

# PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS (PCR)



AFRICAN  
DEVELOPMENT  
BANK GROUP

## I BASIC DATA

### A Report data

<b>Report date</b>	Date of report:	5 <sup>th</sup> of July 2013	
	Mission date ( <i>if field mission</i> )	From: 26 <sup>th</sup> May 2013	To: 31 <sup>st</sup> May 2013

### B Responsible Bank staff

Positions	At approval	At completion
<b>Regional Director</b>	E. GOLDSTEIN	F.J.M. PERRAULT
<b>Country Manager</b>	n. a.	Margate KILO
<b>Sector Director</b>	K. BEDOUMRA	M. EL AZIZI
<b>Sector Manager</b>	A. BEILEH	Akissa BAHRI
<b>Task Manager</b>	Yvan KEDAJ	Franz HÖLLHUBER
<b>Alternate Task Manager</b>	Peter AKARI	Peter AKARI
<b>PCR Team Leader</b>		<b>Mr CHAABOUNI (STUDI International)</b>
<b>PCR Team Members</b>		<b>Mr PICON (OIEAU)</b>

### C Project data

<b>Project name: MONROVIA EXPANSION AND REHABILITATION OF THREE COUNTY CAPITALS WATER SUPPLY AND SANITATION PROJECT</b>		
<b>Project code:</b> P-LR-E00-001	<b>Instrument number(s):</b> 5600155001101	
<b>Project type:</b> Study	<b>Sector:</b> Water and Sanitation	
<b>Country:</b> Liberia	<b>Environmental categorization (1-3):</b> 3	
<b>Processing milestones – Bank approved financing only (add/delete rows depending on the number of financing sources)</b>	<b>Key Events (Bank approved financing only)</b>	<b>Disbursement and closing dates (Bank approved financing only)</b>
<b>Financing source/ instrument1:</b> AWFTRANCHES	<b>Financing source/ instrument1:</b> AWFTRANCHES	<b>Financing source/ instrument1:</b> AWFTRANCHES
Date approved: <b>17 Jan 2008</b>	Cancelled amounts: <b>31,962.32 €</b>	Original disbursement deadline: <b>30 Jun 2009</b>
Date signed: <b>11 Mar 2008</b>	Supplementary financing: 0	Original closing date: <b>31 Dec 2009</b>
Date of entry into force: <b>25/08/08</b>	Restructuring ( <i>specify date &amp; amount involved</i> ): /	Revised ( <i>if applicable</i> ) disbursement deadline: <b>20/12/10</b>
Date effective for 1st disbursement: /	Extensions ( <i>specify dates</i> ): <b>from 17/05/09 to 30/06/11</b>	Revised ( <i>if applicable</i> ) closing date: <b>30/06/11</b>
Date of actual 1st disbursement: <b>04/11 08</b>		

Financing source/instrument (add/delete rows depending on the number of financing sources):	Committed amount (Euro):	Percentage committed (%):	Uncommitted amount (Euro):	Percentage uncommitted (%):
Financing source/ instrument1:	<b>1,403,096.55</b>	<b>97,7 %</b>	<b>31,962.32</b>	<b>2,23 %</b>
Financing source/ instrument2:				
Government:				
Other (eg. co-financiers). <i>Add rows as needed.</i>				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,403,096.55</b>	<b>97,7 %</b>	<b>31,962.32</b>	<b>2,23 %</b>
Co-financiers and other external partners:				
Executing and implementing agency (ies): <b>Liberia Water &amp; Sewer Corporation</b>				

## D Management review and comments

Report reviewed by	Name	Date reviewed	Comments
Senior Water and sanitation Specialist AWF	Maureen NTEGE-WASSWA	30/09/2013	Various comments
Senior Water and sanitation Specialist, OWAS	Rees MWASAMBILI	30/09/2013	Various comments
Principal water and sanitation Eng. AWF	Franz HOLLHUBER	04/10/2013	Several comments and revision of the draft report
Coordinator, AWF	Akiça BAHRI	14/11/2013	Minor comments
Director, EARC	F.J.M. PERRAULT	20/01/2014	No comments
Director, OWAS/AWF	M. EL AZIZI	05/03/2014	No comments

## II Project performance assessment

### A Relevance

#### 1. Relevance of project development objective

Rating*	Narrative assessment (max 250 words)
3	<p>The purpose of the Monrovia expansion and rehabilitation of three county capitals water supply and sanitation project was to a) study economically, technically, environmentally and socially viable water supply and sanitation systems to meet 2025 demands in Monrovia and three county capitals of Kakata, Zwedru and Buchanan, b) develop water sources, abstraction, water conveyance and transmission, water treatment facilities, water distribution network, and sanitation facilities in Metropolitan Monrovia, Kakata, Zwedru and Buchanan as well as efficient water metering and billing systems utilizing appropriate, affordable and least cost technology, and c) mobilize adequate resources for LWSC to implement the expansion and rehabilitation of the WSS systems. The project will contribute towards alleviation of poverty in the study areas through the provision of clean and affordable and sustainable water and sanitation services and also supports in promoting more efficient use of available WSS services. The project was consistent with the country's MDGs Action Plan for water and sanitation, the Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy (IPRS) and in line with the Government policy of rehabilitating infrastructure and utilities for urban dwellers in Liberia on priority basis.</p> <p>The project was also in line with the Bank's operational focus area of providing support for improved environment for sustainable potable water and sanitation facilities.</p> <p>However, the project outcomes were not well defined in the logical framework (no target for the resources mobilized whereas it is the main outcome) and the impact targets were unachievable.</p>

\* For all ratings in the PCR use the following scale: 4 (Highly satisfactory), 3 (Satisfactory), 2 (Unsatisfactory), 1 (Highly unsatisfactory)

#### 2. Relevance of project design

Rating*	Narrative assessment (max 250 words)
2	<p>The project was well organised in 3 different stages linked in a logical manner. However, the content of the project and work to be implemented by the consultant seem to be very considerable compared to the project timeframe. The first stage which is the feasibility study includes many different activities that could be individual projects by themselves, like the definition of design criteria for the water sector. As a consequence, the consultant had difficulties to achieve all the targets on time.</p> <p>A Project Management Team (PMT) including a project manager, a water and sanitation expert and an accountant has been hired to follow up the project. The project manager has been changed in October 2009 because he was not giving satisfaction, the following one left because of sickness and a third one took over the project end of 2010.</p> <p>A Project Steering Committee PSC has been created to follow up the project. The Steering Committee was chaired by the Minister of Public Works or his representative and consists of representatives of the Ministers of Lands, Mines and Energy, Finance, Managing Director of LWSC, Member of Engineering Society, a local NGO, a representative from the private sector and is hosted by the LWSC/PT, serving as a secretariat. However, we can regret that the PSC never met during the study and did not play the supervising role it was supposed to. It was attributed to lack of a Quorum and a misunderstanding of the composition of the new PMT.</p> <p>Training was part of the project but it was too small given the lack of capacity identified at the appraisal stage. The stakeholders were involved through workshops presenting the project findings and results.</p>

### 3. Lessons learned related to relevance

Key issues (max 5, add rows as needed)	Lessons learned	Target audience
1. Outcomes definition	1. The outcomes were not well defined in the logical framework and no specific indicator was quantified related to the mobilization of financial resources which is the main project outcome. This is essential to assess the project effectiveness. The target of 100% was perhaps unrealistic (given the other needs in the country). During implementation it was considered sufficient to obtain funding for the immediate investment programme.	1. Bank and Borrower
2. Scope and timeframe of the project	2. The scope of the work to be done by the consultant was large given the project timeframe. One year should have been enough for the feasibility study, while up to two years might have been required to include the design criteria..	2. Borrower
3. Training	3. Training should have had a greater part in the project, given the lack of capacity identified at the appraisal stage of the institutions and the executing agency LWSC. Recommended trainings include project management, monitoring and evaluation, planning and development.	3. Bank and Borrower
4. Logistics for the PMT	4. Transportation became an issue after the appointment of a new full time Project Coordinator. The car bought from contingencies and savings came too late to serve most of the supervision	4. Bank and Borrower

## B Effectiveness

### 1. Progress towards the project's development objective (project purpose)

Comments
<p><i>Provide a brief description of the Project (components) and the context in which it was designed and implemented. State the project development objective (usually the project purpose as set out in the RLF) and assess progress. Unanticipated outcomes should also be accounted for, as well as specific reference of gender equality in the project. The consistency of the assumptions that link the different levels of the results chain in the RLF should also be considered. Indicative max length: 400 words.</i></p>
<p>The project objective is to prepare economically and technically sound priority project for the Monrovia and three County Capitals, namely Kakata, Zwedru and Buchanan. It aims also to build the immediate capacity of the LWSC to ensure sustainability of the provided facilities and assist the Government in its effort to mobilize adequate resources to cover the funding requirements for the</p>

priority investments identified. The study conducted by an international consultant is the main activity of the project. It has been implemented through 3 different stages:

- Stage 1: Feasibility study
- Stage 2: Detail design, engineering report and bid documents
- Stage 3: Donor's conference and training

- Stage 1: The consultant NCL started in January 2009 and submitted the draft feasibility study in June 2009. A stakeholder awareness workshop was organized on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2009 to inform them on the project and the findings of the feasibility study. The report was reviewed by the Task manager of the bank during his mission in July 2009. The requested improvements and modifications on the feasibility study included the provision of decision making maps showing current networks and population mapping, provision of lots of decision making scenarios to be validated by LWSC and the Steering Committee, Documentation for primary costing, development of long term scenarios to 2030 and a new schedule for report submission was also proposed. The consultant accepted the no cost extension and explained the difficulties he experienced during stage 1. In the meantime, the project manager at LWSC was fired in October 2009 because his work was not judged satisfactory. On the 7<sup>th</sup> of April 2010, the contract was extended by 9 months to 31<sup>st</sup> of May 2010. The revised feasibility study report was submitted in April 2010, following a stakeholder's review workshop that was organised on 18-19 January 2010.
- Stage 2: The Draft tender documents were submitted in July 2010, received in August 2010 by the Bank who provided comments in September 2010. A new contract extension has been agreed, up to December 2010. The final tender documents and engineering drawings were submitted in January 2011 and final technical design report in March 2011. A third contract extension has been agreed, up to June 2011. While the scope of the feasibility was in line with the ToR, both the groundwater assessment and the hydraulic modelling were not found satisfactory during later stages of implementation. Non-availability of drilling equipment and qualified staff appear to have been important reasons for the associated delays.
- Stage 3: Training have been organised by the consultant for 3 staff of MLME and 3 staff of LWSC between the 25<sup>th</sup> of January and 18<sup>th</sup> of February 2010. The donor's conference did not happen because the Government of Liberia, led by the Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs preferred to have a multi-sector donor's conference that will take place when they will be ready. As the funding of the AfDB funded investment project was already assured and the immediate needs covered, this was found acceptable by the AWF. It was agreed that the consultant should deliver concept paper and presentation for the Donor conference, which has been done.

## 2. Outcome reporting

Outcome indicators (as per RLF; add more rows as needed)	Baseline value (Year)	Most recent value (A)	End target (B) (expected value at project completion)	Progress towards target (% realized) (A/B)	Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 50 words per outcome)	Core Sector Indicator (Yes/No)
Outcome 1: % of resources mobilized/resources requirements	0% in 2007	20%	100 % (200 M\$)	20%	Total investment costs evaluation in the Feasibility study is 200 M\$. The Donor's conference was not organised because the Government preferred to organise a multi sector one. However, 40 M\$ were mobilized by the AfDB through the Urban Water Supply and Sanitation project.	yes
Outcome 2: Provide basis technical documentation for the water sector in Monrovia and 3 county capitals	Nothing done in 2007	Feasibility study, Detail design, Procurement documents done	Feasibility study, Detail design, Procurement documents done	100%	The project provided baseline documents for the water sector addressing many different issues (design criteria, water demand, LWSC analysis, environmental and social impact assessment, detail design and tender documents for 13 packages). The project deliverables will contribute to the development of new projects for the Water sector in Liberia.	yes
Rating* (see IPR methodology)	<b>Narrative assessment</b>					
2	One of the two outcomes of the project was reached and the other partially reached. Indeed, the donor's					

conference that was supposed to be organised at the end of the project to mobilize resources did not happen. However, 40 M\$ were mobilized by the AfDB through the Urban Water Supply and Sanitation project..

The project provided basis technical documentation for the development of the water sector in Liberia. The Feasibility study and the tender documents will serve as references for the implementation of future projects. The Urban Water Supply and Sanitation project implemented by the AfDB since 2010 is using the tender documents prepared in the framework of the project.

### 3. Output reporting

Output indicators (as specified in the RLF; add more rows as needed)	Most recent value (A)	End target (B) (expected value at project completion)	Progress towards target (% realized) (A/B)	Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 50 words per output)	Core Sector Indicator (Yes/No)
Output 1.1: Feasibility study report approved	100 %	100 %	100 %	The final Feasibility report was originally expected in January 2009. It was finally delivered in April 2010 after comments from the Bank and review during a stakeholder workshop (as detailed in section B.1).	Yes
Output 1.2: Number of workshops done to present and approve the Feasibility Study	2 workshops organised	2 workshops before the end of stage 1	100 %	A stakeholder awareness workshop was organized on 30 <sup>th</sup> June 2009. The second workshop for review and validation of the feasibility study was organised on 18-19 January 2010.  Unfortunately, the list of participants has not been recorded for both workshops and the Steering Committee was not involved.	yes
Output 2.1: Detail design and engineering report approved	100 %	100%	100%	The final detail design and engineering reports were originally expected in April 2009. The final detail design and engineering reports were submitted in March 2011 after several comments from the Bank mainly regarding missing legend on drawings, Inconsistencies in the units, missing electrical layouts and wrong figures used under the Finance component.	yes
Output 2.2: Tender documents and cost estimates approved	100 %	100%	100%	The final tender documents were originally expected in April 2009. The final tender documents were submitted in January 2011 after several comments from the Bank mainly regarding missing drawings, Inconsistencies in the units, formatting of many of the BoQs and Typographical errors in all documents.. Tender documents have been developed for 13 packages.	yes
Output 3.1: Donor's conference organised	No donor's conference organised	1 donor's conference organised	0 %	The donor's conference did not happen because the Government of Liberia, led by the Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs	yes

				preferred to have a multi-sector donor's conference that will take place when they will be ready. No donor conference has been organised yet.	
Output 3.2: Training implemented by the consultant	100%	100%	100%	Training has been organised by the consultant for 3 staff of MLME and 3 staff of LWSC between 25 <sup>th</sup> of January and 18 <sup>th</sup> of February 2010. The attendants were all engineers. The training concerned water and sanitation feasibility studies, detailed designs and elaborating tender documents	yes
Rating* (see IPR methodology)	<b>Narrative assessment</b>				
3	Over a total of 6 outputs, 5 have been reached and 1 not reached. The 5 outputs have been delivered quite late compared to the planned schedule. A lot of work has been done for the preparation of the feasibility study, detail design and tender documents. Those outputs are the core of the project. The donor's conference was not organised to conclude the project as it was planned. As the funding of the AfDB funded investment project was already assured and the immediate needs covered, this was found acceptable by the AWF. The median % of the implementation of the outputs is 80 %.				

#### 4. Development Objective (DO) rating<sup>1</sup>

<b>DO rating</b> (derived from updated IPR)*	<b>Narrative assessment</b> (indicative max length: 250 words)
2	The achievement of the project Development Objective is unsatisfactory. The donor's conference at the end of the project was not organised and the main outcome which was adequate resources mobilized for reliable and affordable WSS services to Monrovia and three county capitals population was not reached. However, the project provides a valuable outcome through the preparation of baseline documents for the water sector in Monrovia and the 3 county capitals. The Feasibility study addressed a number of important issues for the sector, such as design criteria, water demand, LWSC SWOT analyses, research of new water resources. Also, tender documents have been prepared for 13 infrastructure packages that will serve as basis for the development of future projects.

#### 5. Beneficiaries (add rows as needed)

Actual (A)	Planned (B)	Progress towards target (% realized) (A/B)	% of women	Category (eg. farmers, students)
Population of Monrovia and 3 county capital cities	Population of Monrovia and 3 county capital cities	100 %	50	All categories

#### 6. Unanticipated or additional outcomes (add rows as needed)

Description	Type (eg. gender, climate change, social, other)	Positive or negative	Impact on project (High, Medium, Low)
Implementation of a Sector Reform Study (which has been cancelled)	Country population	positive	Medium

<sup>1</sup> For operations using the old supervision report and rating system in SAP, the DO rating for the PCR shall be calculated using the IPR methodology.

during its implementation)			
Implementation of a Fostering Innovative Sanitation and Hygiene project for un-sewered urban poor	Un-sewered Urban poor Population	positive	Medium

## 7. Lessons learned related to effectiveness (add rows as needed)

Key issues (max 5, add rows as needed)	Lessons learned	Target audience
1. Mobilization at political level	1. The donor's conference was not organised because the Government want to hold a multi sector conference. Organising such conference for the sector could have been an example and beneficial for the other sectors. The implication at political level is essential when it gets to resource mobilization.	Government

## C Efficiency

### 1. Timeliness

Planned project duration – years (A) (as per PAR)	Actual implementation time – years (B) (from effectiveness for 1st disb.)	Ratio of planned and actual implementation time (A/B)	Rating*
16 month	42 month	0,38	1

#### Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 250 words)

The project was supposed to last 16 months, including 10 months for the consultant to complete his work and 5 months for the procurement process. Since the approval of the grant, the procurement of consulting firm took 10 months instead of 5 initially planned (The AWF has given its no-objection in spite of substantial shortcomings of the bid process which are highlighted in the audit report. Re-advertising would have prolonged this substantially). The contract with the consultant was reduced to 8 months to speed up the implementation, for the same amount of work to be done. It was probably not reasonable and the consultant did not manage to meet the target. The consultant faced some challenges that were reported to the Borrower and the Bank. Some of the challenges could have been anticipated such as non-availability of specific material, especially drilling equipment, samples that had to be sent to Nigeria for analysis, lack of local professional staff, or security during field work.

3 contracts extensions have been signed between LWSC and the consultant. Each one of them was signed after the contract was already finished and after recommendations from the Bank.

The implementation of the project was also impacted by several changes in the PMT, lack of handover at each change, and the weak follow up from the first PMT that has been fired at the end of 2009.

### 2. Resource use efficiency

Median % physical implementation of RLF outputs financed by all financiers (A) (see II.B.3)	Commitment rate (%) (B) (See table 1.C – Total commitment rate of all financiers)	Ratio of the median percentage physical implementation and commitment rate (A/B)	Rating*
80 %	97,77 %	0,81	3

#### Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 250 words)

The efficiency of the resource used is satisfactory. Most of the outputs have been delivered except from the donor conference that has not been organised. Nevertheless, the consultant prepared and delivered all the material required to hold the conference.

Project Management budget has been mainly utilized for PMT allowances, office running costs, office equipment, computer software and computer training to LWSC staff. On top of those, the PMT used 27 909 € to buy a vehicle.

31 962,32 € have not been disbursed because the consultant submitted the material of the donor conference after the end of the contract. So it was not paid for that and the amount is still on the special account.

### 3. Cost benefit analysis

Economic Rate of Return (at appraisal)	Updated Economic Rate of Return (at completion)	Rating*
/	/	/
Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 250 words)		
/		

### 4. Implementation Progress (IP)<sup>2</sup>

IP Rating (derived from updated IPR) *	Narrative comments (commenting specifically on those IP items that were rated Unsatisfactory or Highly Unsatisfactory, as per last IPR). (indicative max length: 500 words)
3	<p>The global notation of the IP is 3.43, which is satisfactory.</p> <p>The Government took five months to fulfil the grant conditions.</p> <p>The procurement process to hire the consultant took 10 months. The AWF has given its no-objection in spite of substantial shortcomings of the bid process which are highlighted in the audit report. Re-advertising would have prolonged this substantially. Project monitoring was of low quality but improved at the end of the project. Project management changed 2 times, PMT staff was only part time so not fully involved and the steering committee never met to follow up the project. Two workshops were organised for awareness and for review and validation of the feasibility study. It was the only occasion when the stakeholders were associated to the project. From the feasibility study, the consultant developed 13 projects with detailed design and tender documents for each of them. The PMT and the bank commented the deliverables to obtain an acceptable quality output. There have been indications that the groundwater assessment (drilling and pumping tests), hydraulic modeling and network design were later not found satisfactory.</p> <p>Lack of training of the PMT staff and lack of transportation impacted the overall quality of the monitoring and implementation progress.</p>

### 5. Lessons learned related to efficiency

Key issues (max 5, add rows as needed)	Lessons learned	Target audience
1. Training of the PMT	1. The PMT should be trained to project management and monitoring under the bank rules and procedures at the early stage of the project. Those trainings should also allow for PMT staff from different project to meet and exchange on their needs and issues.	1. Bank
2. Logistics for the PMT	2. Transportation became an issue after the appointment of a new full time Project Coordinator. The car bought from contingencies and savings came too late to serve most of the supervision	2. Bank and Borrower
3. Involvement of the PMT	3. To ensure a high quality of project monitoring by the PMT, it could be useful to have the team involved full time on the project even though the project follow up did not require such high involvement. Otherwise there might prioritize their activities not in the sense of the project and this is what happened.	3. Bank and Borrower

## D Sustainability

<sup>2</sup> For operations using the old supervision report and rating system in SAP, the IP ratings need to be converted from the 0-3 scale used in SAP to the 1-4 scale used in the IPR..



## 1. Financial sustainability

Rating*	Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 250 words)
2	<p>The main project output was the provision of detailed design and tender documents for 13 projects supposed to improve the water and sanitation situation in Monrovia and 3 county capitals, and a Donor conference to finance those projects. Unfortunately, the donor conference was not held because the Government decided to have a multi sector conference. As the funding of the AfDB funded investment project was already assured and the immediate needs covered, this was found acceptable by the AWF. Over the 200 M\$ identified in the Feasibility study, 40 M\$ are financed by the AfDB Through its Urban Water Supply and Sanitation Project (UWSSP) that will finance 3 infrastructure projects in Buchanan, Kakata and Zwedru including groundwater and sanitation and other technical assistance studies.</p> <p>Liberia Water and Sewage Corporation do not have the financial means to invest in new infrastructures. The tariffs are low and LWSC receives each year subsidies from the Government to balance its operational costs. Part of the UWSSP was devoted to a technical assistance institutional support to LWSC to improve the technical and financial performances.</p>

## 2. Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities

Rating*	Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 250 words)
2	<p>In the Feasibility study, the consultant implemented a deep institutional analysis of the water sector in Liberia. The consultant highlighted the major challenges of the sector such as fragmentation of responsibilities, problems of the legal framework and difficulties encountered by the LWSC. It also proposes actions for improvement.</p> <p>The Bank launched a study for the water sector reform that was unfortunately abandoned before the end because it was problematic, the consultant was not performing well and parallel events, such as SWA.</p> <p>Training have been organised by the consultant for 3 staff of MLME and 3 staff of LWSC between 25<sup>th</sup> of January and 18<sup>th</sup> of February 2010. The attendants were all engineers. The training dealt with water and sanitation feasibility studies, detailed designs and elaborating tender documents.</p> <p>The project had finally low impact on governance practices and institutional mechanisms but it provided a solid analysis of the several challenges that needs to be tackled and actions to be done to improve the sector. This analysis should be useful for the development of future projects and sector reforms.</p>

## 3. Ownership and sustainability of partnerships

Rating*	Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 250 words)
2	<p>In order to successfully implement the project, the Steering Committee for Monrovia Water Supply and Sanitation Rehabilitation Program was supposed to guide the study. The steering committee was consisting of :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy,</li> <li>○ Ministry of Finance</li> <li>○ Managing Director of LWSC,</li> <li>○ Member of Engineering Society,</li> <li>○ Local NGO,</li> <li>○ Representative from Private Sector</li> </ul> <p>It was supposed to be hosted by the LWSC, serving as a secretariat. Unfortunately, the Steering committee never met during the study, traducing the low involvement of Government organizations in the project follow up.</p> <p>In order to involve the stakeholders, 2 workshops were organized on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2009 for awareness about the project and a second workshop for review and validation of the feasibility study on 18-19 January 2010.</p> <p>The Donor's conference was also an important step in the association of the different stakeholders in the project but it has not been organized.</p> <p>Finally, only the executing agency, LWSC, was highly involved in the project.</p>

## 4. Environmental and social sustainability

Rating*	Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 250 words)
/	<p>The mitigation measures recommended for the adverse impacts of each component of the project are given below. For the adverse or negative impacts mitigation measures are given, for the beneficial or positive impacts enhancement</p>

<p>measures are given where applicable.</p> <p>Key among the mitigation measures are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Purchase of land with just compensation</li> <li>○ Apply safety rules at construction sites and provide safety equipment</li> <li>○ Train LWSC staff, local health officers and city corporation personnel in ISO 14001 Environmental Management System Methods</li> <li>○ Commission and conduct detailed ESIA for WSP construction and Borehole well operation component of the project</li> <li>○ Compensate displaced household if any</li> <li>○ Conduct participatory groundwater management planning with the communities</li> <li>○ Support health / hygiene education and promotion</li> <li>○ Conduct public awareness campaign</li> </ul> <p>Among the enhancement measures are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide benefits and incentives for LWSC employees and local communities.</li> <li>○ Support public awareness campaign on proper usage of sanitation facilities</li> </ul>
--

### 5. Lessons learned related to sustainability

Key issues (max 5, add rows as needed)	Lessons learned	Target audience
1. Mobilization at political level	1. The donor's conference was not organised because the Government want to hold a multi sector conference. Organising such conference for the sector could have been an example and beneficial for the other sectors. The implication at political level is essential when it gets to resource mobilization.	Government
2. Stakeholders association to the project	2. Stakeholders should have been more associated to the project, especially through the Steering Committee and the Donor Conference.	Borrower
3. Training to stakeholders	Trainings were limited to the LWSC and the Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy. It would have been interesting to extend the trainings to other stakeholders such as Municipalities, Associations, Private operators,...	Borrower

## III Performance of stakeholders

### 1. Bank performance

Rating*	Narrative assessment by the Borrower on the Bank's performance, as well as any other aspects of the project (both quantitative and qualitative). See guidance note on issues to cover. (indicative max length: 250 words)
3	From beginning to the end, the Bank was involved in the follow up of the project through field missions, email and phone communication with the PMT. The Bank implemented four (4) field missions in July 2009, October 2010, March 2011 and May 2011. Each of the missions allowed the Bank to assess the project progress and issues, and make recommendations on the way forward. The Bank missions were very important and helpful for the PMT that was not experienced in the implementation of such project and did not know the Bank procedures as they did not receive any specific training. The first mission was strategically well placed 6 months after the start of the consultant work. The Bank noted the challenges faced by the consultant and the difficulties of the PMT for proper consultant work supervision. At the end of the mission, propositions were made to extend the implementation period. The following mission arrived far too late in October 2010 whereas the project was supposed to be finished in February 2010. During the second mission, the Bank noted that the consultant was still working with a contract that expired since May 2010, and with outstanding deliverables and unpaid

fees. No Quarterly reports were submitted so far by the PMT, the steering committee has been inactive, and the financial project management by the accountant was not in line with the Bank procedures. Between the 2 missions, both the Task Manager and the PMT changed and it had a negative impact on the project implementation. The PMT mentioned some delays from the Bank in responding to day to day communications from the project office.

**Comments to be inserted by the Bank on its own performance (both quantitative and qualitative). See guidance note on issues to cover.** (indicative max length: 250 words)

Key issues (related to Bank performance, max 5, add rows as needed)	Lessons learned
1. Training of the PMT	1. The PMT should be trained to project management and monitoring under the bank rules and procedures at the early stage of the project. Those trainings should also allow for PMT members from different projects to meet and exchange on their needs and issues.
2. Project monitoring by the Bank	2. Project monitoring and the number of missions implemented in the country could be adapted depending on the capacity and experience of the PMT. In this project, the experience of PMT was low, and missions from the Bank were not sufficient.

## 2. Borrower performance

Rating*	Narrative assessment on the Borrower performance to be inserted by the Bank (both quantitative and qualitative, depending on available information). See guidance note. (indicative max length: 250 words)
3	<p>The implementing agency for the Borrower was the LWSC. It responded to the requirements of the contractual agreement with the bank, especially for the delivery of the first disbursement. Then, the implementation was difficult because of several issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Change in the PMT: Several changes appeared in the PMT during the project, disturbing the implementation. The first PMT was removed in October 2009 because it was not satisfactory. A new PMT was appointed in January 2010 of which the Manager died in March 2011 and this is finally the engineer of the second PMT, Mr Flaboe, who took over the management until the end of the project</li> <li>○ Lack of transportation to monitor consultant work on the field</li> <li>○ PMT was not devoted full time to the project so their involvement was not sufficient</li> </ul> <p>As a result of these several issues, the project took longer than expected and monitoring of the contract with the consultant was difficult due to the change in project management. No Quarterly report has been submitted before October 2010. The technical monitoring of the project was of better quality at the end of the project due to the involvement of the Engineer.</p> <p>The lack of training provided by the bank to the PMT staff for project management and monitoring was also an issue, especially given the low experience of the members in this area. Each mission implemented by the Bank to follow the project was highly appreciated and most of the recommendations were quickly implemented.</p>
Key issues (related to Borrower performance, max 5, add rows as needed)	Lessons learned
1. Change management in the PMT	1. Changing the PMT requires proper hand over and additional training to ensure smooth transition, rapid project uptake and to avoid subsequent delays and inadequacies
2. Logistics for the PMT	2. Transportation of the PMT to project sites was not planned at the design stage and it appeared to be an issue during the project, affecting the ability of LWSC to follow the consultant.
3. Involvement of the PMT	3. To ensure a high quality of project monitoring by the PMT, it is advised to have the team involved full time on the project. Otherwise there might prioritize their activities not in the sense of the project.

## 3. Performance of other stakeholders

**Rating\*** Narrative assessment on the performance of other stakeholders, including co-financiers, contractors and service

	<b>providers. See guidance note on issues to cover.</b> (indicative max length: 250 words)	
2	<p>A Steering Committee chaired by the Minister of Public Works or his representative and consisting in representatives of the Ministers of Lands, Mines and Energy, Finance, Managing Director of LWSC, Member of Engineering Society, a local NGO, a representative from the private sector and hosted by the LWSC/PT was supposed to follow up and monitor the project. Regrettably, however, for unknown reasons, the Steering Committee never met during the study and did not play the supervising role it was supposed to. The involvement of the stakeholders out of LWSC was very low.</p> <p>The scope of work to be implemented by the consultant was wide and the timeframe very tight. The consultant experienced some difficulties during the implementation and the project was delayed. The feasibility study provides a precise diagnosis of the challenges of the water sector in Liberia and proposes ways to improve it. It will serve as a baseline for all the future work and studies to be implemented in the sector. The tender documents elaborated will be used for future construction work, especially for the UWSSP project. Only the network designs were not fully satisfactory.</p>	
	<b>Key issues</b> (related to performance of other stakeholders, max 5, add rows as needed)	<b>Lessons learned</b> (max 5)
	1. Stakeholders association to the project	1. Stakeholders should have been more associated to the project, especially through the Steering Committee and the Donor Conference.
		<b>Target audience</b> (for lessons learned)
		Borrower

## IV Summary of key lessons learned and recommendations

### 1. Key lessons learned

<b>Key issues</b> (max 5, add rows as needed)	<b>Key lessons learned</b>	<b>Target audience</b>
1. Training of the PMT	1. Training of the PMT is essential for a good quality and smooth implementation of the project. The PMT should be trained to project management and monitoring under the bank rules and procedures at the early stage of the project. Those trainings should also allow for PMT members from different projects to meet and exchange on their needs and issues.	Bank
2. Bank support to the PMT	2. Bank support is a key element in the project success, especially when the PMT has low experience. The PMT is expecting a lot from Task manager missions, which are the occasion to review the monitoring procedures, the progress, and find solutions to the difficulties encountered. The time between 2 missions should not be too long in order to avoid difficulties to get bigger and delays to get longer.	Bank
3. PMT Working conditions	3. Lack of transportation and part time involvement of the PMT contributed to the difficult implementation and delays of the project. These aspects should be well thought at the project definition stage.	Borrower, Bank
4. Mobilization at political level	4. The mobilization of Politics largely contributes to the project success. It encourages other stakeholders to be involved in the project. The implication at political level is essential when it gets to financial resource mobilization.	Government

### 2. Key recommendations (with particular emphasis on ensuring sustainability of project benefits)

Key issue (max 10, add rows as needed)	Key recommendation	Responsible	Deadline
1. PMT training	PMT training (project monitoring and Bank procedures) appears to be essential to have a good quality project implementation and results. The training should be held at the very beginning of the project, and be reinforced and completed during the bank missions. Such training is also the occasion for the PMT from different projects to meet and exchange about their issues and concerns. When PMT members are changing during the project, training should be provided to the new PMT staff.	Bank	
2. Bank support to the PMT	2. The level of support provided by the Bank to the PMT should depend on the level of experience of the PMT. When the experience of the PMT is low, Bank support is essential for project success and should be greater than when an experienced PMT is in place. Bank support can be provided by frequent missions in the country and reactive communication through emails or phone.	Bank	
3. Political and stakeholder mobilization	3. Political and other stakeholders should be mobilized in the follow up of the project and the decision process. It is essential when one of the final expected outcomes is to mobilize financial resources. The mobilization can be done through the set-up of a steering committee or conferences to present and discuss the results. When those elements are planned in the project definition, the Bank should check that they are effectively implemented.	Borrower & Bank	

## V Overall PCR rating

Dimensions and criteria	Rating*
<b>DIMENSION A: RELEVANCE</b>	<b>3</b>
Relevance of project development objective (II.A.1)	3
Relevance of project design (II.A.2)	2
<b>DIMENSION B: EFFECTIVENESS</b>	<b>2</b>
Development Objective (DO) (II.B.4)	2
<b>DIMENSION C: EFFICIENCY</b>	<b>2</b>
Timeliness (II.C.1)	1
Resource use efficiency (II.C.2)	3
Cost-benefit analysis (II.C.3)	/
Implementation Progress (IP) (II.C.4)	3
<b>DIMENSION D: SUSTAINABILITY</b>	<b>2</b>
Financial sustainability (II.D.1)	2
Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities (II.D.2)	2
Ownership and sustainability of partnerships (II.D.3)	2
Environmental and social sustainability (II.D.4)	/
<b>OVERALL PROJECT COMPLETION RATING</b>	<b>2</b>

## VI Acronyms and abbreviations

Acronym (add rows as needed)	Full name
AfDB	African Development Bank
AWF	African Water Facility
IPRS	Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy
LWSC	Liberia Water & Sewer Corporation
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MLME	Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PCR	Project Completion Report
PSC	Project Steering Committee
PMT	Project Management Team
UWSSP	Urban Water Supply and Sanitation Project
SWOT	Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threat
WSS	Water supply and sanitation

**Required attachment:** Updated Implementation Progress and Results Report (IPR)– the date should be the same as the PCR mission.

## Appendix 1 : List of reference documents

1. Project Fact sheet:02
2. Project Appraisal report : 01
3. Follow up report : 01
4. Supervision rating report : 01
5. Aide-mémoire of supervision missions : 04
6. Quarterly Progress report: 06
7. Project completion report: 01
8. Reports from the consultant:
  - Feasibility study
  - Environmental and Social Impact Assessment
  - Design Criteria
  - Water demand
  - Tender documents for 13 packages

## Appendix 2 : Results-Based Logical Framework

**Country and project Name :** Monrovia Expansion & Three County Capitals Rehabilitation Study

**Purpose of the Project:** The purpose of the Water Supply and Sanitation Project for Monrovia expansion and the three county capitals rehabilitation is a) to develop economically, technically, environmentally and socially viable water supply and sanitation systems to meet 2025 demands in Monrovia and three county capitals of Kakata, Zwedru and Buchanan, where the Liberia Water and Sewerage Corporation is responsible for services production, and b) to develop water sources, abstraction, water conveyance and transmission, water treatment facilities, water distribution network, and sanitation facilities in Metropolitan Monrovia, Kakata, Zwedru and Buchanan as well as efficient water metering and billing systems utilizing appropriate, affordable and least cost technology.

Results Chain		PERFORMANCE INDICATORS			Means of Verification	Risks/Mitigation Measures
		Indicator	Baseline	Target		
IMPACT	Improved water and sanitation services	% of population served with water services	22% in 2007	45% by year 2010 and to 100% by year 2025.	<u>Source:</u> Baseline data collected under the study and Government statistical bulletins and economic reports.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <b>Risks</b></li> <li>○ Lack of continued Government support and priority for WSS sector.</li> <li>○ Lack of commitment of all stakeholders to the project objectives</li> </ul>
		% of population served with sanitation services	15% in 2007	45% by year 2010 and to 100% by year 2025.		
OUTCOMES	Outcome 1: Adequate resources mobilized based on the reports, designs and documents validated by the Government of Liberia, for reliable and affordable WSS services to the Monrovia and 3 county towns population.	% of resources mobilized/resources requirements	0% in 2007	100% at the end of the project	<u>Source:</u> Donors meeting report and amounts pledged. Progress reports.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <b>Risks</b></li> <li>○ Consultant may not delivery good quality reports on time</li> <li>– <b>Mitigation measures</b></li> <li>○ Closer supervision by PIU</li> </ul>



	Results Chain	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS			Means of Verification	Risks/Mitigation Measures	
		Indicator	Baseline	Target			
	Outcome 2: Provide basis technical documentation for the water sector in Monrovia and 3 county capitals	Study reports delivered	Nothing done in 2007	Feasibility study, Detail design, Procurement documents done at the end of the project	<u>Source</u> : Progress reports and project completion report		
OUTPUTS	<b>Stage 1 : Feasibility study</b>						
	<b>O1.1:</b> Feasibility study	Feasibility study report approved	0% in 2007	100% in January 2009	<u>Source</u> : - Project quarterly reports	<p>– <b>Risks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consultant may not delivery good quality reports on time</li> <li>○ Government does not provide its financial , human resources and</li> </ul> <p>– <b>Risks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consultant may not delivery good quality reports on time</li> <li>○ Government does not provide its financial , human resources and logistical requirements in a timely manner</li> </ul> <p>– <b>Mitigation measures</b></p> <p>Closer supervision by PIU</p>	
	<b>O1.2:</b> 2 Workshops to present and approve the Feasibility study to the stakeholders	Number of workshops done to present and approve the Feasibility Study	0 rapport en 2007	2 workshops before the end of stage 1			
	<b>Stage 2 : Detail Design and Tender documents</b>						
	<b>O2.1:</b> Detail design and engineering report	Detail design and engineering report approved	0% en 2007	100% in April 2009	<u>Source</u> : - Project quarterly reports		
	<b>O2.2:</b> Tender documents and cost estimates	Tender documents and cost estimates approved	0% en 2007	100% in April 2009			
	<b>Stage 3: Ressource Mobilization</b>						
	<b>O3.1:</b> Donor's conference	Donor's conference organised	0% en 2007	100% in May 2009	<u>Source</u> : - Project quarterly reports - Donor's conference Report - Training manual		
<b>O3.2:</b> Training of 3 staff of MLME and 3 staff of LWSC	Training implemented by the consultant	0% en 2007	100% at the end of the project				

## Appendix 3 : Project implementation progress reporting and assessment

### C Project implementation progress reporting and assessment

#### Compliance with covenants

Criteria	Number/Percent of conditions complied with	Rating		Assessment <i>With explanation in particular (a) ratings of 2 or 1 and (b) ratings lower than in the previous report</i>
		This report	Previous report	
<b>Compliance with project covenants</b> <i>(full report on compliance with covenants to be reported in Annex-2)</i>	2/2	4		It took about 5 months for the Government to fulfill the grant conditions which included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Establishment of a PMT and a steering Committee</li> <li>○ Opening of a special account</li> </ul>
<b>Compliance with environmental and social safeguards</b> <i>(full report on compliance with covenants to be reported in Annex-3)</i>	100%	4		The project is under category 3
<b>Audit compliance</b>	NA	NA		The audit mission was implemented between the 1 <sup>st</sup> and 5 <sup>th</sup> of April by the consultant More Stephens. At the time of the visit, the Audit report was not submitted yet.

#### Project systems and procedures

Criteria	Rating		Assessment <i>With explanation in particular (a) ratings of 2 or 1 and (b) ratings lower than in the previous report</i>
	This report	Previous report	
<b>Procurement</b>	3		EOI was issued on February 2008 and the contract was signed in December 2008. LWSC followed procurement rules from the Bank with support of the Task Manager.
<b>Financial management</b>	3		Even though financial transactions were recorded to a very large extent, they did not

			fully meet the Bank's prescribed Financial Management and Disbursement Guidelines. The Task Manager did an on-the-job coaching session with the project Accountant to enhance his appreciation of the Bank's financial management requirements. The accounting system in place was still satisfactory. The quality of the financial management has been affected by the change of Accountant half of the project.
<b>Monitoring and evaluation</b>	<b>2</b>		The quality of the monitoring and evaluation performed by LWSC was highly affected by the 2 changes in project manager. The first was fired because of unsatisfactory performance and the second died during the project. No Monitoring and evaluation plan was set up. No progress reports were prepared until October 2010. The contractual relationship with the consultant was not followed very well as contract extension were signed each time after the contract end.

### Project execution and financing

Criteria	Total amount (a)	Cumulative amount to date (b)	Cumulative amount at beginning of the year (c)	Annual projection (expected cumulative amount at end of year) (d)	Progress towards annual projection (% realized) (b-c)/(d-c)	Progress towards total (% realized)	Rating	
							This report	Previous report
Disbursement (Bank approved financing only)	1,403,096.55	1,403,096.55				100%	4	
Budget commitments (Bank approved financing only)	1,403,096.55	1,403,096.55				100%	4	
Counterpart funding disbursements	NA							

Co-Financing disbursements	NA							
----------------------------	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Criteria	Assessment
	<i>With explanation in particular for (a) ratings of 2 or 1 and (b) ratings lower than in the previous report</i>
Disbursement (Bank approved financing only)	The loan approved was of 1,435,058.87 € of which 1,403,096.55 € has been disbursed and 31,962.32 has been cancelled. 100 % of amount disbursed was committed.
Budget commitments (Bank approved financing only)	
Counterpart funding disbursements	<See staff guidance>
Co-Financing disbursements	<See staff guidance>

## Overall implementation

IP rating	This report	Previous report	Justification
			<i>( A rating of 2 or 1, along with proposed remedies, must be discussed in the Issues and Actions for Management section.)</i>
	<b>3</b>		<p>On the 7 criteria assessed, the total score is 24. Therefore, the average rating is 3,43.</p> <p>The main weak point is the project monitoring and evaluation due to change in PMT (Project manager changed 2 times), lack of project management training and no transportation to follow up consultant work on the field.</p>

#### Appendix 4: Contribution of AWF (Supervision missions)

N°	Mission	Date	Nb of days	Nb of Per.	Composition
1	Supervision	16-19 July 2009	4	1	Mr Yvan KEDAJ, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist at AWF, Task Manager
2	Supervision	10-19 October 2010	9	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr Tom Mugoya, Principal water and sanitation engineer at OWAS 1</li> <li>- Ms Maimuna Nalubega, watsan Consultant at AWF</li> <li>- Shiaka Momoh, Procurement specialist at SLFO</li> <li>- Mr Owusu Mensah Agyei, Financial Management Specialist at GHFO</li> </ul>
3	Supervision	14- 25 March 2011	11	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr Tom Mugoya, Principal water and sanitation engineer at OWAS 1</li> <li>- Mr Owusu Mensah Agyei, Financial Management Specialist at GHFO</li> </ul>
4	Supervision	30 April – 6 May 2011	7	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr Hanz Hollhuber , water supply and sanitation specialist at AWF</li> <li>- Mr Tom Mugoya, Principal water and sanitation engineer at OWAS 1</li> <li>- Mr Rogers Lubunga, Principal water and sanitation engineer at OWAS 1</li> </ul>

### Appendix 5 : List of persons contacted during the mission

Name	Organisation	Position	Email	Details
Gabriel Flaboe	Liberia Water & Sewer Corporation	AfDB Project Manager	lwscproject@gmail.com	T : +231-886-513-239/777003198
Clarence Momoh	Liberia Water & Sewer Corporation	Engineer		T : +231-886-533-814