte à la fois des résultats et de la production des livrables. Le tableau 1 présente le système de notation utilisé pour noter la probabilité d'atteinte des résultats et la production des livrables présentée dans les tableaux 2 et 3.

Table 1. Système de notation de la probabilité d'atteinte des objectifs du projet

Note	Critère de notation
1	Probablement atteint complètement . Les livrables/objectifs sont en cours d'atteinte (ou atteints).
2	Probablement atteint largement . Bonne progression vers l'atteinte des objectifs et la majorité des livrables seront probablement produits, en particulier les plus importants.
3	Probablement atteint partiellement . L'atteinte des objectifs et/ou la production des livrables est seulement partielle.
4	Probablement atteint de manière seulement très limitée . L'objectif ne sera probablement pas atteint mais quelques livrables seront produits.
5	Probablement non atteint . L'objectif ne sera pas atteint, et pas de progrès réalisé vers les objectifs ou la production des livrables.
X	X. = Il n'est pas possible d'évaluer s'il y a eu des progrès vers les objectifs ou la production des livrables.

Pour le projet d'Etude de réhabilitation et d'extension des systèmes d'AEPA de Brazzaville et Pointe Noire en République du Congo, la probabilité que les résultats soient atteints et les livrables produits, évalués suivant le système ci-dessus, sont présentés dans les tableaux 2 et 3.

Tableau 2. Notation "produits aux résultats" (Niveau activités)

Objectif: Mettre à la disposition du Gouvernement des dossiers de préparation de projets (outils d'attraction de financements pour l'AEPA)			
Résultat 1 : Les plans et les financements de la réhabilitation et du renforcement de l'AEPA de Brazzaville et Pointe Noire sont en place			
Indicateurs Résultat 1	Progrès	Commentaires	Notation (voir tableau B)
1. Financements mobilisés pour la réhabilitation et le renforcement de l'AEPA de Brazzaville et Pointe	En 2010 seulement 50% des financements sont mobilisés	Le résultat est partiellement atteint	3

Noire			
Résultat 1 : Notation et justification	D'autres financements sont susceptibles d'être mobilisés si des réformes sont engagées pour garantir la gestion et la maintenance des ouvrages		3
Résultat 2 : L'étude jettera une base cohérente pour les investissements future visent à : (i) la satisfaction des besoins en AEPA des communautés urbaines ; (ii) la réduction des risques d'inondations à Brazzaville et Pointe Noire ; (iii) l'amélioration de la gestion du service de l'eau ; (iv) la réduction des maladies d'origine hydrique ; (v) l'amélioration des conditions sanitaires et sociales des populations des deux villes.			
Indicateurs Résultat 2	Progrès	Commentaires	Notation (voir tableau B)
1. Les dossiers de l'étude reconnus par les investisseurs et utilisé pour mettre en œuvre les investissements prévus.	Les documents prévus ont été produits	Les documents ne sont pas toujours utilisables directement comme le souhaiteraient les investisseurs	3
Résultat 2 : Notation et justification	Il est nécessaire de reprendre les documents produits pour faire l'allotement et les compléter pour pouvoir les utiliser.		3

Tableau 3. Notation "produits aux résultats" (Niveau activités)

Résultat	Indicateur	Progrès et probabilité d'atteinte	Note
Etudes diagnostiques de l'AEPA de Brazzaville et Pointe Noire	Rapports des études diagnostiques de l'AEPA de Brazzaville et Pointe Noire disponibles	L'étude Brazzaville a en partie été produite par l'AFD	2
Etudes d'APS et de faisabilité disponibles	Rapports des études d'APS et de faisabilité disponibles	Atteint	1
3 Etudes d'APD et d'EIES des projets retenus disponibles	3 Rapports des études d'APD et d'EIES des projets retenus disponibles	Atteint	1
5 ateliers de lancement et de validation	Rapports des 5 ateliers de lancement et validation	Atteint	1
10 formations individuelles à l'étranger	Rapports de formation	Cette activité a été abandonnée	5
8 séminaires locaux de formation	Rapports de séminaires de formation	Atteint	1

Résultat	Indicateur	Progrès et probabilité d'atteinte	Note
1. 1 table ronde de bailleurs de fonds	1. Rapport de la Table ronde des bailleurs de fonds	Atteint	1
Note moyenne totale des et justification	La majorité des livrables ont été produits, mais le diagnostic Brazzaville n'a été mené qu'en partie, et les formations individuelles à l'étranger ont été abandonnées.		1,7
Attribution du résultat Dans quelle mesure l'atteinte du résultat peut être attribuée à la production des livrables?		Les documents ont été produits, mais d'une part la qualité ne correspond pas toujours aux attentes, et d'autre part les investisseurs attendent la mise en œuvre des réformes.	

2.2. Conception, évaluation et approbation du projet

Quelle est la dernière version du cadre logique utilisée et comment aurait-il pu être amélioré?

La dernière version du cadre logique est celle du rapport d'évaluation de juin 2007. C'est cette version qui a été utilisée tout au long du projet et elle n'a pas été modifiée.

2.3. Exécution du projet

Quelle est la situation du projet, ce qui a été exécuté et ce qui reste à faire?

Le projet est terminé et le rapport d'achèvement du projet a été produit en novembre 2009. Sur la composante études, la totalité des études prévues a été réalisées alors que le volet formation n'a pas été intégralement exécuté. Le projet présente un reliquat de budget d'environ 150 KEUR, soit plus de 10% du montant du financement FAE.

Par ailleurs, l'accord de don a été signé le 1er août 2007 avec une période d'exécution du projet initialement prévue pour 10 mois. Le projet s'est effectivement achevé en novembre 2009, soit avec un retard de 17 mois et une période totale d'exécution de 27 mois.

Quelles sont les raisons des retards éventuels ?

Les retards ont été essentiellement accumulés lors de la phase de démarrage du projet. Le coordinateur est effectivement arrivé en octobre 2007 et la phase de passation du marché d'étude a duré 9 mois au lieu des 5 mois prévus au planning initial.

Par ailleurs, les délais nécessaires à la préparation des différents ateliers de validation n'avaient pas été pris en compte, ainsi que le temps nécessaire à la finalisation et la clôture du projet.

La table ronde des bailleurs, initialement prévue en novembre 2008 a été organisée en mars 2009.

Le projet a-t-il subi des modifications et si oui quelles sont elles et pourquoi?

Sur certaines composantes du projet, il était prévu entre les partenaires avant la formulation du projet d'aller jusqu'au DAO, de manière à pouvoir financer directement les travaux sans avoir d'étude complémentaires à mener.

Pour des raisons de limitation de budget, les DAO prévus initialement ont été abandonnés par la suite, et le projet a finalement visé des études au niveau d'avant-projets sommaires

(APS) ou détaillés (APD). Ainsi la composante AEP de Brazzaville n'a fait l'objet que d'une étude de diagnostic sans que l'on atteigne le stade des APS APD initialement envisagés.

L'étude de diagnostic sur Brazzaville, qui était prévue dans le projet initial, était également programmée par l'AFD, qui l'a en partie réalisée.

Le volet formation n'a pas été exécuté comme envisagé initialement, avec notamment la composante formations individuelles en Europe qui a été abandonnée.

Quelles ont été les principaux problèmes du projet, et comment ont-ils été résolus?

Les principaux problèmes d'exécution du projet sont liés au manque de moyens logistiques, et notamment les moyens de déplacement. Il n'était en effet pas prévu de véhicule ni de budget pour les déplacements et cela n'était pas défini, ni dans le budget FAE, ni dans la part de la partie congolaise.

La phase de diagnostic a souffert d'un manque de temps pour son exécution correcte, et beaucoup d'information collectées sont des informations de deuxième main fournies par le CREPA.

Quels sont les principaux résultats?

Les principaux résultats du projet sont d'une part l'acquisition des études préparatoires pour les investissements nécessaires au développement du secteur, et d'autre part le renforcement des capacités, à la fois au travers des formations dispensées, mais aussi par l'acquisition d'expérience pratique sur la mise en œuvre d'une approche nouvelle de développement des projets.

La table ronde des bailleurs a permis d'identifier les 60 à 80 MEUR disponibles pour financer les investissements, mais a aussi de créer une dynamique de concertation des partenaires du secteur qui va être prolongée sous la forme d'une plateforme de concertation avec des rencontres régulières.

L'exécution du projet s'est traduite aussi par une meilleure connaissance de la FAE par les différents acteurs, et une transmission importante de savoir.

Comment le projet a-t-il contribué à chacun des 4 domaines – substantiellement, significativement, modérément, peu ou pas du tout?

- (i) **Renforcement de la gestion de l'eau** : Modérément, car les études réalisées restent des études amonts qui ne sont pas encore traduites par des réalisations sur le terrain.
- (ii) **Investissements pour les besoins en eau** : Substantiellement. C'est l'objectif global et essentiel du projet.
- (iii) **Renforcement de la base financière** : Modérément, la concertation entre bailleurs a permis d'améliorer la visibilité sur les financements possibles des besoins du secteur.
- (iv) **Amélioration des connaissances sur l'eau** : Significativement, la réalisation des études de diagnostic sur Brazzaville et sur Pointe Noire a énormément amélioré la visibilité et la connaissance du secteur.

Comment le projet a-t-il contribué à chacun thèmes transversaux de la FAE – substantiellement, significativement, modérément, peu ou pas du tout?

- **Renforcement des capacités** : Significativement à modéré, car bien que le projet comporte une composante de renforcement des capacités, plusieurs partenaires considèrent cette composante comme peu pertinente ou mal adaptée aux besoins.
- **Genre** : Significativement, car une attention particulière a été portée aux questions de genre, particulièrement pour l'organisation et le contenu des sessions de formation.
- **Réduction de la pauvreté** : Modérément, car bien que le développement des services de base bénéficie à toute les franges de la population, aucun accent spécifique n'a été mis sur les populations défavorisées avec le développement de systèmes collectifs d'accès aux services. Ce point a été rectifiés ensuite par certains bailleurs dans la préparation de leurs investissements (100 bornes fontaines à Brazzaville et 70 bornes fontaines à Pointe Noire).
- **Durabilité environnementale** : Substantiellement, dans la mesure où les études couvrent les domaines de l'assainissement, les eaux pluviales, les questions d'érosion, et que l'ensemble des investissements prévu a fait l'objet d'une étude d'impact environnemental.
- **Bonne gouvernance** : Significativement, car le projet a apporté à la Direction de l'Hydraulique les bases d'une gestion saine de projet et une méthodologie de préparation. Le déroulement du projet a également été très participatif.

2.4. Exploitation et utilisation des ouvrages, produits et systèmes créés

Niveau d'exploitation et d'utilisation par rapport aux objectifs du projet?

L'objectif global du projet était de produire des études d'investissements pouvant être financés par les différents bailleurs intervenant sur le secteur. Dans une large mesure, cet objectif est atteint et les études produites sont jugées très utiles et utilisées comme base pour la préparation des investissements.

Cependant, le niveau d'achèvement de ces études (manque d'APD) et leur agrégation (composantes et lots mal ou pas définis) constituent un frein à l'utilisation directe des produits.

D'autre part, dans une vision plus large, les bailleurs restent hésitant à financer des investissements tant qu'ils ne sont pas rassurés sur les capacités et la qualité d'exploitation et de maintenance des ouvrages à réhabiliter ou à réaliser. Ces questions d'exploitation et de gestion des ouvrages ont été couvertes dans la composante formation du projet.

Que pourrait-il être fait pour améliorer la situation?

Des études complémentaires pour mieux définir les actions d'investissement et leur allotement sont nécessaires et déjà mises en œuvre par certains bailleurs.

Pour ce qui concerne l'exploitation des infrastructures à financer, le projet PEDU engagé par la Banque Mondiale comporte un volet important d'appui aux réformes du secteur. Si ces réformes sont effectivement engagées, la communauté des bailleurs intervenant sur le secteur en République du Congo sera rassurée et prête à appuyer financièrement le développement du secteur.

Par ailleurs, il semble qu'une meilleure concertation soit initiée sur la préparation du nouveau projet AEPA rural soutenu par la FAE et la BAD, tirant ainsi les leçons du présent projet.

2.5. Suivi et évaluation du projet

Quel système de suivi évaluation a été utilisé, et comment cela aurait pu être amélioré?

Un comité de suivi a été mis en place au démarrage du projet, avec un rapport trimestriel d'avancement préparé par l'unité de gestion du projet, revu par le comité de suivi et transmis à la FAE.

Par ailleurs, la FAE a participé à chaque phase du projet, et notamment aux ateliers de validation des phases de diagnostic, faisabilité et APS/APD. La FAE a assuré aussi un suivi rapproché des 4 sessions de formations organisées en 2009 avec la participation du personnel du ministère et des municipalités de Brazzaville et Pointe Noire.

Le responsable Eau et Assainissement du bureau de la BAD pour la RDC et la République du Congo, basé à Kinshasa, a pris ses fonctions en 2008, et a donc commencé à suivre le projet en cours de route.

Comment les informations de suivi du projet ont-elles été utilisées pour motiver les changements de conception et d'exécution du projet?

Les changements de contenu du projet ont été liés à des contraintes de budget. Cela a été intégré dans le budget final du projet, mais n'a pas fait l'objet de l'attention nécessaire de la part de l'agence d'exécution sur les conséquences techniques sur la qualité des produits et les attentes des partenaires bailleurs de fonds. Il y a donc eu un décalage entre les résultats de la concertation entre acteurs (les attentes des bailleurs) et les résultats du projet.

Les changements de contenu liés à l'intervention de l'AFD sur le diagnostic Brazzaville et eau pluviale sont apparus et ont été discutés lors d'une réunion du comité de suivi.

Les ateliers et les processus de validation mis en œuvre ont été efficaces et les commentaires formulés ont été pris en compte.

Quelle situation initiale a été documentée pour comparer les situations avant et après projet?

Les études diagnostic ont permis de dégager une bonne connaissance de la situation initiale et un croisement des informations avec les autres initiatives en cours. Cela forme une bonne base qui permettra de comparer la situation avant et après exécution des investissements.

2.6. Etapes suivantes, suite possible du projet et effet de levier

Quels sont les nouveaux projets ou concepts émergents à la suite de ce projet?

Le projet visant la préparation des programmes d'investissement pour Brazzaville et Pointe Noire, la suite logique est l'exécution des travaux prévus (réhabilitations et travaux neufs). Le projet a permis de réaliser 12 APS, 3 APD et 2 « APS améliorés ».

Les divers partenaires financiers du secteur sont intéressés par les différentes composantes du projet en fonction de leurs priorités propres d'intervention.

Le développement d'un projet FAE/BAD sur le secteur rural tire les leçons de ce projet, avec notamment une meilleure concertation entre partenaires du secteur.

Quel est le montant indicatif de ces nouvelles propositions de projet?

Le montant total des investissements identifiés et préparés de manière plus ou moins complète correspondant aux 3 APD et « 2 APS améliorés » est de environ 150 MUSD (soit 80 Mds CFA)

Quels sont les bailleurs potentiels et quel est le degré d'avancement des discussions?

La table ronde des bailleurs organisée en mars 2009 a permis d'identifier les bailleurs intéressés par le secteur, et les composantes sur lesquelles ils pourraient intervenir avec les montants envisageables :

- BADEA : AEP Brazzaville et Pointe Noire pour 30 MUSD
- BAD : Assainissement Brazzaville et Pointe Noire pour 16 MUSD
- Banque Mondiale : AEP et forages pour 40 MUSD (PEDU avec 23 MUSD d'investissement et 17 MUSD d'appui aux réformes du secteur)
- BDEAC : AEP avec environ 18 MUSD qui pourraient être alloués au financement de la réhabilitation de l'usine hydroélectrique de Djoué. Ils n'ont cependant pas encore reçu de demande officielle de la part du gouvernement.
- AFD : Eaux pluviales avec 0,4 MUSD pour les études sur le sous-secteur de la collecte des eaux pluviales.

Quelle est la probabilité d'exécution de ces projets? Très probable, probable, incertain, possibilité lointaine ?

Compte tenu des divers engagements pris par les bailleurs, environ la moitié des 150 MUSD d'investissements identifiés sera très probablement financé à court terme.

L'autre moitié sera aussi financée de manière probable.

3. Evaluation du rôle de la FAE dans le projet**3.1. Quelles ont été les difficultés rencontrées durant la phase de préparation du projet?**

La préparation du projet avait été suivie par le précédent directeur de l'Hydraulique au sein du ministère, et n'avait pas posé de difficulté particulière.

Le projet avait initialement été présenté à l'appel à projets de la EUWF en partenariat avec le GRET, mais avait été classé en liste d'attente. Jugé comme bon projet, il a ensuite été présenté et financé par le FAE.

3.2. Comment évaluez-vous l'appui apporté par la FAE? Très bon, bon, adapté ou inadapté ?

L'appui apporté par le FAE lors de la phase de préparation est considéré comme très bon, avec des équipes, et notamment un chef de projet, très présentes, réceptives et réactives.

3.3. Quelles sont les forces et points d'amélioration de la FAE pour la phase de préparation?

Les points forts de la FAE en phase de préparation sont la disponibilité et la bonne gestion des remplacements en cas d'absence des responsables du projet.

Les points d'amélioration concernent plus les dispositions de démarrage et de mise en œuvre du projet, avec notamment la proposition que le coordinateur au sein de l'agence d'exécution puisse prendre ses fonctions dès la phase de préparation du projet, les difficultés rencontrées liées à l'ouverture d'un compte spécial en euros.

Plusieurs partenaires ont souligné qu'il aurait été souhaitable au cours de la phase de préparation d'être plus attentif aux types de produits et formats attendus. Il aurait été préférable d'avoir plus de sélectivité dans les interventions, avec une identification plus précise des besoins et consacrer intégralement le budget sur les 5 études APS/APD et aller jusqu'à la finalisation des DAO.

Le projet, et l'utilisation des produits qui en résultent, aurait bénéficié d'un allotement clair dès le départ.

3.4. Quelles sont les forces et points d'amélioration de la FAE pour la phase d'exécution?

Les points forts cités concernent le suivi d'exécution, avec trois missions réalisées sur place, et un suivi régulier à distance.

En revanche la rigidité du suivi est perçue comme un manque de confiance, et surtout un manque de souplesse dans la mise en œuvre du projet. Le programme de formation a été réduit pour des contraintes financières alors qu'il reste un reliquat budgétaire en fin de projet, ce qui est mal compris par les acteurs impliqués dans l'exécution.

La coordination entre les différents partenaires et bailleurs potentiels a un peu péché car certains bailleurs attendaient directement des DAO utilisables sur les projets AEP. Ce manque de coordination au démarrage de l'étude a abouti à une globalisation des études et donc les lots ne correspondent pas aux secteurs de concentration de chaque bailleur.

Les termes de référence de l'étude n'ont pas été suffisamment discutés au moment de la préparation de l'étude, et ce manque de concertation se traduit maintenant par un manque d'efficacité dans la mise en œuvre des projets préparés. L'un des bailleurs rencontrés est obligé de refaire des études complémentaires pour définir et compléter les composantes du projet sur lesquelles il souhaite intervenir.

Par ailleurs, le choix de certains investissements est jugé à posteriori comme non pertinent par certains bailleurs, ce qui aurait pu être évité par une meilleure concertation initiale.

Afin d'améliorer l'ancrage de la FAE au niveau national et dans le secteur, il est suggéré de développer les communications avec le bureau régional de la BAD, qui peut servir utilement de relais à la FAE au niveau local.

3.5. Comment évaluez-vous l'appui apporté par la FAE pendant l'exécution ? Très bon, bon, adapté ou inadapté ?

L'appui reçu de la FAE est jugé comme très bon par l'agence d'exécution, qui a particulièrement apprécié l'atelier de formation à Tunis sur les procédures de la FAE en octobre 2008. Il est simplement déploré que cette formation n'ait pas eu lieu en début de projet, en 2007.

Il a été relevé par les partenaires un manque d'appropriation du projet par le gouvernement et l'agence d'exécution, qui est interprété comme le résultat d'un manque d'ancrage de la FAE au niveau national et dans le secteur.

Annexes

Personnes rencontrées ou interviewées

Name	Organization	Contact (including e-mail)
Bruno Jean Richard Itoua	Ministre Energie et Hydraulique	meh_cab@yahoo.fr – (+242) 675 32 09
Nicolas Labarre	DG Hydraulique	labarrenick@yahoo.fr - (+242) 629 88 80
Alphonse Youlassani	Dir Gén de l'Hydraulique	dgh_ucp@yahoo.fr - (+242) 532 92 64
Victor Mabilia	Dir Gén de l'Hydraulique	dgh_ucp@yahoo.fr - (+242) 556 95 89
Charles Ngangoue	AMCOW TAC	amcowbrazza@yahoo.fr - (+242) 551 96 75
Léon Raphaël Mokoko	Min du Plan et du Développement	lrnokoko@yahoo.fr - (+242) 551 02 14
Mahin Diop	Banque Mondiale	Mdiop4@worldbank.org - (+242) 592 99 85
Clément Beaud	BDEAC	c.beaud@bdeac.org - (+242) 349 53 27
Guy Martin Mazoukandji	BDEAC	g.mazoukandji@bdeac.org - (+242) 508 20 67
Medjomo Coulibaly	BAD Kinshasa	m.c.coulibaly@afdb.org - (+243) 0 815 705 989
Bruno Zali-Zali	BAD Kinshasa	b.zali@afdb.org – (+243) 815 560 292
Mamadou Tangara	BAD Kinshasa	m.tangara@afdb.org – (+243) 815 560 291
Georgette Ingani	CREPA CONGO	Crepa_cncg@yahoo.fr - (+242) 527 70 36
Jean-Pierre Bidjocka	AMCOW TAC	jp.bidjocka@gwpcac.org - (+237) 22 10 50 86

Documents consultés

- AWF Project Assessment Guide final – January 2010
- AWF Preliminary Report v5 – December 2009
- Operational programme 2008-2010
- Rapport de revue du secteur eau et assainissement et de ses perspectives de développement – OWAS1 Avril 2007
- Rapport d'évaluation - Juin 2007
- Termes de référence Etude de réhabilitation et de renforcement de l'alimentation en eau potable et de l'assainissement de Brazzaville et Pointe Noire
- Accord de Don – Aout 2007
- Document de base Table Ronde des Bailleurs de Fonds – Brazzaville Mars 2009
- Communiqué Final Table Ronde des Bailleurs de Fonds – Brazzaville Mars 2009
- Rapport d'achèvement du projet - Novembre 2009

Matrice du projet

Pays : REPUBLIQUE DU CONGO
 Nom du projet : Etude de réhabilitation et d'extension des systèmes d'AEPA de Brazzaville et Pointe Noire
 Date de mise à jour : Mai 2007

HIERARCHIE DES OBJECTIFS	RESULTATS ESCOMPTES	PORTEE (BENEFICIAIRES)	INDICATEURS DE PERFORMANCE, SOURCE, PERIODICITE	INDICATEURS OBJECTIFS ET ECHEANCIER	HYPOTHESES RISQUES
<p>FINALITE</p> <p>Contribuer à la fourniture de services viables et durables d'AEPA en milieu urbain</p>	<p>RESULTATS A PLUS LONG TERME</p> <p>Contribution à l'amélioration du cadre et de la qualité de vie des populations urbaines contribuant à la réduction de la pauvreté des populations du Congo.</p>	<p>Le Gouvernement et les populations du Congo, les bailleurs de fonds, les collectivités locales, les ONG.</p>	<p>Indice de pauvreté (après les investissements basés sur l'étude)</p> <p><u>Source</u> : Enquêtes nationales sur le cadre de vie et les revenus</p> <p>Etat de Santee des Populations</p>	<p>L'indice de pauvreté en milieu urbain passe de 50% en 2007 à 25% en 2025</p>	<p>Environnement socio économique du pays stable</p> <p>Les investissements prévus mise en oeuvre</p>
<p>BUT DE L'ETUDE</p> <p>Mettre à la disposition du Gouvernement des dossiers de préparation de projets (outils d'attraction de financements pour l'AEPA)</p>	<p>RESULTATS A MOYEN TERME</p> <p>1. Les plans et les financements de la réhabilitation et du renforcement de l'AEPA de Brazzaville et Pointe Noire sont en place</p> <p>2. L'étude jettera une base cohérente pour les investissements future visent à : (i) la satisfaction des besoins en AEPA des communautés urbaines ; (ii) la réduction des risques d'inondations à Brazzaville et Pointe Noire ; (iii) l'amélioration de la gestion du service de l'eau ; (iv) la réduction des maladies d'origine hydrique ; (v) l'amélioration des conditions sanitaires et sociales des populations des deux villes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Le Ministère de l'Energie et de l'Hydraulique (MEH); - La Société Nationale de Distribution de l'Eau (SNDE); - Autres ministères du secteur, etc. 	<p>1. Financements mobilisés pour la réhabilitation et le renforcement de l'AEPA de Brazzaville et Pointe Noire</p> <p>2. Les dossiers de l'étude reconnus par les investisseurs et utilisé pour mettre en oeuvre les investissements prévus.</p>	<p>1. 100 % des financements pour la réhabilitation et le renforcement de l'AEPA de Brazzaville et Pointe Noire mobilisés fin 2008</p> <p>2.1.1 Le taux d'accès à l'AEP en milieu urbain passe de 45% en 2007 à 90% en 2015</p> <p>2.1.2 Le taux d'accès aux services d'assainissement de base passe de 10 % en 2007 à 55 % en 2015</p> <p>2.3. le taux de recouvrement des factures d'eau passe de 60% en 2007 à 95% en 2015</p> <p>2.4. Le taux d'incidence des maladies hydriques est réduit de 75 % dans les 2 villes en 2015</p> <p>2.5. Le taux de mortalité infanto- juvénile baisse de 105,3‰ en 2007 à 58,5‰ en 2015</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adhésion des donateurs à la réalisation des projets préparés ; - Bonne appropriation de l'Etude par les acteurs nationaux

HIERARCHIE DES OBJECTIFS	RESULTATS ESCOMPTEES	PORTEE (BENEFICIAIRES)	INDICATEURS DE PERFORMANCE, SOURCE, PERIODICITE	INDICATEURS OBJECTIFS ET ECHEANCIER	HYPOTHESES RISQUES
<p>ACTIVITES / INTRANTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mise en place comité de suivi - Mise en place UGP - Recrutement Consultant - Etudes diagnostiques et critères - APS et étude de faisabilité - Etude d'APD - Ateliers de lancement et validation - Formations individuelles et séminaires de formation - Table ronde des bailleurs de fonds <p>RESSOURCES FINANCIERES : Don Facilité : € 1 418 235 TOTAL : € 1 418 235</p>	<p>REALISATIONS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Etudes diagnostiques de l'AEPA de Brazzaville et Pointe Noire 2. Etudes d'APS et de faisabilité disponibles 3. 3 Etudes d'APD et d'EIES des projets retenus disponibles 4. 5 ateliers de lancement et de validation 5. 10 formations individuelles à l'étranger 6. 8 séminaires locaux de formation 7. 1 table ronde de bailleurs de fonds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Les populations des villes de Brazzaville et Pointe Noire - La SNDE - La DGH 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Rapports des études diagnostiques de l'AEPA de Brazzaville et Pointe Noire disponibles 3. Rapports des études d'APS et de faisabilité disponibles 4. 3 Rapports des études d'APD et d'EIES des projets retenus disponibles 5. Rapports des 5 ateliers de lancement et validation 6. Rapports de formation 7. Rapports de séminaires de formation 8. Rapport de la Table ronde des bailleurs de fonds <p><u>Source</u> : MEH</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rapports des études diagnostiques de l'AEPA de Brazzaville et Pointe Noire approuvés en mars 2008 2. Rapports des études d'APS et de faisabilité approuvés en Juillet 2008 3. Rapports des études d'APD et d'EIES des projets approuvés en octobre 2008 4. Rapports des ateliers de lancement et validation 5. 10 acteurs clés du secteur ont suivi des formations individuelles à l'étranger. 6. 120 acteurs nationaux formés à l'AEPA dans 8 séminaires de formation. 7. Les dossiers d'APD sont adoptés par les autorités et la communauté des Bailleurs de Fonds et les financements mobilisés fin 2008 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ressources et volonté suffisantes pour réaliser toutes les activités, et sous contrôle à la budgétisation - L'Etat apporte sa contrepartie à temps

Evaluation of the GEO-AQUIFER project – Amélioration de la connaissance et de la gestion concertée du Système Aquifère du Sahara Septentrional (SASS) par l'utilisation de l'imagerie satellitale – February 2010

1. Introduction

The Geo-Aquifer project of the OSS (Sahara and Sahel Observatory) purpose is to increase the North-Western Sahara aquifer system knowledge and improve water resources management by using satellite imagery. The project covers three countries, Tunisia, Algeria and Lybia and is funded through an AWF grant of €487,800, approved on 26 December 2006, with a €76,500 OSS in-kind co-funding. The project is implemented by the Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS), with support from the European Space Agency (ESA) and in partnership with the governments of Tunisia, Algeria and Lybia, for a duration of 18 months.

The overall objective of the project is to create an information and knowledge base to support sustainable transboundary groundwater resources management of the SASS aquifer at national and sub-regional level.

Activities will enhance information and knowledge of the aquifer through the use of satellite data and digital cartography; develop a database and decisions support tools; build the capacity of the ministries and agencies in charge of water, environment and agriculture to use these geo-scientific data management techniques and tools; support research and studies; and reinforce partnership and cooperation among the three countries.

The project assessment methodology for the review is set out in the consultant's preliminary report (November 2009) and the subsequent AWF project assessment guide. This methodology is structured using a broad project cycle framework:

- Project design, appraisal and approval
- Project implementation
- Operation and use of facilities, outputs and systems created
- Project monitoring and evaluation
- Next steps, emerging projects and the leverage effect

Under each of these headings the issues identified in the AWF project assessment guide have been explored with a variety of project partners and stakeholders. The expected primary respondents for each section of the proposed assessment are reminded in italics below each heading in the following sections.

Some questions on specific issues where a rating is requested on a scale of 1 to 4 are also included, as a means of doing a comparative analysis between the projects assessed.

An "output to outcome review" is also proposed as a means of assessing the extent to which the project outputs/outcomes have been achieved, or the likelihood that outputs/outcomes will be achieved. The output to outcome review is developed in the last section of the report.

2. Assessment of the project

2.1. Project performance summary

The scoring system and approach for the AWF project output to outcome review is a simplified version of the DFID output to purpose review approach. It includes a scoring system to indicate the likelihood of achievements of both the project outcomes and the project outputs. Table 1 is the proposed project rating scoring system to be used to rate the likelihood of achievement of the project outcomes and outputs in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 1. Project rating scale for likelihood of project objectives being achieved

Rating number	Criteria for rating
1	Likely to be completely achieved. The outputs/ purpose are well on the way to completion (or are completed).
2	Likely to be largely achieved. There is good progress towards purpose completion and most outputs are likely to be achieved, particularly the most important ones.
3	Likely to be partly achieved. Only partial achievement of the purpose is likely and/or achievement of some outputs.
4	Only likely to be achieved to a very limited extent . Purpose unlikely to be achieved but a few outputs likely to be achieved.
5	Unlikely to be achieved. No progress on outputs or purpose.
X	X. = It is impossible to say whether there has been any progress towards the final achievement of outputs or purpose. This score should not be used unless they meet at least one of the following criteria:

For the Sahara and Sahel Observatory Geo-Aquifer project in Tunisia the likelihood of the outcomes and outputs being achieved is summarized in tables 2 and 3 using the above rating system.

Table 2. Output to outcome project scoring assessment (purpose level)

Goal statement:			
1. Optimiser l'utilisation des données satellitales pour la connaissance et la gestion de l'aquifère SASS partagé par l'Algérie, le Libye et la Tunisie			
2. Renforcer et améliorer les mécanismes de gestion concertée des ressources en eau dans les pays concernés			
3. Renforcer des capacités nationales en matière d'utilisation des données satellitales			
Outcome 1 statement			
Extension de la cartographie numérique de l'occupation du sol, et élaboration de cartes des changements de l'occupation du sol sur des zones pilotes			
Outcome 1 OVis	Progress	Comments	Rating score (see table B)
1. Taux de couverture du bassin en cartes d'occupation du sol : Le taux de couverture du bassin en cartes	Achieved But delayed		1

d'occupation du sol sera de 100% a Mo + 7			
2. Taux de couverture des zones pilotes en cartes de modification d'occupation du sol : Le taux de couverture des zones pilotes en cartes de modification d'occupation du sol sera de 100% a Mo + 9	Achieved But delayed		1
3. Taux de couverture du bassin en carte des mares et plans d'eau : Le taux de couverture du bassin en carte des mares et plans d'eau sera de 100 % a Mo + 12	Achieved But delayed		1
Outcome 1 average score and justification	Outcome 1 was achieved, but with some delays compared with the initial plans		1
Outcome 2 statement Extension des Modèles Numériques de Terrain (MNT) et des produits dérivés sur le bassin SASS			
Outcome 2 OVIs	Progress	Comments	Rating score (see table B)
1. Taux de couverture du bassin en MNT : Le taux de couverture du bassin en MNT sera de 100 % a Mo+4	Achieved But delayed		1
2. Taux de couverture du bassin en produits dérivés du MNT : Taux de couverture du bassin en produits dérivés du MNT a Mo+8	Achieved But delayed		1
Outcome 2 average score and justification	Outcome 2 was achieved, but with some delays compared with the initial plans		1
Outcome 3 statement Création d'un référentiel hydro-géographique, d'un globe virtuel régional et d'un outil de dissémination des données			
Outcome 3 OVIs	Progress	Comments	Rating score (see table B)
1. Existence d'un globe virtuel régional consultable sur internet : Existence d'un globe virtuel régional consultable sur internet a Mo + 10 et nombre de consultations du site a Mo + 17	Achieved But delayed	Virtual globe is available at http://prog.oss.org.tn/geoaquifer/ Not measurable since the web site does not have a consultations counter	1
Outcome 3 average score and justification	The overall outcome is achieved, since the web site is available and in use, but number of visits cannot be counted (indicator selected cannot be quantified).		1

Outcome 4 statement			
Développement des capacités des pays: formation aux techniques de gestion des données géo-scientifiques ; appui à la recherche ; acquisition de matériel informatique			
Outcome 4 OVIs	Progress	Comments	Rating score (see table B)
<p>1. Les Autorités/Agences de l'eau des pays et les Centre nationaux de Télédétection ont recours aux images satellitales pour améliorer la connaissance du secteur de l'eau et les outils de gestion de la ressource en eau :</p> <p>100 % des rapports nationaux soumis au mécanisme de concertation sur le bassin du SASS sont produits a base de données issues des données et images satellitales et de leurs produits dérivés.</p>	<p>Awareness raising of countries regarding the information technologies</p> <p>Tools have been developed and are available</p> <p>The consultative mechanism is in place with high level of appropriation</p>	<p>It is still a bit early to evaluate results and impact.</p> <p>It is necessary to have an operating budget in place to sustain the mechanism and maintain the database. This is planned and on the way.</p>	2
Outcome 4 average score and justification	The training component is considered as successful but the outcome still needs to be sustained.		2

Table 3. Output to outcome project scoring assessment (output level)

Output	Indicator (OVI)	Progress and likelihood of being achieved	Rating score
<p>1. Acquisition d'images satellitales et de cartographies de base :</p> <p>1.1 : Clarification des limites du bassin, sélection des zones pilotes, sélection des sources, acquisition des images, photographies aériennes, cartes thématiques et bases de données existantes</p> <p>1.2 : Cartographie actuelle de l'occupation du sol au 1/200 000</p> <p>1.3 : Cartographies à deux dates (Circa 1990 actuel) de l'occupation des sols au 1/50 000 sur une quinzaine de zones pilotes</p> <p>1.4 : Inventaire et cartographie des mares et plans d'eau à l'échelle 1/200 000</p>	<p>Nombre cartes et d'images satellitales acquises :</p> <p>A fin Mo+7, au moins 10 images basses résolution et 3 images haute résolution acquises sur la zone du projet</p>	<p>100% achieved</p> <p>61 high resolution Spot images purchased on witness zones</p> <p>25 low resolution images purchased</p>	1

Output	Indicator (OVI)	Progress and likelihood of being achieved	Rating score
<p>2. Collecte/Acquisition des données de base :</p> <p>2.1 : Création des produits dérivés (courbes de niveaux équidistante : 100 m, carte des pentes en 10 classes, carte des bassins versants) à partir du MNT de source SRTM à 90 m (ou plus précis si opportunité)</p> <p>2.2 : Elaboration des MNT détaillés à l'aide de données ERS/SAR et ENVISAT/ASAR ou SPOT 1, 2, 4 sur les zones pilotes, élaboration des produits dérivés (courbes de niveaux ; équidistance : 20 m, carte des pentes en 10 classes)</p>	<p>Nombre de cartes numériques thématiques disponibles sur l'ensemble du bassin du SASS :</p> <p>A fin Mo+7, au moins 10 cartes thématiques disponibles sur le bassin du SASS;</p> <p>Nombre de cartes thématiques disponibles sur les 15 zones pilotes :</p> <p>A fin Mo+12, 15 cartes d'évolution de l'occupation du sol produites sur les zones pilotes</p>	<p>100% achieved</p> <p>72 maps produced and available</p> <p>66 maps produced and available (3 on each of the witness zones)</p> <p>This OVI is more linked to Output 1.3</p>	1
<p>3. Renforcement des capacités nationales aux techniques de traitement des images satellitaires et d'utilisation de leurs produits dérivés a connaissance et a la gestion des ressources en eau souterraines :</p> <p>3.1 : Acquisition et préparation des données générales en vue de leur intégration dans le référentiel</p> <p>3.2 : Intégration des données hydrographiques, hydrogéologiques et environnementales et création du référentiel hydro-géographique</p> <p>3.3 : Description des données à l'aide de métadonnées ISO 19115 selon la méthodologie du projet Géo-OSS de l'OSS ; mise en ligne des métadonnées et d'un jeu de données de démonstration sur le site de l'OSS</p> <p>3.4 : Intégration du globe virtuel WorldWind (Intranet), création de globes virtuels régionaux : superposition des données du référentiel</p>	<p>Nombre de métadonnées produites et accessibles en ligne :</p> <p>Nombre de métadonnées produites et en ligne a fin Mo+15 ;</p>	<p>Point 3 is more related to the capacity building component.</p> <p>OVI is not properly designed since it is not possible to calculate the number of "métadonnées"</p> <p>3.1 Achieved</p> <p>3.2 Achieved</p> <p>3.3 Achieved</p> <p>3.4 Achieved, but only one virtual globe makes sense</p>	1
<p>4. Renforcement des capacités nationales en matière d'outils de traitement de l'information : Séminaires de formation dans les pays</p>	<p>Nombre de d'ateliers organisés pour le compte des pays :</p> <p>A fin du projet, 6 ateliers de formation de 2 semaines pour 10 a 20 personnes organisés par pays</p>	<p>100% achieved</p>	1

Output	Indicator (OVI)	Progress and likelihood of being achieved	Rating score
5. Renforcement des capacités nationales en matière d'outils de traitement de l'information : Formation spécialisée en Europe	Nombre de voyages d'études réalisés : A la fin Mo+12, un voyage d'étude pour 3 personnes par pays organisé	12 persons trained (4 per country instead of 3 per country)	1
6. Renforcement des capacités nationales en matière d'outils de traitement de l'information : Stages et voyages d'études en Europe	Nombre de formations spécialisées des cadres et du personnel d'appui réalisés : A la fin M+15, 4 cadres de chaque pays ont suivi une formation spécialisée de 2 semaines	Combined with 5. Achieved	1
9. Renforcement des capacités nationales en matière d'outils de traitement de l'information Formations diplômantes de 3ème cycle en Europe	Nombre de formations diplômantes : A la fin du projet, 3 formations diplômantes ont été suivies avec succès a raison d'1 par pays et 3 stagiaires ont été appuyés sur une période de 2 semaines	Removed from scope and budget reallocated to 5.	5
Total average output score and justification	Considering the change in scope decided by the Steering Committee, the overall score should be 1 in term of achievements. Nevertheless, important delays were observed for all planned outputs.		1,2
Outcome attribution To what extent can the achievement of the outcomes be attributed to the delivery of the project outputs?	Achievement of outcomes is directly linked to the delivery of project outputs.		

2.2. Project design, appraisal and approval

Logical framework

The latest version of the logframe is the one in the final appraisal document of December 2006.

Generally, the activities planned in the logframe are adequate, but the time provided for implementation was underestimated. Some of the OVI are not adequate or not measurable. The logframe was neither updated after project changes, nor used for monitoring implementation.

The logframe should be prepared more in details and should be used as a monitoring tool. On the activities implementation, if better defined, the logframe could have been used to anticipate the delays and variations.

2.3. Project implementation

Latest progress on the project

Grant agreement signed on 3rd January 2007 for an implementation period of 18 months ending in July 2008. At the time of the review, the project is still alive with a time extension granted up to 30th April 2010.

All the objectives have been reached and all deliverable produced.

The project is fully implemented, but a remaining unused budget balance was requested by the Steering Committee to be used for complementary activities (Training and maps printing)

What are the main reasons for any delays?

Between the grant agreement signature and November 2009, the project was delayed by 14 months.

The delays experienced during the implementation phase are due to (i) the administrative procedures to reach grant effectiveness, with special requirements from AWF on the bank account and the auditing procedures, (ii) the procurement procedures, (iii) the change in the content of the training program, and (iv) the time needed for validation and approval of the results by the 3 country partners.

The project inception was delayed from January to July 07 to fulfil the AWF requirements on the bank account and the fund management procedures.

The recruitment and AWF approval for the consultant to prepare the TOR and tender documents took 4 months instead of 2 initially planned in the work schedule.

Then the procurement of the consultancy firm took another 6 months (EOI, short list, call for tenders, technical evaluation with AWF approval and financial evaluation with AWF approval, and no objection) while this period was simply not included in the work plan.

Overall, the most significant delays were caused by the time needed for the consultancy procurement, that was underestimated in the initial work plan, and the OSS goods procurement procedures initially envisaged and finally not adequate.

The steering committee deliberated during its first meeting and decided to amend the capacity building component, and cancelled the budget dedicated to academic studies.

Finally, a time extension of an additional 5 months was granted to use the remaining budget balance and complement the training component.

Was the project implemented according to the agreed project logframe and project agreement, if not what variations were introduced and why?

Globally the project was implemented according to the logframe, and delivered quality tools and material with the expected technical standards. The initial budget was properly managed and kept by the implementing agency.

The capacity building and training component was modified, and the budget initially targeting academic long-term doctorate and post-doctorate formation was reallocated to short term professional training, more appropriate to the project and the expressed needs of the 3 countries.

The initial planning reflected in the logframe was over-optimistic.

What were the main project constraints and how were they dealt with?

The main problem was the administrative procedures to follow, especially at the beginning of the implementation phase. Some adjustments and clarifications were made during an inception workshop.

Delays problems were solved thanks to the availability of the AWF task manager in charge of the project.

There is a need to better disseminate the lessons learned through the project.

What are the main project achievements, including aspects that may not have been including in the original project design or logical framework?

The projects outputs are the following:

- 107 ground occupancy maps – scale 1/200,000
- 33 detailed maps – scale 1/50,000 (3 for each study zone)
- 45 engineers trained on GIS (15 per country)
- 12 engineers trained (the 4 best of each country) abroad on specialized ArcGIS software

In addition, the data base is in place, as well as the map server. Those tools are available to a wide range of potential users on the OSS web site (<http://prog.oss.org.tn/geoaquifer/>).

The main outcome of the project is the strengthened cooperation between the 3 countries, and the development of a consultative mechanism and cooperation based on objective data. This leads to a better understanding and knowledge on the underground resources, and therefore better assistance for each country to make decision. GEOAQUIFER can be considered as a pilot project to learn how to develop joint management of transboundary underground water resources by several countries. The mechanism developed needs to be strengthened.

The project GEOAQUIFER has clearly demonstrated the credibility of satellite images and the use of teledetection methods. It has contributed to the developments of such techniques and national capacities to develop data base and training. The project is a clear success in terms of capacity building.

The project contributes also to the economic agriculture growth of the region.

What are the project achievements and potential areas for improvement and how has the project contributed to each of the main AWF areas of intervention – substantial, significant, moderate, minimal or none?

- (v) Strengthening water governance is rated significant, since it is the main objective and outcome of the project. GEOAQUIFER clearly contributes to better management of the underground water resources and increased collaboration between the three countries involved.
- (vi) Investment to meet water needs is rated moderate. This is not the main objective of the project, but the knowledge developed by the project allow for preparation of investments to meet water needs (irrigated zones for example).
- (vii) Strengthening the financial base is rated minimal.
- (viii) Improving water knowledge is rated substantial. This is one of the main objective of the project, and it contributed effectively to the knowledge development of the SASS aquifer.

To what extent (using a rating system of substantial, significant, moderate, minimal or none) have the AWF cross-cutting issues been addressed by the project, for each of the following:

- (i) Capacity building at local, national, basin and regional level: Substantial. The project included the professional training of 47 engineers, with a very high level of satisfaction. The OSS received congratulation letters from the partner agencies expressing the satisfaction of the civil servants trained.
- (ii) Gender mainstreaming including policies and methodologies to mainstream practices that promote equality between men and women: Significant. A specific attention was given to gender balance, and the gender ration was always 50/50 in the teams and training programs at the level of teledetection and modelisation specialists. Also, indirectly, GEOAQUIFER is contributing to gender issues since it is providing the basis for the project SASS 3 which will study all socio-economic aspects in the region.
- (iii) Poverty reduction: Moderate. The project is contributing to the preparation of SASS 3, which will review all socio-economic aspects in the region.
- (iv) Environmental sustainability: Substantial. The project has highlighted the environmental risks on water quality degradation and soil salination. It provides tools for better management and preservation of the underground water resources.
- (v) Good governance: Significant. Development of information to feed the consultative mechanism that is improving regional and inter-country cooperation.

2.4. Operation and use of facilities, outputs and systems created

To what extent are the facilities, systems, outputs, practices or capacities created by the project, being used and maintained, in comparison to the project design?

Some specific trainings have been incorporated in the training program on the use of the systems developed, and particularly on the use of GIS, as well as data base (Access) management.

The filling of the data base is currently on going, with regular update. Confidence between the countries has been progressively built for a common use of the data base. The data base is hosted on the OSS server, and each country has a copy of the data base. Regular updates are sent to OSS by the three countries through the Consultative Mechanism, and the Algerian Space Agency is supplying satellite data. The data base has progressed from 8000 entries in 2000 up to 18000 entries in 2009.

Regarding the maps produced by the project, all of them are available online on the OSS map server (<http://prog.oss.org.tn/geoaquifer/>)

What could be done to improve the use, operation and maintenance of the facilities, systems, outputs, practices or capacities created?

Regional organisation for teledetection promotion (CRTEAN) could be more involved for the lessons learned sharing and knowledge dissemination.

The use of internet tools to support the Consultative Mechanism should be developed.

The Consultative Mechanism itself should be strengthened and supported for a better use and update of the system by the beneficiary countries.

It would be useful to duplicate the skills and staff using the data base at country level, to make sure the system is used and updated in case of absence or staff change.

2.5. Project monitoring and evaluation

What project monitoring and reporting has been done and how could it have been improved?

The project monitoring system is based on quarterly technical and financial progress report complemented by annual reports. The annual reports are reviewed during the annual Steering Committee meeting (Oct 08, Jul 09 and Nov 09)

The M&E mechanism established to monitor the project seems appropriate and is perceived as efficient by all partners consulted, but the frequency of steering committee meeting could have been higher (6 monthly instead of yearly)

The role of the steering committee could have been more important, especially regarding selection and procurement of the consultancy firm. In addition, it is felt the quality control on the consultancy work was a bit weak.

How was project monitoring information used to inform changes in the project design and implementation?

The changes and variations in the project scope were reported in the quarterly reports. The change in training program content was discussed during the first SC meeting in October 08, and the budget remaining and its use were discussed by the SC in Nov 09.

Regarding budget monitoring, the budget component that was not used because of change in scope of work should have been reallocated much earlier, instead of waiting for the final report and ask for time extension.

What base line data was collected or what situation analysis was prepared at the start of the project that can be used to compare the 'before' and 'after' project situation?

Since the GEOAQUIFER project was following the AQUIFER pilot project, there was a good knowledge of the situation before project that can be used to compare the 'before' and 'after' project situation.

An evaluation that compared the 'before project and 'after project situation' was done for the final report.

2.6. Next steps, emerging follow on projects and the leverage effect

What are the proposed new projects or concepts that are emerging from this project? Please provide brief descriptions.

There are two projects emerging from GEOAQUIFER: (i) SASS 3, building on the tools produced to develop the next phase after SASS 1 and SASS 2, which is a comprehensive socio-economic study covering the SASS aquifer region, and (ii) GEOAQUIFER 2, to complement the coverage zones and refine tools and data to get better knowledge about the use of water for irrigation in the region.

What are the indicative costs of those new project proposals?

The SASS 3 project has a budget of 1.6 MUSD, co-funded by the FFEM and the GEF, and GEOAQUIFER 2 a budget of 180,000 EUR, to be financed by the AWF.

In addition, the approach developed for GEOAQUIFER is being replicated in south Sahara region on the Illumedden aquifer region with a budget of 3 M€ financed by the AWF for 1.3 M€ and the GEF for 1.7 M€.

Where new project proposals are being considered by potential funders, what is the likelihood that these projects will be implemented – very likely, likely, uncertain or remote possibility?

The SASS 3 project is very likely to be implemented, since it is already funded, the GEOAQUIFER 2 is likely, as discussions are on going with the AWF for its financing, and the Illumedden project is also likely to be implemented, since the AWF grant is already in place, and the GEF part is getting approved.

3. Assessment of AWF's role in the project

3.1. Problems experienced during the process of AWF project application, screening, preparation, appraisal and approval

The project preparation phase was not problematic. It was conducted by OSS without difficulty. OSS being based in Tunisia, it was easy to organize meetings and exchange quickly on documents.

After application, AWF mandated a consultant to prepare the project. The consultant assisted OSS to develop the project structure and pertinence.

3.2. Strengths, weaknesses and areas for improvement for the AWF during the process of AWF project development, application, screening, preparation, appraisal and approval

The project was strategically positioned in the support process to OSS, between the two projects SASS 2 and SASS 3, funded by other development agencies. It builds on benefits of SASS 2 to facilitate inception of SASS 3 and generates therefore significant leverage effect through SASS 3 financing (around USD1M in socio-economic surveys in the 3 target countries). The objective is to give OSS objective data to develop discussions between the 3 countries.

3.3. Support provided by AWF during in the project development, appraisal and approval process

AWF was very supportive during the project preparation phase, and they hired a consultant for the project preparation and appraisal mission.

There is consensus among the partners on the very good cooperation with AWF/AfDB and the adequate support received from AWF.

3.4. What are the strengths, weaknesses and potential areas for improvement for the AWF in terms of their support to project implementation, bearing in mind the project budget?

The participation of the beneficiaries of the project to internal AWF training and workshops on AWF administrative procedures was really appreciated, though it came late in the project. Exchanges with other project implementing agencies were particularly interesting.

On the overall AWF grant mechanism, it is felt such type of funding should leave more flexibility to the executing agency on how to implement the project, including some flexibility on project component adjustment.

It was also clear that once the project implementation started in mid-07, the AWF follow-up changed dramatically, from very close and proactive contribution to a much more distant and heavy supervision.

The consulting firm appointed to develop the system should have worked more closely with the water department in each country, or at least with the DGRE in Tunisia.

3.5. How would you rate the support provided by AWF during project implementation – very good, good, adequate or inadequate?

There is consensus among partners to say that the support provided by AWF during project implementation was very good. Again, the geographical proximity with OSS and the Tunisian partners was a big advantage for this project.

Annexes

Persons met or interviewed

Name	Organization	Contact (including e-mail)
Lone Badstue	AWF	l.badstue@afdb.org (+216) 71 10 27 33
Jalel El Faleh	AWF	j.elfaleh@afdb.org (+216) 71 10 35 29
Yvan Kedaj	AWF	y.kedaj@afdb.org (+216) 71 10 24 17
Abdelkader DODO	OSS	abdelkader.dodo@oss.org.tn (+216)71 20 66 33
Djamel LATRECH	OSS	djamel.latrech@oss.org.tn (+216)71 20 66 33
Youba SOKONA	OSS	boc@oss.org.tn (+216)71 20 66 33
Rachid KHANFIR	SASS	khanfirachid@yahoo.fr (+216)71 20 66 33
Neji FEKIH	CRTEAN	dg.crtean@crtean.intl.tn (+216) 71 23 65 75
Hamza MEKKI	DGRE	hamza@iresa.agrinet.tn (+216) 71 39 93 20
Abderrazak DAOUD	DGRE	a.daoud@semide.tn (+216) 71 39 18 51
Brahim LABIDI	DGRE Gabès	laabidiib@yahoo.fr (+216) 75 392476
Rachid TAIBI	ANRH Algérie	anrh@anrh.dz (+213) 21 54 25 59
Sadeg KADRI	GWA Lybie	sadekkad@hotmail.com (+218) 21 487 20 24

Documents consulted

- AWF Project Assessment Guide final – January 2010
- AWF Preliminary Report v5 – December 2009
- Operational programme 2008-2010
- GEO-AQUIFER - Amélioration de la connaissance et de la gestion concertée du Système Aquifère du Sahara Septentrional (SASS) par l'utilisation de l'imagerie satellitale – Rapport d'évaluation – Décembre 2009
- Système Aquifère du Sahara Septentrional – Gestion concertée d'un bassin transfrontalier – Collection Synthèse n°1 – Observatoire du Sahara et du Sahel – 2008
- Rapport d'audit intermédiaire du projet GEOAQUIFER – Version définitive – Mars 2009

Evaluation du projet "Appui à la création de l'Autorité du Bassin de la Volta" – Janvier 2010



Le siège de l'ABV à Ouagadougou lors de la visite. Sur la photo : Francis Bougairé (FAE), Charles A. Biney (ABV) et Yao Samuel Atikpo (ABV)

1. Introduction

L'objectif général de l'Appui à la création de l'Autorité du Bassin de la Volta était de mettre en place l'Autorité du Bassin de la Volta sur le plan réglementaire et organisationnel, profitant de la volonté politique² de collaboration entre les états riverains de ce bassin transfrontalier qui était un des derniers à ne pas être doté de statut et d'organisme de bassin. Ce projet est emblématique pour la Facilité Africaine de l'Eau puisque c'est la première convention de financement à avoir été signée en avril 2006 et qu'il s'agit également du premier projet à avoir été achevé la même année. Le Ministère en charge de l'eau au Burkina Faso, mandataire des futurs pays signataires de la convention de l'ABV a reçu une subvention FAE de 165 000 € approuvée en avril 2006 et a mis en œuvre le projet prévu sur une durée totale de 9 mois (avril-décembre 2006).

Les activités mises en œuvre étaient les suivantes :

- (i) Préparation du projet de convention de l'ABV ;
- (ii) Approfondissement du projet de convention et des textes fondateurs de l'ABV ;
- (iii) Organisation des sessions des experts régionaux ;
- (iv) Mise en œuvre des ateliers de concertation régionaux ;

² Volonté confirmée lors de l'entretien accordé par l'Ambassadeur du Ghana au Burkina Faso.

- (v) Organisation de l'atelier régional ;
- (vi) Tenue de la 2^{ème} réunion des Ministres des pays de la Volta.

La méthodologie retenue pour l'évaluation de ce projet financé par la Facilité Africaine de l'Eau est décrite dans le rapport préliminaire du consultant (novembre 2009) et le guide d'évaluation des projets FAE qui a été finalisé en janvier 2010 (voir ci-après).

Ce guide d'évaluation des projets des est structuré suivant le cycle projet :

- Conception, évaluation et approbation du projet
- Exécution du projet
- Exploitation et utilisation des ouvrages, produits et systèmes créés
- Suivi et évaluation du projet
- Etapes suivantes, suite possible du projet et effet de levier

Pour chaque section, les thématiques identifiées dans le guide d'évaluation des projets FAE ont été abordées et discutées avec les différentes parties prenantes.

Quelques questions sur des aspects particuliers pour lesquelles une notation est demandée sur une échelle de 1 à 4 sont aussi incluses, comme moyen d'établir une analyse comparative entre les projets évalués.

Une évaluation des « produits » et « impacts » et aussi faite séparément, sur la base du cadre logique développé pour le projet, de manière à évaluer dans quelle mesure les produits et résultats attendu du projet ont été atteints. La revue « des produits aux résultats » est présentée dans la première partie du rapport.

2. Evaluation du projet

2.1. Synthèse de la performance du projet

Le système de notation et l'approche pour la revue « des produits aux résultats » pour les projets FAE est une version simplifiée de l'approche DFID « des produits aux objectifs ». Elle inclue un système de notation indiquant la probabilité d'atteinte à la fois des résultats et de la production des livrables (ce qui rend cette méthodologie adaptée aux projets qui ne sont pas encore achevés, ce qui est le cas de la plupart des projets visités par l'équipe de consultants). Le tableau 1 présente le système de notation utilisé pour noter la probabilité d'atteinte des résultats et la production des livrables présentée dans les tableaux 2 et 3.

Tableau 1. Système de notation de la probabilité d'atteinte des objectifs du projet

Note	Critère utilisé pour la notation
1	Probablement atteint complètement . Les livrables/objectifs sont en cours d'atteinte (ou déjà atteints au moment de l'évaluation).
2	Probablement atteint largement . Bonne progression vers l'atteinte des objectifs et les livrables importants seront probablement produits.
3	Probablement atteint partiellement . L'atteinte des objectifs et/ou la production des livrables est seulement partielle.
4	Probablement atteint de manière seulement très limitée . L'objectif ne sera probablement pas atteint mais quelques livrables seront produits.

Note	Critère utilisé pour la notation
5	Probablement non atteint . L'objectif ne sera pas atteint, et pas de progrès réalisé vers les objectifs ou la production des livrables.
X	Au moment de l'évaluation il n'est pas possible d'estimer s'il y a eu des progrès vers les objectifs ou la production des livrables.

Pour le projet d'Appui à la création de l'Autorité du Bassin de la Volta, les résultats de l'analyse suivant le système ci-dessus sont présentés dans les tableaux 2 et 3.

Tableau 2. Notation "produits vs. résultats" (niveau résultats)

Objectif : Améliorer la Gestion Ressources en Eau Transfrontalières (GRET) dans le Bassin du Fleuve Volta au bénéfice de l'ensemble des acteurs des pays membres			
Résultat 1 : Une convention créant l'ABV est approuvée			
Indicateurs	Progrès	Commentaires	Notation
Existence d'une convention signée par les pays membres de l'ABV	Convention signée en janvier 2007 par les Chefs d'Etat	Résultat atteint	1
Résultat 1 : Notation et justification	La présence des 6 chefs d'Etat pour la signature de la convention à Ouagadougou a constitué un signe fort en ce qui concerne le succès du processus. Le retard pris dans l'exécution (janvier 2007 au lieu de juillet 2006 dans le cadre logique) n'est pas significatif compte tenu de la qualité et de la complexité du processus de signature		1
Résultat 2 : Une feuille de route pour la mise en place et le démarrage des activités de l'Autorité du Bassin de la Volta est disponible			
Indicateurs	Progrès	Commentaires	Notation
Existence d'une feuille de route approuvée	La feuille de route a été adoptée lors de la réunion ministérielle qui s'est tenue à Lomé en juillet 2006	Résultat atteint	1
Résultat 2 : Notation et justification	Le résultat 2 a été dépassé puisqu'en plus de la feuille de route le reliquat disponible sur la convention FAE a permis de réaliser l'étude institutionnelle complète de l'ABV y compris définition de l'organigramme		1

Résultat 3 : Une ABV effectivement opérationnelle et obtenant les résultats prévus			
Indicateurs	Progrès	Commentaires	Notation
Opérationnalité de l'ABV et mise en œuvre des dispositions prévues dans la feuille de route	En janvier 2010 l'ABV est en place mais pas encore complètement opérationnelle	Résultat en bonne voie d'être atteint	2
Résultat 3 : Notation et justification	Au moment de la clôture du projet l'ABV n'était pas encore complètement opérationnelle. Le processus de ratification et de mise en place de l'équipe définitive a pris plus de temps que prévu (en janvier 2010 l'exécutif de l'ABV n'était pas encore définitivement validé)		2

Tableau 3. Notation "produits aux résultats" (niveau activités/délivrables)

Activité	Indicateur	Progrès et probabilité d'atteinte	Note
Activité 1 : Préparation de l'esquisse du projet de convention pour l'ABV	Esquisse de projet de convention	Atteint	1
Activité 2 : Approfondissement du projet de convention et de la feuille de route pour les textes relatifs à la création de l'ABV	Projet de convention	Atteint et même dépassé, puisque le reliquat a permis de financer l'étude institutionnelle complète de l'ABV (organigramme, règlement intérieur, etc.)	1
Activité 3 : Organisation des ateliers nationaux avec participation des principaux acteurs, validation du projet de convention (dite « version A »)	Atelier National sur la Version A de la Convention	Atteint : des ateliers ont été organisés dans tous les pays en avril et mai 2006, avec une efficacité qui a permis de faire des économies sur le budget alloué à cette activité	1
Activité 4 : Seconde session du Comité des experts régionaux et production de la « version B »	Version B de la Convention	Atteint	1

Activité	Indicateur	Progrès et probabilité d'atteinte	Note
Activité 5 : Atelier régional plus complet pour la validation de la version B et préparation de la version C (projet définitif) et de la feuille de route	Atelier Régional, sur la version B et production de la version C de la convention et feuille de route	Atteint	1
Activité 6 : 2ème réunion du Conseil des Ministres du Bassin de la Volta à Lomé en juin 2006 pour la signature de la convention	Le Conseil des Ministres signe la Convention et adopte la feuille de route	La deuxième réunion a eu lieu à Lomé en juillet 2006 mais la convention a finalement été signée en janvier 2007 à Ouagadougou, à l'occasion d'un sommet des chefs d'Etat	1
Note moyenne totale des et justification	La totalité des livrables ont effectivement été produits et la convention de financement de la FAE a même permis d'aller plus loin que les résultats prévus		1
Attribution du résultat Dans quelle mesure l'atteinte du résultat peut être attribuée à la production des livrables ?		Les livrables (notamment les versions successives de la convention) ont concouru très directement à l'atteinte des résultats (la création de l'ABV et son opérationnalité)	

2.2. Conception, évaluation et approbation du projet

Problèmes rencontrés lors de la phase de préparation / approbation

Ce projet, techniquement parlant le premier à être financé par la FAE, a été instruit de manière particulièrement rapide, avec un dialogue permanent entre la FAE et le CTBV (Comité Technique du Bassin de la Volta). Le mandat donné par les pays du bassin au Ministère en charge de l'eau au Burkina Faso a considérablement facilité le processus, la Direction Générale des Ressources en Eau (DGRE) et notamment son Directeur étant directement impliqués dans le processus de préparation. Le CTBV, compte tenu de ses travaux antérieurs à la formulation de la demande avait une idée très claire du contenu du projet et le design a fait l'objet de peu d'aller-retour entre le demandeur et la Facilité.

Il est à noter que le projet d'appui à la création de l'ABV devait initialement être financé par la Facilité Européenne de l'Eau (le projet a effectivement vu le jour deux ans plus tard). L'opportunité d'un financement de la FAE est apparue en 2005, quelques mois après la décision de mise en place de l'ABV (2004) qui a été prise à la même époque où la FAE se mettait en place. Le travail de préparation a donc consisté à « extraire » du projet en préparation pour la Facilité Européenne un petit noyau d'activités considérées comme véritablement prioritaires et surtout urgentes pour la mise en œuvre de l'ABV.

Quelle est la dernière version du cadre logique et comment aurait-il pu être amélioré ?

La dernière version du cadre logique est celle contenue dans le rapport d'évaluation d'avril 2006. C'est cette version qui a été utilisée tout au long du projet et elle n'a pas été modifiée.

2.3. Exécution du projet

Quelle est la situation du projet, ce qui a été exécuté et ce qui reste à faire?

Le projet est terminé comme prévu dans la convention en décembre 2006 et le rapport d'achèvement du projet a été produit en mai 2007. Suite aux économies réalisées sur l'organisation des ateliers nationaux le reliquat disponible a été utilisé avec l'accord de la FAE pour approfondir les textes nécessaires au fonctionnement de l'ABV.

Quelles sont les raisons des retards éventuels ?

Ce projet n'a fait l'objet d'aucun retard particulier. On note seulement que la signature de la convention de l'ABV en tant que telle, initialement prévue en juillet 2006, a été signée en janvier 2007, mais : 1) on peut considérer que le principe de la création de l'ABV a été entériné dès juillet 2006 au niveau ministériel ; 2) le report de la date de signature à janvier 2007 a été bénéfique puisqu'il a permis à l'ABV de bénéficier d'une validation à un niveau plus élevé – celui d'un sommet des chefs d'Etat.

Le projet a-t-il subi des modifications et si oui quelles sont-elles et pourquoi ?

Les seules modifications apportées au projet concernent l'utilisation du reliquat constaté à mi-parcours suite à la tenue des ateliers nationaux de validation. Cette modification a permis d'élaborer les principaux textes réglant l'organisation de l'ABV et elle a donc accéléré la mise en place effective de l'Autorité au cours de l'année 2006.

Quelles ont été les principaux problèmes du projet, et comment ont-ils été résolus ?

L'agence d'exécution (DGRE) et les principaux partenaires ont mentionné deux problèmes principaux rencontrés dans la mise en œuvre du projet :

- La difficulté de transférer rapidement les fonds nécessaires à l'organisation des ateliers nationaux dans les pays du bassin de la Volta ; cette difficulté a été contournée par l'avance des fonds par le Ministère en charge de l'eau au Burkina Faso ; la flexibilité du Ministère a permis d'avancer les fonds et sans cette flexibilité les ateliers nationaux n'auraient probablement pas pu voir le jour dans les délais impartis ;
- Difficulté plus opérationnelle concernant la difficulté à organiser une véritable concertation au niveau de chaque pays puis au niveau régional pour discuter des textes fondateurs de l'ABV dans des délais très brefs ; cette difficulté a principalement été contournée par l'implication des points focaux nationaux au travers du CTBV. La DGRE et le Ministère en charge de l'eau au Burkina Faso ont clairement joué un rôle moteur pour catalyser les énergies et résoudre les difficultés techniques – ce qui représente un achèvement remarquable compte tenu de la faiblesse du budget disponible et du fait que les ressources humaines mobilisées pour mettre en œuvre le projet provenaient essentiellement des équipes existantes de la DGRE, appuyées sur des aspects précis par des consultants régionaux et internationaux.

Quels sont les principaux résultats ?

Le projet a atteint l'ensemble des résultats escomptés (voir tableau 2), à commencer par le plus important : la création et la mise en place effective de l'ABV, deux ans seulement après la première manifestation de la volonté politique de créer une telle Autorité.

Comment le projet a-t-il contribué à chacun des 4 domaines – substantiellement, significativement, modérément, peu ou pas du tout ?

- **Renforcement de la gestion de l'eau** : Substantiellement en ce qui concerne la GREC et le fait qu'aucun organisme de bassin n'existait avant 2006 pour mettre en œuvre une gestion partagée impliquant les 6 pays riverains ;
- **Investissements pour les besoins en eau** : Peu. Il s'agit là d'un objectif de l'ABV en tant que tel, qui a vocation dans les années à venir à être le maître d'ouvrage de projets d'investissement significatifs à l'échelle du bassin ; mais cette dimension n'était pas vraiment prioritaire dans le cadre du projet financé par la FAE ;
- **Renforcement de la base financière** : Significativement. L'existence même de l'ABV a permis de mobiliser des financements nouveaux à l'échelle du bassin, y compris les financements complémentaires (France, CEDEAO, CE) qui ont permis la mise en place rapide de l'ABV et de ses premières activités en 2007 ;
- **Amélioration des connaissances sur l'eau** : Modérément. L'existence de l'ABV s'est construite sur un diagnostic fin du bassin de la Volta conduit en 2003-2007 sur financement du PNUE. Le projet financé par la FAE n'a pas amélioré ces données en tant que telles, mais a amélioré la connaissance des acteurs.

Comment le projet a-t-il contribué à chacun des thèmes transversaux de la FAE – substantiellement, significativement, modérément, peu ou pas du tout ?

- **Renforcement des capacités** : Significativement. La création de l'ABV a été un processus « d'auto-formation » pour l'acteur central (la DGRE du Ministère en charge de l'eau au Burkina Faso). Ce renforcement des capacités s'est également fait au travers du recours à des consultants régionaux et aux réunions régionales qui ont permis à certains pays (Togo, Ghana) à se familiariser avec la GREC ;
- **Genre** : Modérément. Le genre a été une préoccupation des acteurs du projet à l'occasion des phases de concertation au niveau national et au niveau régional, mais ces acteurs s'accordent pour dire que ce n'était pas une dimension fondamentale ;
- **Réduction de la pauvreté** : Modérément, car l'effet de la création de l'ABV en tant que tel n'aura qu'un effet indirect sur la réduction de la pauvreté, au travers de la possibilité offerte aux usagers du bassin de mobiliser davantage de ressources en eau pour la production agricole (entre autres utilisations) ;
- **Durabilité environnementale** : Substantiellement, dans la mesure où l'ABV est amenée à jouer un rôle fort dans la préservation des équilibres naturels dans le bassin de la Volta, y compris une gestion raisonnée des ressources en eau transfrontalières dans un cadre partenarial complètement nouveau pour les 6 pays concernés ;
- **Bonne gouvernance** : Substantiellement, car c'est l'objectif même de l'ABV de mettre en place une bonne gouvernance de l'eau à l'échelle du bassin, par le biais d'une institution transparente et ouverte à la concertation (même si le Forum des parties prévu dans le design de l'ABV tarde pour le moment à se concrétiser).

2.4. Exploitation et utilisation des ouvrages, produits et systèmes créés

Niveau d'exploitation et d'utilisation par rapport aux objectifs du projet ?

Le Burkina Faso a été très impliqué dans le projet et continue à jouer un rôle clé. L'ABV est créée mais dans une large mesure elle est toujours en construction et fonctionne avec une équipe minimum fournie essentiellement par les projets hébergés (situation en janvier 2010).

L'ABV est maintenant reconnue et dispose d'un plan stratégique. Un seul pays n'a pas encore ratifié la convention, l'accord de siège va être signé. L'ABV a le potentiel pour assurer la maîtrise d'ouvrage de gros projets à l'échelle des six pays. En ce qui concerne la contribution financière en 2009 seuls le Burkina Faso et le Mali s'en sont acquittés, les autres se sont engagés à payer leurs arriérés mais en janvier 2010 la situation financière de l'ABV n'avait pas concrètement trouvé de solution.

Des initiatives sont maintenant prises entre les 6 pays, par exemple l'actualisation de l'analyse transfrontalière, le projet de charte de l'eau et tous les projets qui sont en ce moment dans les cartons de l'ABV. Un effet bénéfique de la création de l'ABV est indéniablement l'engouement des partenaires autour des projets prioritaires. L'ABV est désormais crédible, le dernier conseil a autorisé le recrutement du personnel, il faut maintenant injecter progressivement plus de substance.

Que pourrait-il être fait pour améliorer la situation ?

La convention de l'ABV est de bonne qualité de même que son cadre institutionnel de manière générale mais il y a encore beaucoup de choses à mettre en œuvre pour sécuriser son fonctionnement sur le plan financier, pour étoffer et pérenniser son personnel et enfin pour mettre en œuvre le plan stratégique à 5 ans. Au début de l'année 2010 le fonctionnement de l'ABV continue de présenter un caractère transitoire. Certains organes restent à mettre en place, et notamment le Forum des parties qui devrait permettre une meilleure implication de la société civile dans la gestion des affaires du bassin.

Suivi et évaluation du projet

Quel système de suivi évaluation a été utilisé ?

Compte tenu de la modicité du financement prévu dans la convention et la rapidité de son exécution, aucun système de suivi-évaluation en tant que tel n'a vraiment été mis en place. La DGRE s'est chargée elle-même du suivi des indicateurs. Le suivi financier rigoureux exercé par la DGRE et le Ministère dans le cadre de la convention de mandat a permis d'identifier rapidement le reliquat disponible à la mi-2006, ce qui a déclenché une réaction rapide et pertinente : rédaction de termes de référence complémentaires qui ont été soumis à la FAE pour l'utilisation de ce reliquat avant la fin de l'année 2006.

De quelle manière la situation initiale a-t-elle été documentée pour comparer les situations avant et après projet ?

Compte tenu de la nature du projet, la situation initiale était clairement identifiée : il n'existait pas d'autorité de bassin. La situation initiale a donc été établie directement par le Comité Technique du Bassin de la Volta (CTBV) qui en a déduit les résultats à atteindre pour mettre en place l'Autorité, analyse qui a servi de base au montage de la demande de financement.

Effets immédiats et à moyen terme du financement de la FAE

Le projet FAE, en permettant la mise en place rapide de l'ABV, a déclenché de nombreux financements dont certains étaient déjà en cours de négociation par le CTBV : la coopération française via le FFEM, le Danemark, la CEDEAO (Unité de Coordination des Ressources en Eau), la Commission Européenne (Facilité Européenne de l'Eau). Un projet Volta HYCOS a également vu le jour et a été soumis au financement de la FAE pour instruction. En ce qui concerne la mobilisation des ressources spécifiques pour assurer le fonctionnement de l'ABV et de ses principaux organes, le premier rapport d'étape (septembre 2006-septembre 2007) estime les financements mobilisés immédiatement à 230 000 Euros, ce qui représente plus du double de la subvention accordée en 2006 par la FAE.

Le financement de la FAE est arrivé au moment idéal dans le processus. Cet argent a été rapidement mobilisé, les dépenses (ateliers, réunions, etc.) n'étaient pas forcément éligibles aux procédures de la plupart des bailleurs de fonds. La valeur ajoutée a donc été considérable et de l'aveu même de tous les protagonistes, l'ABV (et son portefeuille de projets actuel) n'existerait pas sans le projet financé par la FAE.

Evaluation du rôle de la FAE dans le projet

Le rôle de la FAE a été évalué comme très positif par l'ensemble des partenaires et notamment de la principale structure chargée de l'exécution du projet, la DGRE :

- La procédure d'instruction a été remarquablement rapide : premier contact entre le CTBV et la FAE (fin 2005), la mission d'évaluation (mars 2006), l'approbation du don (avril 2006), l'effectivité du financement (20 avril 2006) et enfin le déblocage de la première tranche (30 avril 2006) qui a permis le lancement immédiat des activités ;
- A cet égard, le caractère symbolique de ce premier projet (le Directeur de la Facilité a fait lui-même le déplacement pour la signature de la convention à Ouagadougou) a donné à son instruction un caractère exemplaire qui ne le rend pas représentatif de l'ensemble des projets en ce qui concerne la rapidité de mise en place ;
- La Facilité a également fait preuve d'une réactivité qualifiée de « très bonne » lors du suivi de l'exécution, le meilleur exemple étant la négociation au sujet de l'utilisation du reliquat, à l'occasion de la demande présentée à la FAE par le Ministère en charge de l'eau. La réponse rapide de la FAE a permis de d'approuver cette demande de réaffectation et a contribué au dépassement des résultats fixés ;
- Avec le recul, plusieurs acteurs ont exprimé à l'occasion de la réunion de restitution le regret que le financement de la FAE n'ait pas été plus ambitieux, permettant à l'ABV de disposer de ressources lui permettant de transformer très rapidement en activités et en opportunités l'enthousiasme qui a prévalu lors de sa création en 2007.

Annexes

Personnes rencontrées ou interviewées

Nom et fonction	Organisation	Contact (e-mail)
Francis Bougaïré, ingénieur principal E&A	FAE	f.bougair@afdb.org
Charles A. Biney, Directeur Exécutif a.i.	ABV	c.biney@abv-volta.org
Yao Samuel Atikpo Directeur Exécutif Adjoint a.i.	ABV	Non disponible
Marc Tonde, Chef de Service Administratif et Financier	DGRE	Non disponible
Eléonore Delemlilga, Chef de Service Législation	DGRE	Non disponible
Ousseini Thanou, Directeur	DGRE	ous.tha@gmail.com
Innocent Ouedraogo, Coordinateur a.i.	UCRE	ino@ecowas.int
Mahamane Touré, Chargé des programmes régionaux	UCRE	hama@ecowas.int
Florence Ardorino, Assistante Technique	UCRE	f.ardorino@ecowas.int
Ousmane S. Diallo, Coordinateur Régional	UICN	ousmane.diallo@uicn.org
Kwame Odame-Ababio, Coordonnateur PAGEV	UICN	kwame.odame-ababio@uicn.org
Jean-Marc Garreau, Coordinateur du Programme Régional	UICN	jean-marc.garreau@uicn.org
Aimé J. Nianogo, Directeur Régional	UICN	aimé.nianogo@uicn.org
Dam Mogbante, Coordinateur régional Afrique de l'Ouest	GWP	dam.mogbante@gwpao.org
Peter Jorgensen, Conseiller de coopération	Danemark	petjor@um.dk
Albert Compaoré, Chargé de programme national	Suède	albert.compaore@sida.se
Göran Björkdahl, Conseiller régional (environnement)	Suède	goran.bjorkdahl@sida.se
Christophe Barat, Chargé de mission	AFD	baratc@afd.fr
Mathieu Badolo, Chargé de programmes E&A	UE	mathieu.badolo@ec.europa.eu
Jean Bosco Bazié, Coordinateur régional	Eau Vive	jbbazie@eau-vive.org
SEM Chief Dauda Mandiaya Bawumia, Ambassadeur	Ghana	Non disponible
Alfred Gogu A. Saame, Chef de la Chancellerie	Ghana	saame176@hotmail.com
Alain Hussard, Conseiller Technique auprès du DE	ABV	a.hussard@abv-volta.org
Kouassi Kouamé, Directeur des études	2IE	kouassi.kouame@2ie-edu.org
Amadou Hama Maïga, Directeur Général Adjoint	2IE	amadou.hama.maiga@2ie-edu.org
Bertrand Ficini, Conseiller du Directeur Général	2IE	bertrand.ficini@2ie-edu.org

Documents consultés

- Autorité du Bassin de la Volta, Forum des parties prenantes au développement du bassin, phase 1 – Identification des acteurs membres du Forum des parties prenantes au développement du Bassin de la Volta et renforcement de leur participation – Note de cadrage – Juillet 2006

- Comité Technique du Bassin de la Volta – Projet d'Appui à la création de l'Autorité du Bassin de la Volta – Rapport final – Mai 2007
- Banque Africaine de Développement – Appui à la création de l'Autorité du Bassin de la Volta – Rapport d'évaluation – Version du 14 mars 2006
- Accord de don entre la BAD/FAE et le Ministère de l'Agriculture, de l'Hydraulique et des Ressources Halieutiques du Burkina Faso, avril 2006
- Volta Basin Technical Committee – Activity Report – July 2006
- Comité Technique du Bassin de la Volta – Convention de mandat entre les futurs pays membres de l'ABV donnant mandat au Ministre chargé de l'eau au Burkina Faso
- Convention portant Statut du fleuve Volta et création de l'Autorité du Bassin de la Volta (ABV) signée par les Chef d'Etat à Ouagadougou le 19 janvier 2007
- ABV – Plan stratégique de l'Autorité du Bassin de la Volta – Novembre 2009
- ABV – Rapport d'étape Septembre 2006 – Septembre 2007
- ABV – Rapport d'activités Novembre 2007 – Septembre 2008
- ABV – Rapport d'activités Décembre 2008 – Novembre 2009
- ABV – Compte-rendu de la 4^{ème} réunion du Comité des Experts, préparatoire de la 3^{ème} réunion du Conseil des Ministres de l'ABV – décembre 2009

Project assessment guide

This memo deals with how the consultant is planning to organize project visits, what kind of approach we are going to adopt, which tools we are going to use to collect data, assess the project performance and report the visit to the AWF team.

1. Overview of the approach

It is important that the results and emerging lessons from AWF projects are assessed and documented for wider dissemination. The available time allocated for the project assessments is relatively short, so it is important that the project assessment approach is clear, streamlined and achievable within the time available. The suggested project assessment approach is outlined below.

1.1. General preparation phase

1. Develop and agree a project assessment methodology, including assessment formats and liaise with AWF about any suggested changes.
2. Circulate a summary of the proposed project assessment approach and the proposed assessment formats to task managers, AfDB field Offices in concerned countries and in-country project partners, so that there is a clear understanding of both the proposed project assessment process and the information requirements for the assessments.

This memorandum is produced at the end of the general preparation phase and its main aim is to inform AWF on the proposed methodology for project visits.

1.2. Project assessment phase

1. Review project documentation prior to the project visit, including the quality of the project design in the logical framework and documents related to the screening, preparation, appraisal and submission for approval phase.
2. Review any base line data collected at the start of the project, in order to compare with the project outcomes.
3. Initial field consultations - review documentation held by the lead project partners and consult key partners, including beneficiaries, about how the project was implemented, including how constraints were dealt with and project achievements.
4. Undertake a project 'output' to 'purpose' or 'outcome' review, together with project partners, with reference to the latest version of the project logical framework. The purpose of this exercise is to determine to what extent the project outcomes have been achieved, or the likelihood that outputs/outcomes will be achieved. Refer to section 3 of this note which outlines the proposed approach and scoring for the output to purpose or outcome review. This exercise will be carried out by the consultants who will consult lead partners, the Project Management Unit, the recipient and the beneficiaries, who are available.
5. Compare project outputs/outcomes to date with the latest AWF areas of intervention and project criteria, such as the leverage or catalytic effect, addressing cross cutting issues etc.

6. Assess perceptions of project partners about the strengths and areas for improvement of the Africa Water Facility, covering aspects such as: AWF project criteria and process for applications, screening, preparation, appraisal and approval, supervision and completion, as well as the support received during project development and implementation.
7. Draft a concise project assessment report for each project reviewed and circulate it to the project lead partners, recipient and beneficiaries for comment. The format of the reports is likely follow the structure shown by the headings in section 2 of this note.
8. Review the project assessment reports for all projects to determine common trends, strengths, weaknesses and differences that will inform the overall AWF operational review and institutional assessment.

2. Key questions

2.1. Introduction

The proposed project assessment methodology for the review of the selected AWF projects is set out in the consultant's preliminary report (November 2009). This guide for the assessment of the projects in the 8 countries to be visited is based on what is proposed in the preliminary report and is structured using a broad project cycle framework:

- Project design, appraisal and approval
- Project implementation
- Operation and use of facilities, outputs and systems created
- Project monitoring and evaluation
- Next steps, emerging projects and the leverage effect

Under each of these headings the broad issues to explore with a variety of project partners and stakeholders are set out below. Where appropriate, cross cutting issues will be considered in relation to each phase of the above mentioned broad project cycle. Some questions on specific issues where a rating is requested on a scale of 1 to 4 are also included, as a means of doing a comparative analysis between the projects assessed. These issues need to be explored with a variety of project stakeholders that are going to be met in the countries.

An "output to outcome review" is also proposed as a means of assessing the extent to which the project outputs/outcomes have been achieved, or the likelihood that outputs/outcomes will be achieved. Refer to the separate format for the output to outcome review.

Note that the expected primary respondents for each section of the proposed assessment are highlighted in italics below each heading below.

2.2. Project design, appraisal and approval

Expected primary respondents: lead project partner staff in the project executing agency.

- a) Were there any problems experienced during the process of AWF project application (incl. adequacy and accessibility of information and instructions for applicants prior to submission), screening, preparation, appraisal and approval, and what were those problems?
- b) How would you rate the support provided by AWF during in the project development, appraisal and approval process – *very good, good, adequate or inadequate?*

- c) What are the strengths, weaknesses and areas for improvement for the AWF during the process of AWF project development, application, screening, preparation, appraisal and approval?
- d) What is the latest version of the project logical framework and how could it have been improved, particularly in the light of experience during implementation?

2.3. Project implementation

Expected primary respondents: project executing agency staff and other key project partners.

- a) What is the latest progress on the project, what has been completed and what remains to be done?
- b) What are the main reasons for any delays?
- c) Was the project implemented according to the agreed project logframe and project agreement, if not what variations were introduced and why?
- d) What were the main project constraints and how were they dealt with?
- e) What are the main project achievements, including aspects that may not have been including in the original project design or logical framework?
- f) How would you rate the support provided by AWF during project implementation – *very good, good, adequate or inadequate*?
- g) What are the strengths, weaknesses and potential areas for improvement for the AWF in terms of their support to project implementation, bearing in mind the project budget?

For questions h) to k) it is recognised that the project executing agency may not have much to say on these issues for some projects, although it would be useful to obtain their views where possible. Where there are gaps the relevant AWF staff who support the projects will be consulted.

- h) What are the project achievements and potential areas for improvement for each of the AWF main areas of intervention?
 - Strengthening water governance;
 - Investments to meet water needs;
 - Strengthening the financial base;
 - Improving water knowledge
- i) How has the project contributed to each of the main AWF areas of intervention (i) to (iv) – *substantial, significant, moderate, minimal or none*?
- j) To what extent (*using a rating system of substantial, significant, moderate, minimal or none*) have the AWF cross-cutting issues been addressed by the project, for each of the following:
 - Capacity building at local, national, basin and regional level;
 - Gender mainstreaming including policies and methodologies to mainstream practices that promote equality between men and women;
 - Poverty reduction;
 - Environmental sustainability;
 - Good governance.

- k) What are the main reasons for the ratings for each cross-cutting issue?

2.4. Operation and use of facilities, outputs and systems created

Expected primary respondents: lead project partner staff and other key project partners, plus users of project facilities/outputs/systems.

- a) To what extent are the facilities, systems, outputs, practices or capacities created by the project, being used and maintained, in comparison to the project design?
- b) What could be done to improve the use, operation and maintenance of the facilities, systems, outputs, practices or capacities created?

2.5. Project monitoring, supervision and evaluation,

Expected primary respondents: lead project partner and other key project partners, plus users of project facilities/outputs/systems

- a) What project monitoring and reporting has been done and how could it have been improved?
- b) How was project monitoring information used to inform changes in the project design and implementation?
- c) What base line data was collected or what situation analysis was prepared at the start of the project that can be used to compare the 'before' and 'after' project situation?
- d) Has there been any project evaluation that compares the 'before project and 'after project situation' and what are the key findings?
- e) What are the main conclusions and ratings from the 'output to outcome review'? (Refer to the separate format).and what are the lessons to be drawn from these ratings?
- f) How many AWF supervision mission have been organized and was there enough missions?
- g) Were the AWF supervision missions pertinent and useful for the Project achievements?
- h) Was a project completion report prepared by the Project Executing Agency and how long after the project completion date?
- i) Were there any budget savings? Which decision was taken (reimbursement to the AWF or additional activities?

2.6. Next steps, emerging follow on projects and the leverage effect

Expected primary respondents: lead project partner and other key project partners.

- a) What are the proposed new projects or concepts that are emerging from this project? Please provide brief descriptions.
- b) What are the indicative costs of those new project proposals?
- c) Are there potential funders for such emerging projects, who are they and what stage have discussions or project developments reached in each case?
- d) Where new project proposals are being considered by potential funders, what is the likelihood that these projects will be implemented – *very likely, likely, uncertain or remote possibility?*

3. Main tool: the output to purpose review

The proposed scoring system and approach for the AWF project outcome to output review is a simplified version of the DFID output to purpose review approach. In addition to a structured project assessment it includes a scoring system to indicate the likelihood of achievements of both the project outcomes and the project outputs. The approach is explained in the following tables:

- Tables A1 and A2 are the proposed output to outcome review formats based on the latest logical framework, including a structured project assessment and scoring.
- Table B is the proposed project rating scoring system to be used to complete Table A.
- Tables C and D are example summaries of project scoring for a number of projects that could be used or adapted for the AWF projects assessed.

3.1. Table A1. Output to outcome project scoring assessment (outcome level)

Goal statement:			
Outcome 1 statement			
Outcome 1 OVs	Progress	Comments	Rating score (see table B)
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
Outcome 1 average score and justification			
Outcome 2 OVs	Progress	Comments	Rating score (see table B)
1.			
2.			
3.			

4.			
Outcome 2 average score and justification			

3.2. Table A2. Output to outcome project scoring assessment (output level)

Output	Indicator (OVI)	Progress and likelihood of being achieved	Rating score
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			

Output	Indicator (OVI)	Progress and likelihood of being achieved	Rating score
Total average output score and justification			
Outcome attribution To what extent can the achievement of the outcomes be attributed to the delivery of the project outputs?			

The scores from Tables A1 and A2 can be summarised with the scores from other projects, as shown in Tables C and D.

3.3. Table B. Project rating scale for likelihood of project objectives being achieved

Rating number	Criteria for rating
1	Likely to be completely achieved. The outputs/ purpose are well on the way to completion (or are completed).
2	Likely to be largely achieved. There is good progress towards purpose completion and most outputs are likely to be achieved, particularly the most important ones.
3	Likely to be partly achieved. Only partial achievement of the purpose is likely and/or achievement of some outputs.
4	Only likely to be achieved to a very limited extent . Purpose unlikely to be achieved but a few outputs likely to be achieved.
5	Unlikely to be achieved. No progress on outputs or purpose.
X	X. = It is difficult to say whether there has been any progress towards the final achievement of outputs or outcomes. This score should not be used if at all possible.

The rating system in Table B can be used to assess outcomes and outputs using formats A1 and A2. Table C and D below are examples of how the level of achievement of a number of projects can be collated and summarised.

3.4. Table C. Example 1 summary of project scoring for a number of projects

Project title	Project outcome score	Project output average score

3.5. Table D. Example 2 summary of project scoring for a number of projects

Purpose rating	Number of projects	%	Output rating	Number of projects	%
1	3	7	1	4	8
2	20	49	2	21	50
3	14	34	3	15	36
4	1	2	4	0	0
5	2	4	5	2	4
X	2	4	X	0	0
Total	42	4		42	100

4. Selection of projects to be visited

The selection process included consultations with senior AWF staff and with participants at the GC meeting held in Nouakchott. The project selection process considered a review of AWF projects against the agreed criteria and used purposeful sampling techniques since the sample size is too small for random or any of the other statistically correct techniques of sampling. The criteria taken into account were the following ones:

- The project size (amount of the grant disbursed by the Facility)
- The geographical coverage (country alone or multi country project)
- Level of completion (only completed or nearly completed projects)
- The geographical diversity in terms of AMCOW regions
- The diversity in terms of types of projects (TWRM, NRWM, WSS, etc.)

Table below contains the 8 selected projects. The objective was to select 8 projects while keeping a reasonable balance between the 5 criteria listed above. The final list of countries to be visited is therefore slightly different from the list that was included in the ToRs.

5. Preparation of country visits

The visits will be conducted by the consultant alone, who will use the output to purpose approach described above. The average duration of a project visit will be 5 days, which is considered as enough to meet all key informants and visit a sample of facilities if need be.

5.1. Inputs

The AWF team will provide the consultant with the electronic versions of all the documents related to the selected projects: appraisal report, quarterly progress reports, audit reports, BTO reports of the project managers and/or the consultants hired by the AWF. Where there are existing, Bank Field Offices, they should be consulted.

The AWF team will also give to the consultant a list of key informants to be provided by the task manager. The number of primary respondents needs to be kept within reasonable range (we suggest an average of 10 interviews per visit). Prior to the visit, given the schedule proposed by the consultant, the AWF secretariat will send official letters to announce the visit of the consultant's expert and mark the more important meetings.

5.2. Outputs

Within less than a week after the project visit, the consultant will send a short report to the AWF, including a brief description of the work carried out (persons met, meetings held, facilities visited, etc.). The two main scoring tables (purpose level and output level will be annexed to the document). The draft visit report will be sent to a few persons within the Facility (management, task manager) for commenting. All relevant comments will be integrated into the final version of the project visit report, and all the visit reports will be annexed to the efficiency assessment report.

Final list of surveyed projects

Country	Project name	Grant amount	Category	AMCOW Sub Region	Status	Type of project
Burkina Faso	Support to the creation of the Volta Basin Authority	165 000	Multinational	West	Completed	IWRM Capacity building River basin Authority
Congo Brazzaville	Support to a water supply and sanitation policy and priority investments preparation in Brazzaville and Pointe Noire	1 418 235	Single country	Central	Under Implementation	WSS urban areas project preparation
Ethiopia	Support to the Development of Water Information and Knowledge Management Systems in Ethiopia	500 000	Single country	East	Under Implementation	IWRM Knowledge management
Kenya	Lake Victoria Basin commission Water & Sanitation Initiative	994 000	Multinational	East	Under Implementation	WSS urban areas project preparation
Mozambique	Preparation of the National Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Programme	486 233	Single country	South	Completed	WSS rural areas project preparation
Niger	Support to the Niger-HYCOS Project (information system for the monitoring of water resources in the Niger basin)	1 200 000	Multinational	West	Under Implementation	TWRM Knowledge management
Tunis	Geo-Aquifer: North-Western Sahara Aquifer System water resources management improvement using satellite imagery	487 800	Multinational	North	Under Implementation	TWRM Knowledge management
Uganda	Implementation of an Integrated Project of Water Supply and Sanitation Services for the Urban Poor - Kampala	800 000	Single country	East	Under Implementation	WSS urban areas pilot project

Source: AWF portfolio and data collected by the consultant. If it is a multinational project, the AMCOW sub region is determined as the sub region to which belongs the country where the headquarters of the project implementing agency are located.