

The Regional Water and Sanitation Group for Eastern and Southern Africa

**Åke Nilsson
Knut Samset
Ron Titus
Mark Murwahuzi
Björn Brandberg**

**Department for Natural
Resources and the
Environment**

The Regional Water and Sanitation Group for Eastern and Southern Africa

Åke Nilsson
Knut Samset
Ron Titus
Mark Murwahuzi
Björn Brandberg

Sida Evaluation 99/35

**Department for Natural
Resources and the
Environment**

Evaluation Reports may be ordered from:

Infocenter, Sida
S-105 25 Stockholm
Telephone: (+46) (0)8 795 23 44
Telefax: (+46) (0)8 760 58 95
E-mail: info@sida.se, Homepage <http://www.sida.se>

Authors: Åke Nilsson, Knut Samset, Ron Titus , Mark Murwahuzi, Björn Brandberg.

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Evaluation 99/35
Commissioned by Sida, Department for Natural Resources and the Environment

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Registration No.: NATUR-1997-0221
Date of Final Report: May 1999
Printed in Stockholm, Sweden 1999
ISBN 91-586-8956-7
ISSN 1401-0402

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Sveavägen 20, Stockholm
Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
Telegram: sida stockholm. Postgiro: 1 56 34-9
E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Table of Contents

Foreword	1
Summary	i
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Scope and methodology	1
2 Achievements	3
2.1 Background	3
2.2 Measuring achievements	4
2.3 Outputs produced by the Group.....	5
3 Relevance	8
4 Approaches	9
4.1 Rural water supply and sanitation	9
4.2 Urban environmental sanitation, including water supply.....	10
4.3 Participation	10
4.4 Gender.....	11
4.5 The body of knowledge promoted by the Group.....	12
5 Environmental aspects	13
6 Relationships	14
7 Impact	15
7.1 Policy	15
7.2 Investment programmes.....	15
7.3 Learning	16
8 Organisational issues	17
9 Sustainability	19
10 Conclusions and recommendations	20
10.1 Conclusions	20
10.2 Recommendations.....	22
Annex 1	24
Annex 2	28
Annex 3	29
Annex 4	32
Annex 5	33
Annex 6	38
Annex 7	41
Annex 8	44

Foreword

This report on an assessment of the Regional Water and Sanitation Group for Eastern and Southern Africa (RWSG-ESA), has been prepared by a team consisting of:

Åke Nilsson, Water Resources Specialist, Geoscope AB (Team Leader and consultant for Sida)

Knut Samset, Ph.D., Senior Partner, Scanteam International AB (Consultant for the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs)

Ron Titus, President, Angelhoeve Associates Inc. (Consultant for CIDA)

Mark Mujwahuzi, Institute of Resource Assessment, University of Dar es Salaam (Local consultant for Tanzania and Uganda)

Björn Brandberg, Sanitation Advisor, SBI Consulting (Local consultant for Malawi and Mozambique)

The Assessment Team has based its findings on information gathered from staff of RWSG-ESA and a large number of persons in the water supply and sanitation sector in the region. A list of the persons interviewed is annexed to the report. The Assessment Team wishes to thank all those interviewed for their willingness to share their knowledge and experiences with us.

We want to express our appreciation of the extensive assistance we have received from Mr. Jean Doyen, Director of RWSG-ESA, and his staff. This includes the logistical support extended to us by the entire support staff, and especially Keziah Kihara, Nyambura Thande and John Mwangi.

Nairobi, May 1999

The Assessment Team

Summary

This report presents the findings of an assessment made of the Regional Water and Sanitation Group for Eastern and Southern Africa (“the Group”), one of five regional groups under the UNDP/World Bank Water and Sanitation Program (“the Global Programme”).

The development objective of the Group, taken to be the mission statement of the Global Programme, is to help poor people gain sustainable access to improved water and sanitation services. The Group works towards achieving this by assisting in strengthening sector policies, supporting sustainable investments, and learning and disseminating lessons of best practice in the sector. The Group is active in rural water supply and sanitation, urban environmental sanitation and participation and gender oriented activities in ten countries in the region and through five regional programmes. A central theme in its operations is to develop capacity among its clients.

The assessment, which has covered the achievements of the Group and the relevance and efficiency of its operations, has been based on information gathered from the Group, and from interviews with a large number of the Group’s clients and other stakeholders in the water and sanitation sector in the region. The conclusions arrived at therefore reflect the views of these stakeholders.

Promoting water and sanitation in urban and rural areas in the ten countries covered by the Group, is as relevant today as in the past, and the Group has been a source of support in this regard to ministries, professionals, government and non-government organisations, and projects in the region.

The Group has made professional contributions in the countries where it has been active, essentially towards making qualitative changes in government policy and strategy in the sector, in planned and on-going projects, and in extracting experience from such projects and disseminating lessons of best practice. The Group has also played a role in facilitating and influencing World Bank investment programmes.

In countries where the Group has had a long presence and where certain macro-level conditions have been favourable, the Group has been able to establish good and productive partnerships with national client institutions and other stakeholders. The Group has also established good and productive cooperation with the Network for Water and Sanitation International in Kenya and with the Institute of Water and Sanitation Development in Zimbabwe.

The Group is little known or even unknown to some important actors in the region, including some NGOs and donors which it would serve the Group well to be better linked with. The Group is often also confused with the World Bank as such. This points to the need to improve networking and information, relevant actors should be aware of the Group, and of its mandate and activities.

The objectives – as interpreted by the Assessment Team – and activities of the Group, are considered individually relevant with regard to the needs of the target groups and to present policies. However, since the relative importance of each objective and of the activities aiming at fulfilling the different objectives has not been clearly defined, the relevance of the Group’s operations in a narrower organisational sense can be questioned.

The Group’s approach is explorative rather than strategic in the sense that it is not guided by a clearly defined objective but is consistently seeking opportunities for involvement where it can

be found. As a result, the operations lack focus, and resources are spread thinly on an uncoordinated variety of activities in different fields, several countries, at different institutional levels, and at different stages of project cycles. This raises doubt about the effectiveness of the approach in producing intended outputs.

Whereas the Group's linkage at project level would be necessary in its attempts to extract lessons from ongoing activities, it may be questioned whether it is a cost-effective use of resources to be directly involved in design and programming at project level. The potential strength of the Group lies in its ability to influence at a policy and strategic level in relation to regional and national institutions.

The learning inputs and processes developed and promoted by the Group could be more productive if they were directly linked to supporting policy and strategy development. Learning and disseminating lessons in best practices is not being carried out in a systematic manner. In defining a coherent and target-oriented learning strategy, it may be beneficial to consider scaling down and focussing; what others are already doing could be utilised to a larger extent. The Group should not organise or coordinate pilot and demonstration activities but limit their role to extracting lessons from ongoing activities.

The advice provided by the Group is generally regarded as best practice in the sector. The advice is not unique, but part of a body of knowledge known to the main institutions in the sector. Since there are many sources of this information, the challenge is to improve the Group's efficiency in conveying the message, rather than refining the message itself.

Although the relation of the Group's work to environmental and integrated water resources management issues is clear, and although the Group could play an important role in promoting that such issues be considered in a systematic way in the sector, the Group does not have a strategy for how to incorporate these issues in its operations.

The balance between sanitation and water supply in combined water supply and sanitation programmes in the region is commonly in favour of the water supply component, which has a negative impact on the effectiveness of the programmes in improving health. This imbalance is reflected also in projects and programmes in which the Group is actually involved.

A review of the progress of the Group's activities in 1998, and parts of those in 1997, showed that more than half of the planned activities were delayed or cancelled as a result of circumstances beyond the control of the Group such as changing policies, lacking commitment, projects being suspended, and war. This raises doubt about the realism and cost-effectiveness of the approach chosen by the Group. The high administration cost, 21.5%, also indicates that cost-effectiveness should be a concern for the Group.

Despite recommendations by the evaluations in 1991 and 1996, and by the Regional Program Advisory Committee in 1997, to clarify its mandate and focus activities accordingly, the Group has failed to do this and is guided by multiple objectives that seem to confound rather than consolidate the use of resources.

The Group has not had a management information system to evaluate progress against work plans, and has not performed regular reviews to this effect. Only recently, as a result of a recommendation in the Regional Program Advisory Committee in 1997, has an attempt to introduce a system of work plans and progress reports been made. However, the reporting is still unsystematic, does not accurately reflect the activities of the Group, and gives a distorted and exaggerated picture of achievements.

The evolution of the Group's role from promotion of appropriate technology to community based management and demand-responsive approaches and, more recently, to the promotion of private sector participation, implies a need for a change of staffing pattern. Alternatively, it could be considered whether issues related to private sector participation should be dealt with by other, better equipped, organisations.

Co-funding of the Group from countries with which it cooperates does take place, but to a very limited extent, and substantial financial contributions from governments and client institutions in the region seems unrealistic. Most of the funding for the Group comes from bilateral donors, and a large part of the present funding expires by the end of this year. Future financial sustainability of the Group will depend to a large extent on the Group's ability to increase its efficiency and accountability.

The Assessment Team makes the following *recommendations*:

1. The activities of the Group should be guided by a strategy that clearly states its role and the limits to its involvement in the sector. Within this framework there should be flexibility to respond to needs as they arise.
2. To this effect, and taking into due consideration the conclusions of the present assessment, the Group should develop a strategic plan that clearly defines a realistic goal for its operations, in order to improve management and maximise its strategic impact. This should be facilitated by experts in organisational development.
3. With reference to the strategic plan, the Group should clarify its scope of involvement in different countries, its modes of operation, and precisely define the role of the Nairobi office and the Country Sector Advisors, with a view to make the most cost-effective use of resources.
4. The Group should develop and implement a management system which allows it to manage resources effectively and improve accountability of operation. The system should allow regular assessment of progress against plans. Review of performance should be done semi-annually.
5. To strengthen its role in networking; to facilitate learning and dissemination of lessons; and to strengthen ownership among key institutions at the national and regional levels, the Group should develop (1) a marketing strategy to promote their services, (2) a dissemination policy and strategy; and (3) a data base of individuals and organisations involved in the water and sanitation sector in Eastern and Southern Africa.
6. Donors should review the strategic plan to determine the mode and extent of their future involvement in, and funding of the Group.

1 Introduction

This report presents the results of an assessment of the Regional Water and Sanitation Group for Eastern and Southern Africa, RWSG-ESA.

1.1 Background

RWSG-ESA is one of five regional groups under the global UNDP/World Bank Water and Sanitation Program, with headquarters in Washington. In addition to RWSG-ESA, there is one regional group in South America, one in West Africa and two in Asia. RWSG-ESA has its offices in Nairobi, Kenya. In the following text, RWSG-ESA will generally be referred to as “the Group”, and the UNDP/World Bank Water and Sanitation Program as “the Global Programme”.

The objective of the Global Programme is “*to help poor people gain sustainable access to improved water and sanitation services*”... The Group works towards achieving this development objective in the Eastern and Southern Africa region through advisory services and support to policy development, sustainable investment and learning. It is active in the subject areas of rural water supply and sanitation, urban environmental sanitation, and participation and gender, in ten countries in the region and through five regional programmes.

The assessment was commissioned jointly by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), and the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who all contribute funds to the Group. The present CIDA funding agreement extends to 2002, whereas Swedish and Norwegian funding expires by the end of 1999.

1.2 Scope and methodology

The purpose of the assessment has been to provide information to the donors on the performance, relevance and efficiency of the work carried out by the Group from 1993 onwards, and to give recommendations on possible continued support. The Terms of Reference of the assessment are presented in Annex 1. It should be noted that it was not included in the Terms of Reference of the assessment to provide advice to the Group on details of its operations, neither on technical contents nor on its management structure.

The assessment has been carried out by a five-member team, in the following referred to as “the Assessment Team”; three consultants recruited from the three donor countries, and two consultants recruited in the region.

In order to collect information needed for the assessment, the Assessment Team has studied documentation provided by the Group, and interviewed key persons in the water and sanitation sector in five countries where the Group operates. Information was also gathered through a questionnaire distributed at the Regional Program Advisory Committee meeting in Nairobi on 2nd March and responded to by 15 participants, and through direct interviews with selected participants. The Assessment Team also interviewed an additional selection of persons attached to donor organisations, and some regional resource persons. The programme of the visits in the region, and a list of persons interviewed, are shown in Annexes 2 and 3.

For the purpose of data collection and distribution of responsibilities within the Assessment Team, the issues listed in the Terms of Reference were structured into generalised subject areas, corresponding to the headings of the report. The analyses presented in the Report result from common discussions, and the conclusions and recommendations are agreed within the Assessment Team. The responsibility for writing the various parts of the report has, however, rested with individual team members in accordance with their professional competence. Final editing of the report has been carried out by the Team Leader.

A list of acronyms and abbreviations used in the text is provided in Annex 4.

2 Achievements

2.1 Background

The Water and Sanitation Program originated in 1978 when UNDP and the World Bank decided to co-operate in the promotion of low-cost sanitation and water supply technologies as alternatives to conventional sewage and piped water systems. The Global Programme was created in 1988 when a number of UN-supported, World Bank-managed projects were consolidated into a single programme.

The concept of setting up a decentralised structure with regional groups was implemented in a period when UNDP and the World Bank experimented with different approaches to sector development support. The idea was that these groups would be resource centres and facilitators in their respective regions, that could contribute to and draw upon the expertise developed in the Global Programme. This was thought to be a cost-effective method to deliver programme assistance to the participating countries. As multidisciplinary teams, the regional groups would be in a position to help countries develop longer-term sector policies and strategies as well as to provide advice on particular problems. Located close to the countries they serve, the regional groups would become familiar with regional and national sector issues, develop good relationships with officials, and respond quickly to requests for assistance from the countries.

Funding for the Global Programme peaked in 1991 and then declined as funding from UNDP dropped by almost 50 per cent over two years. This trend has continued, but the Global Programme has gained momentum in the last years with increased funding from bilateral donors.

The focus of the Global Programme has evolved from the development and application of appropriate technology to a present major focus on community-based approaches to rural water supply and sanitation and urban sanitation. The Global Programme applies a three-fold strategy: (1) strengthening sector policies, (2) supporting sustainable investments, and (3) learning and disseminating lessons. The Global Programme is a service to governments, NGOs, communities and donor agencies, and sees its role in supporting stakeholder coordination and collaboration, piloting innovative approaches to rural water supply and sanitation and urban environmental sanitation, and documenting and disseminating best practices and lessons learned among the countries in the region.

From its initial focus on appropriate technology and assisting governments in their efforts to deliver services to low-income areas, the strategy was changed in 1992 to help create capacity within communities to access water and sanitation services according to their own demand, rather than operating in a supply-oriented mode. In 1993 the expertise on handpump development was handed over to the Swiss Centre for Appropriate Technology. During 1992–1994 the regional groups were strengthened. Since 1996 there has been an increasing focus on improving the capacity to extract and disseminate lessons learned. In this period the Global Programme has continued decentralising activities by deploying Country Sector Advisors in a number of countries covered by the Regional Groups. In 1997, the focus on urban environmental sanitation was strengthened in response to the problems caused by rapid urbanisation in developing countries. More recently, the Global Programme has started to focus on private-public sector partnership, in light of the role of governments changing from provider of water and sanitation services to facilitator and regulator. A strategy for the period 1999–2003 has been recently de-

veloped ("Water and Sanitation Services for the Poor: Innovating through Field Experience. Program Strategy 1999 to 2003, Draft for Review, September 1998"),

In its perspective for the future ("Meeting the Challenge of Water and Sanitation Services for the Poor in East and Southern Africa – A Three-Year Regional Business Plan FY 2000–2002"), the Regional Water and Sanitation Group for Eastern and Southern Africa specifies a number of issues as highlights, i.e. the need to decentralise the delivery of services in the sector; that the responsibility for ownership and management should be at the lowest appropriate level; that governments should create an enabling environment to facilitate service delivery with due involvement of all partners, including the private sector and civil society organisations; and that cost recovery should underpin sector investment decisions and actions for sustained service delivery. Appropriate safety nets should, however, be put in place to protect the poorest of the poor, in taking into consideration their willingness and ability to pay. This is in agreement with the Plan of Actions and Guiding Principles that were issued in November 1998, by the Africa Consultative Forum of the Water and Sanitation Africa Initiative.

2.2 Measuring achievements

In general terms, achievements are measured in relation to objectives and planned outputs. In a single project, resources are usually employed in a consolidated effort to meet a single, overall objective. The major activities take place within the project's setting, and this makes it possible to identify the chain of events caused by the project, and to verify achievements.

In a broader programme, on the other hand, and in particular in a sector support programme, resources are usually spread more thinly on a variety of activities or projects. Each activity may be only one of many factors leading to the overall programme goal. The possibility to verify the effect of the programme activities will therefore be correspondingly limited. This problem is evident in the present assessment of achievements of the Group, the operations of which in fact constitute a sector support programme.

Along the road from the initial expression of needs, to water and sanitation facilities being installed and in operation in the communities, there are many intermediary steps that have to be taken. Securing *evidence of best practise* from similar projects; translating this into *an appropriate policy* based on these experiences, and; *securing the necessary funds* for investments. These are the three main objectives specified for the Global Programme: drawing lessons, developing policy and securing investments. The next step after funds have been secured would be to select the *appropriate institutional arrangement*, then *plan the project* and *implement* it, before the user's *needs can be satisfied*.

The activities of the Group are essentially limited to advisory and facilitating services in the form of studies, workshops, study tours and programming activities. The activities are linked to different stages of the process described above, and in support of a number of government and non-government institutions in different countries. This adds to the problem of measuring the effect of activities, since there are usually other more significant factors affecting policies and investments in the sector. The general and ambitious nature of the Group's development objective also makes it virtually impossible to use that as a basis for measuring success.

The assessment of achievements in this study is therefore limited to a review of outputs produced by the Group as presented in its work plans and progress reports, and a review of the signifi-

cance and relevance of these outputs as seen from the point of view of client institutions, which will be discussed in the subsequent chapters.

2.3 Outputs produced by the Group

In fulfilling its mandate, the Group has adopted an open-ended approach to problem solving, based on demands or needs in client institutions rather than on strategy. The activities are guided mainly by requests from institutions, initiatives taken by the Group, and off-springs from workshops and working groups, in a multitude of countries and institutions, and at different stages of project cycles.

A Global Programme evaluation report of 1991 argued that this was a necessary choice: *“In short, the program in its particular circumstances and with its special challenges has no options but to utilise retail types of machinery in attacking wholesale problems that confront it and that would otherwise be largely ignored or avoided by the world community”*. It also pointed out that the Global Programme was in its infancy with a *“unique (and mysterious, to some) combined management, a significant but not well-defined place among the many organisations operating in the sector, and a far-reaching, not entirely specific mandate (again confusing to some). The image is not entirely sharp, the mandate yet to be clarified”*. The present image of the Global Programme – as well as the Group – could still be characterised with the same words.

The complex and explorative nature of the Group’s operations and the lack of direction is reflected in a general absence of plans and progress reports. This problem was pointed out in evaluation reports for the entire Global Programme in 1991 and 1996 but has not led to major changes in the Global Programme or in the Group. In 1997, the Regional Program Advisory Committee recommended that the Group should *“improve its accountability and report against clear objectives, activities and intended outputs”*.

Systematic plans and progress reports that can be used in the present assessment as a basis for a review of achievements are available only from 1998. The Assessment Team has studied in particular the work plans for 1997, 1998 and January–June 1999; and the progress report for 1997–98. In addition, the Group was asked to produce overviews of major outputs during the entire period covered by the assessment, for the countries visited by the Assessment Team. The overviews produced by the Group for Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania and Uganda are annexed to this report (see Annex 5). These overviews were used by the Assessment Team as a basis for planning and performing the stakeholder interviews, and as check lists – in combination with lists of intended outputs provided in the recent work plans – to verify actual outputs. Also, an activity review produced by the Group in 1995 as an input to the evaluation of the Global Programme, was made available to the Assessment Team.

Based on an analysis of these documents, it is evident that the Group has provided professional contributions to the sector in the countries where it is active, depending on the scope and duration of involvement and the quality of response in different countries... For instance, country visits by the Assessment Team indicate that the achievements of the Group are more substantial in Tanzania and Uganda than in Malawi and Mozambique, where it has more recently been engaged.

The outputs of the activities are clustered around the three key objectives of the Group, i.e. to strengthen sector policy, support sustainable investments, and learning and disseminating lessons.

An overview of the involvement and current budget in the ten countries where the Group is involved is shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Overview of the involvement of the Group.

Country	Main involvement of the Group Policy Investm. Learning			Budget 1999 (1000 US\$)		Involved in the country since	Country Sector Advisor since
				RWSS	UES		
Eritrea		X	X	37		1995	
Ethiopia	X	X	X	81	68	1994	1996
Kenya	X	X	X	83	160	1993	1997
Malawi	X	X		252		1997	1998
Mozambique	X	X		225		1997	1998
Rwanda	X	X	X	73	82	1996	1998
Tanzania	X	X	X	35	68	1993	
Uganda	X	X	X	89	47	1993	
Zambia	X	X		82	60	1997	1998
Zimbabwe	X	X		76		1998	
Regional	X		X		410		

Strengthening sector policies

The Group has throughout its existence assisted governments and national agencies in their efforts to design sector policies and strategies. Its input has essentially been to introduce principles that are consistent with recommendations in international fora and generally recognised as best practise in the sector. The Group has assisted in this mainly by participating in, and providing secretariat support to, regional or national working groups, facilitating study tours, and assisting in preparing strategic documents. In Zimbabwe, for instance, the Group has provided advice to promote a demand-responsive approach in rural water and sanitation projects after the government has recognised that it can no longer afford to provide water supply and sanitation services to rural communities, and that national policy will have to be revised accordingly. A number of such activities have been carried out in most of the ten countries involved, particularly for the purpose of influencing government policy to be sensitive to issues such as local ownership, gender, and empowerment of communities.

Supporting sustainable investments

Under this heading, the Group partly aims to promote investments in the sector, and partly to assist governments and development organisations in making planned or ongoing projects in the sector sustainable. The Group has had more success with the latter type of interventions than with the former, and most of the activities in this area provide inputs to the programming or design of projects and programmes, most of which are World Bank funded. Again, the involvement of the Group is mostly to undertake special studies or assist in preparing the terms of reference for such studies, provide advice regarding design, facilitate study tours and regional or national workshops, and at project level to assist in developing monitoring and evaluation systems, and participate in supervisory missions. The initiatives are aimed at making qualitative changes in mainstream projects in the sector, by introducing and promoting issues such as gender strategies, sanitation, and health education.

Learning and disseminating lessons

One of the main justifications for initiating the Global Programme was to extract lessons from the field as input to an ongoing learning process, in order to generate lessons of best practice that can be disseminated in the regions to different parties in the sector. A concern in the Group is therefore to get involved in innovative projects, or to initiate pilot projects to test specific principles or strategies. This is done by the Group essentially by undertaking special studies, assisting in preparing the terms of reference for such studies, assisting in the design of pilot projects, promoting study tours and workshops, and developing training materials. The Group has undertaken a number of such activities in the countries where it has been involved. An essential part of the learning process is the involvement of the Global Programme in processing information and extracting lessons. The Group is involved in networking and attempts to find ways to disseminate material and promote learning in the region.

Summary comment on outputs

A review of activities, carried out jointly with Group staff, for six countries during 1998–1999, revealed that a number of the planned activities have been successfully completed. However, more than half of the planned activities had been delayed by 6 months or more, suspended or cancelled (see Annex 6). These problems were not reflected correctly or explained in the reports. The review also revealed that the outputs reported by the Group often were expressed in terms that went beyond the limited support that it provides. For instance, one output would be registered as “*a study has been done*” when the involvement from the Group was only to help formulating the Terms of Reference for a study that was funded and carried out by other institutions. The reports failed to draw the distinction between factual outputs as a result of the Group’s activities, and the hypothetical achievements that might eventually result. The reports therefore tend to give a distorted picture with a tendency to exaggerate the role of the Group in producing reported outputs. This problem is also reflected in many of the documents produced by the Group.

The findings of the activity review accounted for above is corroborated by the review of outputs in countries visited by the Assessment Team. The case of Tanzania is shown as an example in Annex 7.

The considerable number of suspensions, cancellations and delays of planned activities raises doubt about the efficiency and also the cost-efficiency of the Group’s operations. In many cases, problems were caused by factors beyond the control of the Group, such as cancellation of programmed projects, suspension of funding for ongoing projects, policy changes, and war. Apparently, some of the problems are also caused by the explorative nature of the Group’s operations which requires a considerable amount of overplanning, and an opportunistic approach seeking involvement where it can be found rather than responding to genuinely felt needs. This may make it less likely that the necessary action is taken by governments and client institutions as intended. Also, the danger of spreading resources too thinly is that it becomes increasingly difficult to follow up on processes and decisions necessary to ensure progress, and that it creates management problems in the Group as discussed in Chapter 8. This suggests that there is still a need to strengthen the focus and develop a consolidated, realistic strategy for the Group’s operations.

3 Relevance

The objectives of the Group are not clearly and unambiguously stated (see Chapter 8), and the objectives discussed in the following text should therefore be seen as the Assessment Team's interpretation of what the objectives actually are, rather than the Group's officially stated objectives.

The Group appears to have accepted the mission statement of the Global Programme as its overall objective, that is to help poor people gain sustained access to improved water and sanitation services. This is considered a relevant objective with regard to the needs of the target group. It also coincides with present policy orientation and development efforts in the countries in the region.

The three immediate objectives of (1) strengthening sector policies, (2) supporting sustainable investments, and (3) learning and disseminating lessons, are also considered relevant objectives, which should contribute to achieving the development objective.

An additional central objective is to create capacity with the Group's partners in the countries to achieve the immediate objectives. This is also considered a relevant objective.

The Group pursues the achievement of its immediate objectives through activities in the three areas of rural water supply and sanitation, urban environmental sanitation, and participation and gender. This is done through a large variety of activities and approaches which are described elsewhere in this report. The question as to whether the agglomeration of all the individually relevant objectives and activities into one programme is relevant and realistic, is discussed in Chapter 8. The Assessment Team has found that the documentation and information is not consistent in expressing the relative importance that should be given to each individual objective, and to the individual activities aiming at fulfilling the different objectives. This means that while the activities of the Group as a whole may be considered relevant in the widest sense, the relevance in a narrower, organisational sense can be questioned.

The promotion of demand-responsive approaches is a central theme in the operations of the Group. The development and application of such approaches has been a major activity in the sector for a long time, and their importance for sustainability is widely recognised. However, it needs to be noted that when water supply to the poorest is considered, it is not necessarily true that demand responsiveness alone will lead to improved water supply; the poorest, when faced with having to pay for the services, may choose to use their limited resources to meet other needs that they consider more important. The same is valid for the provision of sanitation in a general sense. The application of demand-responsive approaches therefore, needs to be supplemented with activities aimed at increasing demand for services, such as education and awareness creation.

4 Approaches

4.1 Rural water supply and sanitation

In the early years of the Global Programme the focus was on development and application of appropriate technology, specifically the development and standardisation of reliable and low-cost hand pumps, village level operation and maintenance of facilities and low-cost sanitation based on the use of VIP-latrines. This expertise has been handed over to other institutions and the Group is not involved in developing or promoting specific types of technology.

The focus has gradually shifted from hardware towards the processes needed to apply and make use of technology. This includes various means to ensure participation and ownership in the communities, the linkage of water, sanitation and health education, empowering women to ensure their involvement at all stages of the process, and more recently the demand-responsive approaches to ensure commitment and ability to make projects sustainable.

The body of knowledge promoted by the Global Programme is the result of the ongoing international efforts to improve performance in the sector. This means that the advice provided by the Global Programme – as well as by the Group – at present is generally considered best practice. The question of how and where specific principles can be applied have to be resolved in each individual case. For instance, there may be ways to organise water and sanitation projects in urban areas that may not be appropriate in semi-urban squatter areas.

The Group has been progressive in promoting community based management and demand-responsive approaches, and more recently also to some extent private sector participation

To some of the client institutions some of the ideas and methods promoted by the Group may be entirely new. This does not mean, however, that they are innovative in the true sense of the word, they are generally methods and approaches that have been tested out by many actors in the sector. The contribution of the Group lies more in helping to put the items on the agenda, and putting the different approaches into a specific context, rather than promoting innovative approaches as such. The Group both provides advice on the more general policy issues and helps translating this into strategies than can be adopted at project level. At this level, the Group could have been more active in disseminating specific experience on resource enhancing techniques – such as rainwater harvesting, valuable experience of which is available in the region – and in promoting income-generating activities relating to water supply and sanitation.

The dilemma of sanitation being of central importance for improvement of health but at the same time difficult to promote in projects and programmes in the region, is often referred to. It seems that this is also generally reflected in the priorities of projects and programmes with which the Group is connected. The Group has recently increased its efforts in promoting sanitation, and taken some initiatives at national and regional levels, but in order to make an impact in this particular area there is a need for it to assume a more active and strategic role.

4.2 Urban environmental sanitation, including water supply

The Group has been looking at urban sanitation in a wider context including water supply, latrine construction, condominal and conventional sewerage, local drainage, and solid waste collection with focus on cost effective approaches.

Cost effective technical options have been identified using a strategic approach to sanitation involving stakeholder assessment of needs, affordability and technical options. The approach builds on the concept that scale is important for appropriateness and that considerable savings and more sustainable solutions can be afforded if households join in groups of households looking for benefits that accrue from larger-scale applications. On the other hand, savings can be achieved by looking at alternative solutions for specific conditions instead of trying to find a standard solution for all. This "bundling and unbundling" approach has been used, for instance, in the preparation of the Kibera Project in Nairobi.

Stakeholder participation has been the principal approach in a project in Mombasa, resulting in a changed attitude from the Municipality towards promotion and co-ordination, rather than supply, and in active participation of a range of stakeholders including community based organisations participating in problem identification, planning and decision making. This approach is also reflected in a regional Water Utility Partnership project aiming at strengthening the delivery capacity of utilities in providing services to urban poor.

Principal messages conveyed by the Group are:

- Community participation can be achieved through stakeholder participation in problem identification, planning and decision making.
- Municipalities should not act as suppliers of services but as facilitators, promoters and organisers.
- Problem analysis and needs assessment are best done together with the stakeholders using participative methods for assessment of affordability and willingness to pay.
- Costs may be recovered by cross subsidies so that also the lowest income groups can be reached.
- Awareness workshops involving NGOs and community groups are useful for identification of community based approaches.

Though stakeholder participation, participatory methods, cost recovery, and the bundling and unbundling approaches may be well known to many, they have been innovative in the contexts where they have been used by the Group.

The Group has not explored ecological sanitation possibilities such as diversion and recirculation of human waste for agriculture or urban environment management purposes. Neither has it, which will be described in Chapter 5, developed any pro-active strategy relating to integrated water resources management issues.

4.3 Participation

It is widely recognised that sustainability of water and sanitation services depends on people's capability to establish and manage services which fit the particular local circumstances and demands. This means people have to be able to identify their needs, to plan how to meet those

needs and to implement the plans they make. In other words, people must have the capacity to participate effectively in the whole cycle of water supply and sanitation activities.

Recognition of the importance of people's participation in the development of water supply and sanitation sectors has led to the use of a wide variety of participatory methods in the region. Methods used include Self-esteem, Associative strength, Resourcefulness, Action planning, and Responsibility (SARAR), Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA), Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA), Visualisation In Participatory Process (VIPP), and Participatory Hygiene and Sanitation Transformation (PHAST). Although the above methods may differ in their approaches, they all have the same aim of empowering people or communities.

It is not the mandate of the Group to develop new participatory methods or approaches. As a result the Group has concentrated on collecting information on, and promoting the different participatory methods. The participatory approaches disseminated by the Group – of which PHAST has been the cornerstone – are not new or unknown. The contribution of the Group has been to make the approaches more widely known and applied.

The Group's activities with regard to participatory approaches have consisted of collecting, analysing and disseminating information, supporting training activities, supporting regional meetings devoted to the development and promotion of methods, and production of training and promotional materials.

Available documents which were presented to the Assessment Team and discussions held with sector actors indicate that the different approaches have been effective in stimulating participation among communities and in empowering communities to take charge of development activities. Unfortunately no systematic evaluation of their effectiveness has been carried out, and it is therefore not possible to say which approaches have proved to be best practice in different situations.

4.4 Gender

There has been a growing recognition of the role of women in promoting sustainable water supply and sanitation. Thus the need to enhance the participation of women in water supply and environmental sanitation activities has gained wide acceptance. This acceptance of women participation has been accompanied by concern over the roles of other segments of the community. Best practice in this area therefore suggests a gender-sensitive approach which considers women participation in relation to other actor groups, such as men and children, with distinct stakes and roles. It is now commonly recognised in the sector that approaches which specifically involve gender considerations improve on the delivery and sustainability of services.

The Group has promoted participatory approaches which would result in effective involvement of women and at the same time incorporate gender considerations in the design, implementation and sustainability of water and sanitation projects.

In order to advance gender participation specifically, the Group has carried out, facilitated or initiated several gender related activities, including:

- Promotion of the Role of Women in Water and Environmental Sanitation Services (PROWESS).
- A regional gender workshop for Eastern and Southern Africa.

- Country gender assessments in Malawi, South Africa, Zambia, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda.

4.5 The body of knowledge promoted by the Group

The approaches that have been promoted by the Global Programme have evolved over a period of two decades since the commencement of the International Water Supply and Sanitation Decade in 1981.

This expertise is not unique to the Global Programme, but is part of a body of knowledge and experience that has been developed in the sector as a result of the activities of numerous donor organisations, government and non-government implementing organisations, universities and research institutions. The Global Programme has played an important role, but is only one of several actors that have been instrumental in developing and promoting this body of knowledge. One of the strengths of the Global Programme lies in extracting lessons from different regions as inputs to the ongoing international process to develop the body of knowledge. It may well be in the forefront in some areas.

A common conclusion, therefore, is that the advice provided by the Group is generally regarded as best practice in the sector, both in water and sanitation, and in participation and gender issues. It should be noted that since the body of knowledge promoted by the Group is not unique, but generally known to the main institutions in the sector, there may be numerous sources of the same expertise in the countries where the Group is active. The challenge therefore may be more to improve the strategic approach and the efficiency of the Group in conveying its message to the clients, than the refinement of the message itself.

5 Environmental aspects

Some of the Group's activities, notably those in urban environmental sanitation, are directly linked to protection of the environment. An improvement of sanitation facilities, for instance, reduces the risk of pollution of groundwater, and improvement of solid waste disposal or drainage creates a healthier general environment. There are also activities in which the Group is or may be engaged where there are environmental risks involved, for instance in connection with water supply from coastal aquifers where there is risk for saltwater intrusion, or when lowering of groundwater levels can result in neighbouring wells going dry.

Such direct linkages to environmental issues and problems seem to be addressed by the Group as and when they are encountered. It is done in an ad-hoc way, however, and there is no programme or preparedness for how the Group should deal pro-actively with the environmental aspects of the various activities it supports.

Consequently, promotion of environmental impact assessments does not form part of the Group's work. They are, however, carried out in several of the countries in the region, at least for most larger water projects. In some countries they are obligatory by law.

It was suggested by many respondents that the Group should have a specific environmental agenda, and a strategy for how environmental aspects should be addressed.

Neither has the Group opted to engage itself pro-actively in aspects relating to integrated water resources management. The argument is that this is a complex area into which one can not enter without considerable commitment and without appropriate competence in the Group. Considering that sustainability is a key concept in the objective of the Global Programme as well as in the approaches promoted and applied by the Group, this lack of pro-activity is worth noting. The word "sustainability" has little meaning unless the water resource itself is protected and managed in an integrated way. It is assessed that the Group could play a strategic role in promoting a more sustained management of water resources.

Considering the rapid urbanisation in the region, and the pressure this will put on the water resources in urban areas, the Group having a strategy for how to address integrated water resources management issues would be of particular importance in connection with its activities in urban environmental sanitation, which include water supply to peri-urban areas.

6 Relationships

When asked about their relationship to the Group, responses from stakeholders in countries visited by the Assessment Team, ranged from government ministries who were working closely with the Country Sector Advisors and other staff members of the Group, to some donors and NGOs who had no relationship. Many saw the Group as a donor or the World Bank, in some cases even respondents who have established a working relationship with the Group referred to them as “the Bank”. The Group has also been referred to as the regional office of the World Bank in Nairobi. No one asked could describe the Group’s mandate or the range of services which it could provide. When informed by the Assessment Team of what the Group offered, many stakeholders welcomed the concept of a regional water and sanitation group and stated that they would try using their services in the future. Two respondents stated that in the past, one in 1994 and another in 1997, they had contacted the Group for assistance but received no reply. Responses continued to vary when bilateral donors were asked how the Group related to their specific country projects. With the clear exception of CIDA, most stated they had little or no relationship and some were even unaware of the Group’s existence.

When the issue of a balance between regional activities and country specific activities was examined, it was not possible for the Assessment Team to make a judgement. Certainly the Group has placed the emphasis heavily on the country programmes and indeed some respondents have complained that the Group’s operations are country-driven to the detriment of the regional perspective. Without a clear mandate having been stated for the Group (see Chapter 8) it is impossible to determine what an appropriate balance would be.

The Group has a well established and appropriate working relationship with the two International Training Network (ITN) institutions for water and sanitation, one in Kenya (NETWAS) and the other in Zimbabwe (IWSD). Relationships have also been developed with the recently established NETWAS in Uganda. The Group provides these institutions with experts to deliver courses, and learning materials for course participants.

Yet the Group has no relationship with the African Medical and Research Foundation which is involved in similar, albeit more limited, activities throughout Eastern and Southern Africa. This is an indication that the Group may not be effective in promoting sector co-ordination at the regional level...

In some countries sector co-ordination amongst stakeholders is already well established and the Country Sector Advisor simply participates and contributes as appropriately. In other countries the Country Sector Advisor and other Group staff are required to facilitate the establishment of a forum for sector co-ordination.

7 Impact

The Group has only recently developed a monitoring system for assessing its achievements. As has been described in Chapter 2, however, even with the existing monitoring system it is difficult to assess comprehensively what the Group has actually produced in terms of outputs, let alone the actual impact the work has had. The following assessment is therefore limited to summarising the information received from the respondents during the country visits, from the Group, and at the Regional Programme Advisory Committee Meeting in Nairobi.

7.1 Policy

In Tanzania and to some extent also in Uganda, the inputs from the Group has had a substantial and positive impact on policy and strategy development. The Group has been able to contribute with relevant professional and material support to processes that have had support and momentum, both at political and departmental levels. The contribution of the Group to these processes, both in terms of contents and facilitation, is appreciated by many of their counterparts.

The contribution of the Group to policy development in Kenya has been marginal, despite its many years of presence in the country, and at the same time as a bilateral donor – Sida – is quoted to have had substantial impact on policy in the sector. The Group has had some impact on coordination in the rural water supply and sanitation sector through its support to the Working Group on rural water supply and sanitation.

In Malawi and Mozambique the Group has only within the past year renewed efforts, with the establishment of Country Sector Advisors. Therefore it is too early to assess the possible impact.

7.2 Investment programmes

There are cases where there has been an impact of the Group's work in facilitating World Bank investment programmes, for instance in Tanzania where the Group has been able to facilitate programme preparation procedures, and in Rwanda where the actual investment process was speeded up by the Group.

The Group has also had an opportunity to influence the contents of on-going and planned World Bank projects in Uganda and Tanzania through participation in project preparation and supervision missions. It is a general opinion among respondents in Tanzania, that the Group has had a substantial influence on the projects where it has been involved, and that this has impacted the ability of the programmes to develop sustainable water supply and sanitation facilities.

With regard to NGOs and donors other than the World Bank, and with the exception of CIDA with whom the Group has cooperated in the identification of new water projects in Malawi and Mozambique, it is clear that the impact on their programmes is generally limited. An exception to this is the case of NETWAS and IWSD where the rather close relationship has strengthened the capacity of these institutions.

7.3 Learning

The Group responds to demand for knowledge from specific countries through the facilitation of high quality workshops, conduct of study tours, the provision of learning materials and the provision of technical assistance. With regard to regional activities to promote participatory and gender-sensitive approaches, it is assessed – based on the number of meetings, workshops and seminars devoted to such issues, and the number of respondents who have referred to taking part in such events – that the Group has contributed to a wider use of such approaches in the region. However, both the country-level and regional activities are usually “one off” activities with little follow-up by the Group.

There are no structured dissemination plans for individual activities nor does the Group have a clear communications and dissemination policy or strategy. Respondents mentioned that many of the publications disseminated by the Group are quite academic in nature and rather large in size which indicates a restricted audience, and a need to clarify at what level documentation is targeted. The Group has recently established a position of communication specialist who works with a documentation assistant at the Nairobi office. Perhaps the most disquieting aspect of knowledge sharing which the Assessment Team discovered was the lack of a regional data base of sector contacts at the Nairobi office and a lack of a regional network of individuals and organisations active in the water and sanitation sector in Eastern and Southern Africa.

The Group does not have an efficient mechanism to disseminate information, such as their new “Field Note” publications, to a larger regional network. The Group currently relies on their Country Sector Advisors to do most of the dissemination on an ad hoc basis in the countries where the Country Sector Advisors are present. Often dissemination is limited to the participant list of the related workshop. Several respondents in different countries mentioned that the group is ideally placed to assist the countries to gather their lessons learned and disseminate them to other countries but were not aware that the Group is doing so.

Group staff participate in supervisory missions of World Bank projects, and inception missions of CIDA projects. For these activities it may be more appropriate to build capacity in the local private sector to have the Group identify local consultants to be involved in such missions. The Group would then receive lessons and influence the projects through local resources, maintaining their strategic stance.

It appears that the Group is not effective in achieving one of its main objectives. These findings are not new but were mentioned in the 1991 and 1996 evaluations as well as at meetings of the Regional Program Advisory Committee. At the 1999 Regional Program Advisory Committee meeting, a brainstorming session was held to generate ideas on how to better disseminate knowledge; this is an unexpected activity at this stage of the Group’s operations. The Group has had difficulty learning from its experiences.

8 Organisational issues

The most striking observation regarding the Group as an organisation is that it does not have a clearly defined mandate to guide programming or which is understood by each member of the organisation, their clients or other stakeholders involved in the water and sanitation sector in Eastern and Southern Africa. There is no mission statement for the Group and no two employees who describe the same mandate for the Group. Some point to the Global Programme mission statement as their own while others talk of country-level responsibilities where programming priorities are set based on opportunities that present themselves. Documentation such as work plans, business plans and progress reports are not consistent when presenting objectives and often tend to confuse rather than clarify the Group's operations. As a result the Group does not adequately play its role at a strategic, regional level but is driven by conflicting, regionally uncoordinated, and in some cases inappropriate country-level demands. Despite recommendations from the 1991 and 1996 evaluations and the meeting of the Regional Program Advisory Committee in 1997, to clarify its mandate and focus activities, the Group has failed to do this, being guided by multiple objectives that appear to confound rather than consolidate the use of resources.

Several key respondents in the region point to the Group's role in assisting in policy development as being potentially the most important strategic function of the Group.

Staffing levels, either numbers or types of skills, are difficult to evaluate without a clear mandate having been specified for the organisation. The existing staff are hard working, competent and dedicated, as well as open to change. The Group has participated in annual retreats, instituted and organised by the Director, which focus on team-building and have resulted in the establishment of an atmosphere of trust within the staff and management, and the delegation of authority. The Director exhibits a participatory management style, has been described as energetic, visionary, and offering a lot of ideas, although at times in an unfocussed fashion.

The role of the Group has evolved since its inception, from a focus on appropriate technology to community based management and demand-responsive approaches, and more recently to the promotion of private sector participation. This indicates a change in staff expertise is required to correspond with this evolution. Whether current staffing represents the appropriate complement should be examined by the Group. Similarly, it is difficult to determine whether they are always involved in appropriate activities. Without a strategic plan in place it is not possible to comment on the effectiveness of the current organisational structure. Suffice it to say that some form of regional office with representatives – Country Sector Advisors – at the country level appears appropriate. Several respondents observed that in order to increase knowledge of the Groups activities in the region and regional ownership, attachments of individuals from sector stakeholder organisations could be provided at the Nairobi office.

The current director is moving the Group more towards the World Bank particularly in its administrative systems with several employees actually being World Bank employees with Bank benefits including training and professional development opportunities and the Bank's performance appraisal system. While most employees, particularly the administrative staff, welcome this move on a personal level, some consider it detrimental for programming and their relationship to their clients and other stakeholders as the bank is often seen in a negative light of being pushy, unresponsive to local needs, and overly bureaucratic.

As mentioned elsewhere in this report, many already see the Group as synonymous with the World Bank. Being associated with the World Bank – but not part of – does provide the Group with leverage in their work. Actually becoming part of the Bank may remove this leverage. The Global Programme does influence programming in the various regional offices – as it should – however, the degree of influence is critical for each regional office to have the freedom to address the unique needs of each regional programme.

The Assessment Team was informed that at the Global Program Management Team meeting in Washington in February 1999, the Group was told to focus on the three countries where the World Bank is most active in order to support Bank projects, that is Ethiopia, Tanzania and Mozambique. It is unclear as to what effect this will have on the interests of the bilateral donors funding the Group, as well as its clients in the other countries.

The Country Sector Advisors are producing good quality products and participate in activities at a variety of levels. Their terms of reference are country specific, developed by the Group in conjunction with the host ministry. The individual work plans reflect a scattering of responses to a variety of client demands which may not necessarily address any strategic regional imperative of the Group. Some respondents have suggested that the Country Sector Advisors are too involved in project implementation thus neglecting their higher level sector advisory roles. The issue of the Country Sector Advisor role is expected to be discussed at the Group's 1999 retreat. However, without a strategic plan for the Group, the Country Sector Advisor role cannot be adequately assessed.

Currently resources are adequate for the Group to carry out its activities. However, the funding agreements with Norway and Sweden expire at the end of 1999. This makes the Group vulnerable. Administrative and management costs for the programme are high at about 21.5 per cent – rule-of-thumb suggests an appropriate level is between 13 and 15 per cent (see Annex 8). The costs of office facilities appear to be appropriate with the Group paying lower than average for Nairobi rent. Costs for workshops and other programming events are generally appropriate and often co-funded by ministries or donors. However, there is an impression of some respondents that the costs in terms of staff time in organising events and the subsequent preparation of event documents is very high. Staff travel often in their work which has lead several respondents to complain of their availability for advisory services. In general, considering time and cost, the information provided indicates that the matter of cost-efficiency should be a concern for the Group.

The Regional Program Advisory Committee is an appropriate mechanism for funding agencies and other stakeholders to provide the Group with policy level advice, and forms an integral part of a programme monitoring system. However, the Group has been selective in implementing recommendations of its Advisory Committee while ignoring some of the identified critical organisational needs such as the need to plan strategically, develop a Logical Framework Analysis, and report semi-annually.

The Group currently reports to the Global Programme and to its various donors annually. However, the reporting is not consistent or systematic and confuses activities with results. In short, reporting is inadequate and does not allow for effective programme monitoring. The membership in the Regional Program Advisory Committee weighs heavily on public sector participation. It was indicated by some respondents that more NGO participation would benefit the Committee.

The Program Advisory Committee is an essential forum for donors to receive information and provide input to the Global Programme, which will have a corresponding effect on the activities of the Group.

9 Sustainability

Water and sanitation actors with whom the Group has a substantial co-operation in the region generally appreciate the presence of the Group and its activities, and there is substantial participation of regional stakeholders through the Regional Program Advisory Committee. The possibility of regional “ownership” in terms of more substantial contributions from regional stakeholders, however, is limited. Firstly, it is the opinion of most stakeholders, that such an ownership would weaken the advocacy position of the Group. Secondly, although co-funding already takes place – but to a very limited extent, in connection with for instance workshops – substantial financial contributions from governments and client institutions in the region seems unrealistic.

The Global Programme has evolved from a situation where most of the funds came from UNDP and a small share from bilateral donors – to a present reversed situation where bilateral donors provide most of the funding. The reliance on several donors instead of one major source may make the Global Programme less vulnerable in financial terms. For the Group the situation is at present more volatile. In 1998, about 82 per cent of the funds came from four bilateral donors, i.e. Norway, Sweden, Canada and Belgium (see Table 2). UNDP provided 13 per cent of the budget. Norway and Sweden which provide about 40 per cent of the budget have committed funds only to the end of 1999. At present, the budget for 2000 – 2002 has a deficit on committed funds of about 50 per cent. This situation has a bearing on the sustainability of the Group’s activities. The Global Programme being part of the Global Water Partnership may be an important factor for the Group being able to attract donor funding. However, future support to the Group will depend on its efficiency and ability to deliver – and on the relevance of its contributions.

Table 2 Funding of the Group.

		1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Bilateral Agencies							
Canada	(blank)	267 056	147 149			77 806	400 073
Denmark	TF020835	155 551	185 825	212 868	268 000		1 322
Finland	(blank)	106 908	114 960	133 900			
Germany	(blank)	13 328	2 975		32 000		
Norway	(blank)	77 584	234 830	40 750	309 000	356 223	438 255
Sweden	TF026354/5	147 527	115 733	189 707	381 167	115 242	320 359
Switzerland	TF023745	240 978	280 344	318 676	135 000	149 669	1 405
Belgium	TF020954					311 951	375 903
Netherlands	TF020953					567 462	42 015
Subtotal, Bilateral		1 008 932	1 081 816	895 901	1 125 167	1 578 353	1 579 332
UNDP							
Country Projects	ETH/90/010	265 700	42 000				204 092
	NIR/87/011	282 800	156 100				
	UGA/92/001	199 700	386 600	220 400		12 768	
	ZIM/88/006	146 500	105 900				
	RAF/92/007					778	26 941
	INT/92/001					110 411	16 654
Interregional	(blank)	864 600	550 600	137 000			
Regional Africa	(blank)	75 842	110 121	330 000	128 400		
Subtotal, UNDP		1 835 142	1 351 321	687 400	128 400	123 957	247 687
World Bank - BB		43 500	69 400		31 000	70 285	55 324
GRAND TOTAL		2 887 574	2 502 537	1 583	1 284 567	1 772 595	1 882 343

10 Conclusions and recommendations

10.1 Conclusions

The Assessment Team arrives at the following conclusions:

1. The presence of the UNDP/World Bank Water and Sanitation Program in the sector over a period of two decades, and particularly the presence of the Regional Water and Sanitation Group for Eastern and Southern Africa in the region in the more recent years has made the Group a source of support to ministries, professionals, government and non-government organisations, and projects, particularly in the participating countries.
2. Promoting water and sanitation in urban and rural areas in the ten countries covered by the Group, is as relevant today as in the past. This is because of the governments' commitment to the task, the intolerable conditions in which the majority of the population live, and the fact that the situation has deteriorated during the last ten years despite numerous development interventions, as a result of population increase.
3. The Group has produced professional contributions in the countries where it has been active, depending on the scope and duration of involvement and the commitment and involvement of governments and client institutions. The contributions have essentially been towards making qualitative changes in government policy and strategy in the sector, in planned and on-going projects, and in extracting experience from such projects and disseminating lessons of best practice. The Group has also played a role in facilitating and influencing World Bank investment programmes.
4. In countries where the Group has had a long presence and where certain macro-level conditions have been favourable, the Group has been able to establish good and productive partnerships with national client institutions and other stakeholders. The Group has also established good and productive cooperation with the Network for Water and Sanitation International in Kenya and with the Institute of Water and Sanitation Development in Zimbabwe.
5. The Group is little known or even unknown to some important actors in the region, including some NGOs and donors which it would serve the Group well to be better linked with. The Group is often also confused with the World Bank as such. This points to the need to improve networking and information, relevant actors should be aware of the Group, and of its mandate and activities.
6. The objectives – as interpreted by the Assessment Team – and activities of the Group, are considered individually relevant with regard to the needs of the target groups and to present policies. However, since the relative importance of each objective and of the activities aiming at fulfilling the different objectives, has not been clearly defined, the relevance of the Group's operations in a narrower organisational sense can be questioned.

7. The Group's approach is explorative rather than strategic in the sense that it is not guided by a clearly defined objective but is consistently seeking opportunities for involvement where it can be found. As a result, the operations lack focus, and resources are spread thinly on an uncoordinated variety of activities in different fields, several countries, at different institutional levels, and at different stages of project cycles. This raises doubt about the effectiveness of the approach, in producing intended outputs.
8. Whereas the Group's linkage at project level would be necessary in its attempts to extract lessons from ongoing activities, it may be questioned whether it is a cost-effective use of resources to be directly involved in design and programming at project level. The potential strength of the Group lies in its ability to influence at a policy and strategic level in relation to regional and national institutions.
9. The learning inputs and processes developed and promoted by the Group could be more productive if they were directly linked to supporting policy and strategy development. Learning and disseminating lessons in best practices is not being carried out in a systematic manner. In defining a coherent and target-oriented learning strategy, it may be beneficial to consider scaling down and focussing; what others are already doing could be utilised to a larger extent. The Group should not organise or coordinate pilot and demonstration activities but limit their role to extracting lessons from ongoing activities.
10. The advice provided by the Group is generally regarded as best practice in the sector. The advice is not unique, but part of a body of knowledge known to the main institutions in the sector. Since there are many sources of this information, the challenge is to improve the Group's efficiency in conveying the message, rather than refining the message itself.
11. Although the relation of the Group's work to environmental and integrated water resources management issues is clear, and although the Group could play an important role in promoting that such issues be considered in a systematic way in the sector, the Group does not have a strategy for how to incorporate these issues in its operations.
12. For a number of reasons, the balance between sanitation and water supply in combined water supply and sanitation programmes is commonly in favour of the water supply component, which has a negative impact on the effectiveness of the programmes in improving health. This imbalance, which is general for combined programmes in the region, is reflected also in projects and programmes in which the Group is actually involved.
13. A review of the progress of the Group's activities in 1998, and parts of those in 1997, showed that more than half of the planned activities were delayed or cancelled as a result of circumstances beyond the control of the Group such as changing policies, lacking commitment, projects being suspended, and war. This raises doubt about the realism and cost-effectiveness of the approach chosen by the Group. The high administration cost, 21.5%, also indicates that cost-effectiveness should be a concern for the Group.
14. Despite recommendations by the evaluations in 1991 and 1996, and by the Regional Program Advisory Committee in 1997, to clarify its mandate and focus activities accordingly, the Group has failed to do this and is guided by multiple objectives that seem to confound rather than consolidate the use of resources.

15. The Group has not had a management information system to evaluate progress against work plans, and has not performed regular reviews to this effect. Only recently, as a result of a recommendation in the Regional Program Advisory Committee in 1997, has an attempt to introduce a system of work plans and progress reports been made. However, the reporting is still unsystematic, does not accurately reflect the activities of the Group, and gives a distorted and exaggerated picture of achievements.
16. The evolution of the Group's role from promotion of appropriate technology to community based management and demand-responsive approaches and, more recently, to the promotion of private sector participation, has implications on the required staff expertise. It can be argued that the present staffing pattern does not reflect this change of role. This is particularly evident with regard to private sector participation, which implies a need for a change of staffing pattern. Alternatively, it could be considered whether issues related to private sector participation should be dealt with by other, better equipped, organisations.
17. Co-funding of the Group from countries with which it cooperates does take place, but to a very limited extent, and substantial financial contributions from governments and client institutions in the region seems unrealistic. Most of the funding for the Group comes from bilateral donors, and a large part of the present funding expires by the end of this year. Future financial sustainability of the Group will depend to a large extent on the Group's ability to increase its efficiency and accountability.
18. In summary, based on the information collected and analyses made, and taking into consideration the opinions of key stakeholders, the Assessment Team concludes that the Group is one of the organisations in the region that have a role to play in promoting sustained water and sanitation services for the poor. However, the role of the Group still has to be properly delineated and specified, and the necessary management decisions taken accordingly.

10.2 Recommendations

The Assessment Team makes the following recommendations:

1. The activities of the Group should be guided by a strategy that clearly states its role and the limits to its involvement in the sector. Within this framework there should be flexibility to respond to needs as they arise.
2. To this effect, and taking into due consideration the conclusions of the present assessment, the Group should develop a strategic plan that clearly defines a realistic goal for its operations, in order to improve management and maximise its strategic impact. This should be facilitated by experts in organisational development.
3. With reference to the strategic plan, the Group should clarify its scope of involvement in different countries, its modes of operation, and precisely define the role of the Nairobi office and the Country Sector Advisors, with a view to make the most cost-effective use of resources.
4. The Group should develop and implement a management system which allows it to manage resources effectively and improve accountability of operation. The system should allow regular assessment of progress against plans. Review of performance should be done semi-annually.

5. To strengthen its role in networking; to facilitate learning and dissemination of lessons; and to strengthen ownership among key institutions at the national and regional levels, the Group should develop (1) a marketing strategy to promote their services, (2) a dissemination policy and strategy; and (3) a data base of individuals and organisations involved in the water and sanitation sector in Eastern and Southern Africa.
6. Donors should review the strategic plan to determine the mode and extent of their future involvement in, and funding of the Group.

Annex 1

Department for Natural Resources and
the Environment

1999-01-15

Bengt Johansson

Diarienummer

NATUR-1997-0221

Terms of Reference for a Joint Assessment of the support to the Regional Water and Sanitation Group for East and Southern Africa

1. Background

The Regional Water and Sanitation Group for East and Southern Africa of the UNDP/WB Water and Sanitation Program, RWSG-ESA, involvement in the rural water and sanitation sector has evolved from the development of hand pump technology in the 80' to building capacity for sustainable rural water supply in the 90's.

The UNDP/WB Water and Sanitation Programme has decided to attach special importance to three key programme themes namely;

- Rural Water Supply and Sanitation
- Urban Environmental Sanitation
- Participation and Gender

The reason for bilateral donors to support the Programme is mainly its ability to pool resources for innovative work in the sector, its strength in working with sector policy as well as its ability to influence large investment projects, and then in particular the World Bank funded projects.

In 1996 a project proposal for 1997–99 was developed and presented to the donors (dated June 1996). The RWSG-ESA supports both regional and country-level activities. During the period 1997–99 it is envisaged that support will be given to Ethiopia, Eritrea, Kenya, Uganda, Zimbabwe, Tanzania, Malawi, and Lesotho.

Sida has supported the RWSG-ESA since 1993 through the funding of one post at the office in Nairobi. Totally MSEK 3.9 was disbursed between 1993 and 1996. For the period 1997–99 Sida has decided to contribute with MSEK 9.0 as core funding for activities and staff at the RWSG-ESA.

In addition to the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden, bilateral funds have also been provided by Belgium and Canada.

The UNDP/WB Water and Sanitation Programme presents annual work plans at a Programme Advisory Committee meeting where the main stake holders are invited. The regional groups have also regional stake holders meetings to discuss the work plans. However the donors have not been involved in details about operational issues and follow-up.

2. Reason for the Assessment

The RWSG-ESA has been supported through Trust Fund agreements with the World Bank by different donors.

No detailed independent review or evaluation of the RWSG-ESA has so far been carried out. This Assessment aims at providing information to the donors on the relevance and efficiency of the work carried out by RWSG-ESA. It will further provide recommendations on the rationale for future support beyond the present funding period.

This document forms the Terms of Reference for such an Assessment.

3. Scope and focus of the Assessment

The main objectives of the Assessment is to assess the relevance and achievement of the work carried out by the Regional Water and Sanitation Group for East and Southern Africa. Based on the above, recommendations shall be made on measures to be taken for the remaining project period as well as comments on and justification of continued support beyond the present project period.

The consultant shall concentrate, but not necessarily be limited to, the following issues;

A. Past performance

- a) Assess the achievements of the RWSG-ESA since 1993 in relation to agreed objectives and plans.
- b) Assess the management structure of the RWSG-ESA and the costs of staff, office facilities, workshops etc. and the administrative costs.
- c) Assess the relevance of the work performed by RWSG-ESA in relation to the needs of the target group and the overall policies in the sector.
- d) Assess the efficiency in the work performed by the RWSG-ESA, including its administrative costs.
- e) Assess the comparative advantage of the RWSG-ESA in relation to other structures as well as in relation to bilateral programmes and projects.
- f) Comment on the approach for involvement of donors and other partners in the Programme Advisory Committee and other structures.
- g) Assess how activities of the RWSG and results are integrated in and used by regional, national and local authorities.
- h) Assess the regional / local ownership of the RWSG-ESA including the potential for regional/local co-funding of the group.
- i) Assess the balance between regional- and country level activities and the mechanism for structural learning between different countries as well as learning from other actors experiences. This assessment shall also include comments on the channel and means for sharing of experiences.
- j) Assess the relationship with other actors who have a sector support role in the region, particularly the ITN-centers, including NETWAS (Kenya) and IWSD (Zimbabwe).
- k) Assess in general how environmental impact assessments are applied and mainstreamed into the work carried out by the RWSG-ESA.

- l) Assess the approach for the inclusion of environmental aspects in the activities supported including if there exists a policy for Environmental Impact Assessment and if the consequences for the quality and quantity of the water resources are considered.
- m) Assess the sustainability of the activities supported by the RWSG-ESA as well as the sustainability of the funding of the RWSG-ESA itself.
- n) Assess the RWSG-ESA's influence on the approaches applied in projects funded by the World Bank and other large actors e.g. if the projects funded by those large actors are more appropriate, sustainable and geared towards the low income groups in the different countries.
- o) Assess the approach applied in the work with the three special key programme themes including:
 - Rural Water and Sanitation – innovative approaches e.g. relation to sustainability of technology (i.e. rainwater harvesting, improvement of traditional wells etc.), relation to income generation activities and cost sharing.
 - Urban Environmental Sanitation (UES) – innovative approaches in different area such as health, poverty reduction and environmental issues. The latter should include how the RWSG-ESA has applied the new thinking in ecological sanitation based on diversion and recirculation of human waste to (urban)agriculture and how experiences in other parts of the world are tested and considered in policies and projects supported by RWSG-ESA. The relationship between activities in UES and national strategies and other activities in the sector.
 - Participation and Gender – innovative approaches e.g. how participation and gender strategies have been mainstreamed into the work supported by the RWSG-ESA.

B. Recommendations

- a) Give recommendation on possible need for revision of the work plans, management structure of the RWSG-ESA etc. during the remaining project period.
- b) Give recommendations on the approach, management, reporting etc. for donor involvement in the planning and monitoring of the RWSG-ESA.
- c) Give recommendations to the donors on possible continued funding of the RWSG-ESA beyond the present funding period including the approach to the planning and preparation, donor co-ordination etc. of such support.

4. Methodology and time schedule

The Assessment shall include the work performed by the RWSG-ESA between 1993 and present.

The Assessment shall include a gender perspective i.e. analysis made, statistics and results presented should, when possible, consider impact and consequences for men and women and their respective roles.

The Assessment shall be based on the Logical Framework Approach, LFA, in its analysis of results and achievements.

The Assessment will be carried out in the beginning of 1999, tentatively in February. It is envisaged that field visits are undertaken during approximately three weeks in Eastern Africa. At least

three countries shall be visited during the Assessment. The selection of the countries shall be made in close co-operation with the manager of the RWSG-ESA in Nairobi. The visit to the different countries shall include visits to field projects and activities, to relevant ministries, NGOs and other relevant stake holders in the sector, including the World Bank representations.

5. Consultant

The Assessment shall be carried out by a team of two international consultants and possible one or two local consultants (hereinafter called the Consultant) covering relevant technical, economical, social and organisational aspects. The Consultant shall work in the English language and have knowledge of the region and its characteristics.

One of the members of the consultant team shall be appointed as a team leader and will be responsible for the elaboration of a joint report from the Assessment.

6. Reporting

The report is to be the product and responsibility of the different team members, each one contributing certain sections as agreed within the team and in addition, offering professional views on all sections of the report.

The team leader shall be responsible for the planning and co-ordination of the mission, the distribution of work and responsibilities among the team members and the finalisation and presentation of the report to the donors.

Draft written conclusions shall be presented to and discussed with representatives of the donors prior to the departure from the region. It is envisaged that such a presentation will be made in Nairobi.

The Consultant shall, to the involved donors, present a Draft Report of no more than 25 pages, excluding annexes, containing a summary of 1–2 pages, in English in 3 copies not later than two weeks after finalising the field-visits. The Consultant shall be prepared to discuss the Draft Report at a joint meeting with interested donors.

The Consultant shall present a Final Report to the donors in 3 copies not later than two weeks after receiving the donors comments on the Draft Report.

All reports shall be written in the English language.

Annex 2

Mission programme

- 22.2 Start of mission in Nairobi. Internal Assessment Team meetings and meeting with the Group.
- 23.2 Meetings in Nairobi continued.
- 24.2 Departure southern detachment (Samset, Titus and Brandberg) for Lilongwe, northern detachment (Nilsson, Mujwahuzi) meetings with regional and Kenya sector representatives and departure for Dar es Salaam.
- 25.2 Meetings with sector representatives.
- 26.2 Meetings continued.
- 27.2 Meetings continued.
- 28.2 Meetings continued, northern detachment departure for Nairobi.
- 1.3 Southern detachment (Titus and Brandberg) departure for Maputo, Samset in Lilongwe, northern detachment participation in Regional Program Advisory Committee
- 2.3 Southern detachment meetings with sector representatives in Maputo, Samset departure for Nairobi, northern detachment continued participation in Regional Program Advisory Committee.
- 3.3 Southern detachment meetings continued, Samset meetings with sector representatives and the Group in Nairobi, northern detachment departure for Kampala and meetings with sector representatives.
- 4.3 Meetings continued, southern detachment departure for Nairobi.
- 5.3 Meetings continued, entire Team returns to Nairobi.
- 6.3 Internal Assessment Team meetings and report writing
- 7.3 Internal meetings and report writing continued.
- 8.3 Meetings with the Group and internal meetings and report writing continued.
- 9.3 Internal meetings and de-briefing meeting at the Swedish Embassy. End of mission.

Annex 3

Persons interviewed

RWSG-ESA

Jean H. Doyen, Regional Manager
Tore Lium, Senior Technical Specialist
Mukami Kariuki, Urban Development Specialist
Ato F. Brown, Sanitation Specialist
Andrew Makokha, Water and Sanitation Planner
Piet Klop, Water Resource Management Consultant
Wambui Gichuri, Economist/Country Sector Advisor (Kenya)
Rose Lidonde, Community Development Specialist
Brazille Musumba, Communication Specialist
Paulo Oscar Monteiro, Country Sector Advisor – Mozambique
Chikusa Chimwemwe, Country Sector Advisor – Malawi
Aimable Uwizeye, Country Sector Advisor – Rwanda
Chimwanga Maseka, Country Sector Advisor – Zambia
Belete Muluneh, Country Sector Advisor – Ethiopia

Country visits

Kenya

David N. Stower, Senior Deputy Director of Water Development, Ministry of Water Resources
Lars Karlén, Sida Programme Coordinator, Ministry of Water Resources
Friedrich Fahrlander, GTZ Project Advisor, Kenya Water Institute
Anders Karlsson, Councillor, Swedish Embassy
Alex Tameno, Programme Officer, Swedish Embassy
Islama Shah, Coordinator for technical assistance, Swiss Development Cooperation
Rolf Winberg, Water Advisor, RELMA
Matthew N. Kariuki, Executive Director, NETWAS
Patrick M. N. Nginya, Programme Co-ordinator, NETWAS
Erik Nordberg, Medical Director, AMREF
Gerald Rukunga, Head of Water and Environmental Sanitation, AMREF
Sue Cavanna, Co-ordinator, Maji na Ufasani
Mohamad, Engineer, Howard Humphreys Kenya Ltd.

Malawi

Owen Kankulungo – Controller of Water Services, Ministry of Water Development
Fabiano Kwaule, Borehole Maintenance Coordinator, Ministry of Water Development
Mathew Magombo, Chief Health Inspector, Ministry of Health
Mary Shawa, Deputy Director of Women Affairs, Ministry of Women Youth and Community Services

Linda Mializi, Director, National Water Development Project
Denise Beaulieu, Tram leader, CIDA Project Design Group
David N Bethune, Project Engineer, CIDA Project Design Group
Nameth Ilah, Adviser, institutional aspects, CIDA Project Design Group
Sarah Horrocs, Hydrogeologist, CIDA Project Design Group
Suzan E. Smith, Adviser health aspects, CIDA Project Design Group
Allan Chintedza – Program Officer UNDP
Kabuka Banda – WES Program Officer UNICEF
Tetsuo Seki, Deputy Resident Representative, JICA
Charles Changaya – Program manager, Save the Children Fund-UK, Malawi
Vincent Moyo, Regional manager-Centre, World Vision
Kaman Kariuki, Principal Consultant, Manjoo Consulting Centre
A.K.G. Shaba, Sales Manager, Brown and Klapperton

Mozambique

Nelson Beete, Acting National Director of Water, Ministry of Public Works and Housing
Carlos Noa Laisse, Director, National Low Cost Sanitation Programme, Ministry of Public Works and Housing
Julião Alferes, Senior Project Engineer, National Water Development Project
Derrick Owen Ikin, Head of DNA /Swiss Development Cooperation, Institutional Development Programme
Manuel Turnhofer Project Engineer, DNA /Swiss Development Cooperation, Institutional Development Programme
Kes Metselaar, First secretary, Embassy of the Netherlands
Claudette Lavalloé, Social Sector Adviser, CIDA-Maputo
Dermot Carty, Project Officer WES, UNICEF-Maputo
Patrick Sayer, Deputy Director Program, CARE International, Mozambique

Tanzania

Christopher Sayi, Director, Rural Water Supply and Sanitation, Ministry of Water
Baltazar Njau, Director, Urban Water Supply and Sewerage, Ministry of Water
Gabriel Lwakabare, Acting Head, Operations and Maintenance, Rural Water Supply and Sanitation, Ministry of Water
Naomi Lupino, National Project Coordinator, Water Sector Coordination, Ministry of Water
Alex Kaaya, Acting Head, Operations (Urban), Ministry of Water
Arcadi Mutalemwa, Director General, DAWASA
J. M. Kirango, Head, Dar es Salaam Waste Management Department
Barney I. S. Laseko, Portfolio Management Specialist, World Bank Resident Mission
Lennart Bondesson, Sida, Swedish Embassy
Melvin Woodhouse, Consultant, UNICEF
Rebecca Budimu, Project Officer, UNICEF
A. Shantidevi, UNICEF
Reinhart Koschel, Project Coordinator, GTZ
Annelies Leemans, Project Coordinator, Maji/Danida Rural Water Supply Project

Uganda

Patrick Kahangire, Director, Directorate of Water Development

Ian Arebahona, Co-ordinator, Water and Environmental Sanitation Programme, Directorate of Water Development

Aaron Kabirizi, Senior Engineer/Drilling, Directorate of Water Development

Ephraim Kisembo, Coordinator, Small Towns Water and Sanitation Project, Directorate of Water Development

Joseph Eyatu-Oriono, D:y Project Co-ordinator and Procurement Officer, Small Towns Water and Sanitation Project, Directorate of Water Development

Tom K. Mwebese, Asst. Commissioner for Environmental Health, Environment Health Division, Ministry of Health

William Fellows, Officer in charge, Water and Environmental Sanitation Programme, UNICEF

John Odolon, Senior Programme Officer, NETWAS

James Tumuine, Associate Professor, Makerere University

Ayub Lutori, Councillor, Local Council III, Kampala

Paul Lukumbira Kiabi, Chairperson, Local Council II, Kampala

Mohamed Kyagera, Chairman, Katwe Allied Progressive Association

Other persons interviewed

Bengt Johansson, Head of Department, Sida, Stockholm

Eva Stephansson, Programme Officer, Sida, Stockholm

Mona Gleditch, Special Advisor, NORAD, Oslo

Wendy Miller, Senior Development Officer, CIDA, Ottawa

Krystyna Dunska, Water Specialist, CIDA, Ottawa

Melinda Kelly, Development Officer, CIDA, Ottawa

Len Abrams, Water Policy Africa/LJA Development Services, Johannesburg (by phone)

Ingvar Andersson, UNICEF, New York

Brendan Doyle, Senior Regional Advisor, Sanitation and Hygiene Policy and Programming, UNICEF, Harare

Wendy Quarry, Consultant, Cowater International, Ottawa.

Maferima Toure, Deputy Director, WUP Programme, UADE, Abidjan (by phone)

Paul Taylor, Consultant, Harare

Anthony Waterkeyn, Consultant, Harare (by phone)

Annex 4

List of acronyms and abbreviations

CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
ITN	International Training Network
IWSD	Institute of Water and Sanitation Development, Harare
NETWAS	Network for Water and Sanitation International, Nairobi
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
PHAST	Participatory Hygiene and Sanitation Transformation
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
PROWESS	Promotion of the Role of Women in Water and Environmental Sanitation Services
RRA	Rapid Rural Appraisal
RWSG-ESA	Regional Water and Sanitation Group for Eastern and Southern Africa
SARAR	Self-esteem, Associative strength, Resourcefulness, Active planning, and Responsibility
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
VIP (latrine)	Ventilated Improved Pit (latrine)
VIPP	Visualisation In Participatory Process

Annex 5

Country overviews of major outputs, prepared by RWSG-ESA

MALAWI

	Outputs	Effects
Policy Support	<p>CLC Workshops Zimbabwe (1994) – Sector Coordination; Entebbe (1995) – Community water Supply; Magneteto (1997) – Demand Responsive Approaches Short term strategy for NWDPs RWSS component Support to the NWDP Implementation Manual Workshop Support to the operations of the CWS Working Group</p>	<p>Acceptance and understanding of the DRA Concept (MWD, MWYCD, UNICEF) DRA Concepts Operationalized (MWD, NWDP, MASAF, NGOs) Improved Sector Coordination (starting) (MWD, NGOs, ESAs)</p>
Investment Support	<p>Borehole rehabilitation Project Karonga handpump testing Project Pretoria Gender Workshop (1997) COMWASH preparation Workshop and Situation Analysis (1998)</p>	<p>(MWD, UNDP) (MWD, DANIDA) Gender Assessments (MWD, UNICEF, MWYCD) (MWD, CIDA)</p>
Learning	<p>Direct action handpump (93–94) Study tours, CWS (1994) and rural sanitation (1994&1996) M&E Training (1997) Support to Zomba NGO sector Forum (ongoing from 97) Support to finalization of training materials for CWSS (1998) Study tour to Uganda and Kenya (1998) Gender assessments to understand the link between gender, project performance and sustainability(1999)</p>	<p>Standardized and locally manufactured handpump and acceptance of VLOM concept coordination parameters for an M&E system identified (MWD) Improved sector coordination (MWD, NGOs, ESAs) Increased capacity for sector management at community level Lessons and good sector practices Better policies and projects(MWD, MWYCD, MOH)</p>

MOZAMBIQUE

	Major outputs delivered/produced by RWSG	Actual/expected effects
1. supporting policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DAR workplans (98, 99) • Integration of Low-Cost Sanitation in Rural Water Transition Plan (RWTP) (98,99) • Workshop and agreement on TA requirements in implementing RWTP (98) • Participation of 2 DAR staff in regional workshop on PHAST (98) • Workshop on the future of EPARs (99) • Elaborated RWTP policy/strategy document (99) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency with RWTP (<i>DAR</i>) • Merger of Low-Cost Sanitation Program into DNA/DAR (<i>DNA, DAR, PNSBC</i>) • Low-cost sanitation as integral component of Inhambane pilot project (<i>DAR, NWDP-I, DA Inhambane, communities, CIDA</i>) • Accelerated communication and implementation of RWTP (<i>DAR, NWDP-I, NGOs, DA Inhambane, communities</i>) • Introduction of participatory methods in RWSS (<i>DAR-PEC</i>) • Process to reform EPARs and increase private sector participation in RWSS (<i>DAR, NWDP-I, DA Inhambane, private sector, NGOs, communities</i>) • Improved understanding of RWTP at different government levels, sector agencies (<i>DAR, DA Inhambane, NGOs, private sector, communities</i>)
2. making investments sustainable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support to CIDA and NWDP-I project preparation/supervision (98, 99); review of Project Management Plan (CIDA) and contributions to PIM (NWDP-I) • Beneficiary assessments in 2 districts in preparation of 'early impact' Inhambane project (99) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved project design and performance through better appreciation of institutional and other constraints (<i>DAR, DA Inhambane, CIDA, NWDP-I</i>) • First DAR experience in demand-responsive planning and implementation of RWSS, credibility-boosting early impact on coverage (<i>DAR, DA Inhambane, CIDA, NWDP-I</i>)
3. extracting/ disseminating best practices/ experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study tour to Ghana and Kenya for 13 participants (98) • Facilitation of Nampula workshop on small piped water supplies (98) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved appreciation of DRA (community-based WSS, private sector participation, financing mechanisms) (<i>DAR, DA Inhambane</i>) • Input in follow-up learning on community-based management of small piped systems (<i>DAR, NWDP-I, NGOs, DA Inhambane, communities</i>)

TANZANIA

	Major outputs delivered/produced by RWSSG	actual/expected effects
1. supporting policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual meetings between government and donors (93) Water Sector Review (95) Workshop to review RWS component of 1991 National Water Policy (98) Technical Advisory Committee of RWSS stakeholders to advise government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> improved sector coordination (<i>MoW, UNDP, FINNIDA, other donors</i>) coherent strategy for whole water sector (<i>MoW and related ministries: agriculture, health, community development</i>) updated RWS component of National Water Policy (<i>MoW, regional and district water departments, NGOs, communities</i>) improved exchange of information and ideas within RWSS sector (<i>MoW, other ministries, NGOs, private sector, donor agencies</i>)
2. making investments sustainable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tanga Sanitation Project (GTZ): recommendations for peri-urban sanitation, guidelines for on-site sanitation, training of trainers, private sector involvement (latrine building) (94) Preparation of RWSS pilot project (World Bank LIL): participation in World Bank preparation missions, district assessments (98–99) Identification of community-based WSS component in Dar es Salaam Water Supply Project for World Bank financing; models for utility-community partnerships (99) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved government and private capacity for low-cost sanitation development (<i>MoW, communities</i>) US\$ 5 M pilot effective per July 99 in Kilosa, Mpwapwa and Rufiji districts; experience with applying DRA is to lead to RWSS sector investment program (<i>MoW, district water departments, communities</i>) Improved coverage (<i>DAWASA, MoW, private sector, communities</i>)
3. extracting/disseminating best practices/experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study tour to Kenya on privatization/community-management of large-scale rural piped supplies (Murugi Mugumango, Ngagaka, Kabuku) (93) PROWESS core group, strategy and training (93) Facilitation of Water Resources Management workshop (94) Tanzanian participation in several regional workshops (handpumps, rural sanitation, urban sanitation, PROWESS, water resources management) Study tour to Ghana on demand-responsive approach (97) Regional UES workshop (97) Review of performance of newly autonomous Urban Water and Sanitation Boards (as part of Urban Sector Rehabilitation Project) (99) Study on small-scale private sector participation in peri-urban sanitation in Dar es Salaam (99) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> appreciation for role private sector and communities can play in RWSS development (<i>MoW</i>) Application of participatory methods (<i>MoW</i>) Increased awareness among 40 participants from Tanzania of importance and opportunities of Integrated Water Resources Management Impetus to discussions/activities/developments within Tanzania (<i>MoW</i>) Appreciation of autonomy of RWSS departments, private sector and NGO role in service delivery (<i>MoW</i>) Appreciation of Strategic Sanitation Planning among members of <i>UES Country Team</i> Improved performance indicators (e.g. service to poor), increased private sector participation (<i>UWSBs, MoW</i>) Improved incentives for private sector participation (<i>DAWASA, MoW, private sector, communities</i>)

UGANDA

	Outputs delivered/Produced by RWSSG	Actual/Expected Effects
1. Supporting Policy	<p><u>Policy analysis/Development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Hand pump Monitoring Program (1993-1994) ⇒ Urban Sanitation Workshop (1994) ⇒ Drafting of TOR for the RWSS strategy (to be financed by DANIDA. 1998) ⇒ Issue paper on decentralization and RWSS Strategy (1999) ⇒ Support to Sanitation Task Force ⇒ Preparation of operational guidelines for sanitation (1998-1999) ⇒ Preparation of sanitation strategy (1997-1998) ⇒ National Sanitation Forum (1998) ⇒ Preparation of proceedings & brochure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Standardization & local manufacturing of hand pump and adaptation VLOM concept ⇒ awareness, sharing of experiences and introduction of strategic sanitation planning concept ⇒ Coherent rural water strategy for implementation of demand based approach and institutional transition ⇒ National sanitation Policy/strategy adapted and widely communicated, with commitment by key actors to raise the sanitation profile ⇒ Coherent approach to planning sanitation for STWSP ⇒ Development of an investment program
2. Making Investments Sustainable	<p>Participated in Project Identification and Preparation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ STWSP 1993-1994 ⇒ Northern Reconstruction Project (<i>DWD, NWSC, MOLG</i>) 1994 ⇒ Participated in World Bank supervision mission of the STWSP (1996-1999) <p>(i) Review of project approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - community ownership - Institutional arrangements and O&M - M&E <p>(ii) In put to mid term review 1999</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Participated in Implementation Completion Report (ICR) for the Second Water and Sanitation Project with a focus on service to the poor- NWSC (1998) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ CBA and demand based approach concepts incorporated in project operation 1995-1999 ⇒ Demand orientation and O&M arrangements ⇒ Better understanding of issues related to service to the poor

<p>3. Extracting/ Disseminating best practices</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ PROWESS National Workshop (1992) ⇒ PHAST National Workshop (1993) ⇒ Sector personnel trained on PROWESS/SARAR and PHAST methodologies ⇒ Participated in the Regional Gender in Pretoria 1997 ⇒ country action plans developed ⇒ undertake gender assessments ⇒ Global case study on the <i>impact of project rules on Sustainability</i> (RUWASA Phase 1) ⇒ Katwe Urban Pilot Project 1993–5 ⇒ Training of core team of trainers on M&E (3 people at IRC-1997) ⇒ National Training Workshop for CBM&E methodology (1997) ⇒ Review of first year implementation of the M&E 1999 system ⇒ <i>NGO/DWD Forum (1997 March Report)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ PROWESS Methodologies applied in WSS projects RUWASA PHASE 1 covering 8 districts and WESS program in 40 districts ⇒ Tool-kits adapted ⇒ Increased demand for hygiene and sanitation facilities (RUWASA Phase 1) ⇒ Informal Participatory Network established among sector partners (<i>DWD, MOH, NETWAS, UNICEF, DANIDA</i>) ⇒ Better understanding and commitment to undertake the mainstream of gender of gender participation in CWSSP ⇒ Guidelines for gender participation in RWSS ⇒ Input into RWSS strategy ⇒ limited physical improvements ⇒ Formation of community groups ⇒ Small scale enterprises (concrete slabs, charcoal briquettes) ⇒ reviewed of the MIS and M&E system (<i>STWSP & RUWASA Phase 1</i>) 1996–1997 ⇒ Sector partners trained on M&E ⇒ Community Based monitoring systems established for STWSP (<i>reports & draft manual</i>) ⇒ <i>Framework for identifying issues and learning 1999</i> ⇒ Better sector coordination and systematic application of CM demand based community approaches ⇒ Focal point established in DWD
--	---	--

Annex 6

Sample review of progress of activities

Review of progress of RWSG-ESA activities 1998 onwards, based on plans and progress reports, for Kenya, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Rwanda.

Note: This overview does not give a picture of activities in the countries, but an (incomplete) summary of progress on activities based on a review of workplans and reports.

1. Kenya

- Suspension of WB funding to Kenya December 1998 has suspended 3 projects in the pipeline and therefore also several RWSG-ESA activities related to appraisal/design/M&E systems.
- In the period, 3 workshops were undertaken, one with 6 months delay.
- One study was completed with 7 months delay, one study was suspended.
- Two studies are listed as RWSG-ESA studies, but are in fact externally funded and implemented with only minor inputs from the group.
- One paper/workshop proceeding was completed on time, two with 7 months delay. One paper was suspended, and one of the listed papers was unknown/could not be accounted for!
- The Ministry's RWS and UES working groups proceeded as intended. RWSG-ESA has the secretarial function for the former but there was disagreement whether the group also has the secretarial function for the latter!
- In general, plans are not specific, outputs are not linked with activities, progress on activities has only started recently, plans and progress reports are incomplete and erratic, and there is a tendency to take credit for outputs where the group has only a minor part.

2. Eritrea

- RWSG-ESA has been involved in the country since 1995 on request from UNICEF
- Involvement essentially in two areas (1) workshops to support policy development (2) assistance to WB funded social programme
- A workshop to disseminate lessons was delayed by 11 months because the project's impact assessment was delayed.
- Initiatives to support development of policy was suspended because the Minister was discharged
- An M&E system for the project was completed as planned by a RWSG-ESA-funded consultant
- All activities related to supervision, extracting lessons learned and revising the technical handbook of a project have been suspended because of war.

3. Ethiopia

- RWSG-ESA has been involved in Ethiopia since late 1994.
- Activities have been delayed essentially because of delays in one or two major WB-financed RWS projects, the war situation, and the suspension/cancellation of one WB financed sanitation project.

- As a result, all specified outputs to this project have been delayed except for two supervision missions.
- One Management Information System was implemented by GTZ as scheduled.
- One paper to extract lessons was completed 10 months behind schedule.
- The outputs reported by RWSG-ESA go beyond the often very limited inputs provided by the group, and give a very distorted/exaggerated picture of achievements.

4. Zambia

- RWSG-ESA has only been involved since early 1998.
- There are two main focuses (1) sanitation in peri-urban areas and (2) supporting development of a national strategy for rural WS
- RWSG-ESA provides secretarial support to working groups in both areas.
- A draft strategy for rural water is expected in June 1999, 6 months delayed.
- A strategy for peri-urban sanitation is on schedule, final version expected in June 1999.
- An attempt to include a WSS component in a WB financed project failed, and subsequent RWSG-ESA activities to develop guidelines and extract lessons is cancelled.
- All planned activities related to peri-urban WSS project have been suspended.
- RWSG-ESA participation in supervisory mission of the project was listed in the 1998 workplan. However, the group is not part of the supervisory team.
- In general, the distinction between factual outputs as a result of RWSG-ESA activities and hypothetical achievements is not made in the workplan. The reports therefore do not reflect actual achievement. Also, activities are listed under RWSG-ESA's three main objectives. This is unfortunate and adds to confuse the picture.

5. Zimbabwe

- The programme is limited because of the considerable capacity in the country and is focused on introducing the Demand Response Approach.
- RWSG-ESA participated in a pre-appraisal/appraisal of a WB project as planned.
- Assistance in preparing 4 ToRs was planned and completed, 1 cancelled
- Workshops and a paper to extract lessons delayed because the review study it should be based on was delayed by government.
- Deployment of CSA was suspended by government.
- Regular meetings of WSS Forum has been delayed by government.
- As a result of delays, RWSG-ESA inputs 1998 was only 15–10 m/w – not 50 as planned.
- Studies referred to as RWSG-ESA activities are in fact planned, financed and implemented by other organisations.

6. Rwanda

- RWSG-ESA has been involved since 1996.
- Initiatives to assist working groups in developing policies for rural and urban WSS is ongoing with the assistance of the resident CSA.
- One working group is established but not in operation. This has delayed several of the activities.
- RWSG-ESA has helped influence WB to provide initial funding for a sanitation project (0.9 M\$).

- One workshop has been cancelled due to change of policy and one has been delayed.
- 2 study tours have not been organised and one has been delayed.
- One review has not been started and 2 have been delayed 4–12 months.
- 2 papers have been produced as planned, and 2 have been delayed 6–12 months.
- Plans systematically exaggerate the role of RWSG-ESA in producing the reported outputs.

Annex 7

Tanzania output review

The review is based on information gained from interviews with the RWSG-ESA Task Manager and stakeholders in Tanzania, and from information provided in Workplan 1997, Workplan 1998, and Progress Report 1997–98. The table should be read as a complement to the RWSG-ESA overview of major outputs (Annex 5), verified during the country visit. The headings used are the same as those used in the work plans, that is the areas of intervention.

Area of intervention	Outputs indicated in WP-97 and WP-98 but not included in the RWSG-ESA major output overview (Annex 5)	Comment
Rural Water Supply and Sanitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documented assessment of relevant sector experience. • Recommendations on policy/legal modifications. • Final draft rural water policy and operational guidelines, and agreement on preparation process for RWSS sector program. • Specific learning products: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Synthesis of lessons learned. – Working paper on private sector participation. – Working paper on local funding mechanisms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four assessments produced as input to workshop. • Discussions held with consultant and Task Force. • Final draft policy not yet finalised (one year over-due). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Included in proceedings of workshop; part of LIL preparation. – Deferred; part of or based on LIL preparatory studies. – Deferred; same as above.

<p>Urban Environmental Sanitation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of UES experience. • Proceedings of national UES workshop and action plan. • M&E framework for assessing impact of USRP on access to services for the poor. • M&E reports and analysis of data. • Documented lessons learned from USRP. • Recommendations for modification of USRP. • Strategy and policy recommendations. • Agenda of activities to implement UES Country Action Plan • Initiate the documentation of UES services to the urban poor in Dar es Salaam and performance review of UWSBs. • Generic Strategic Sanitation Plans for municipal authorities. • Overview of UES services provision to the urban poor in Dar es Salaam. • Study tour for UES Country Team. • Workshop on models/arrangements for UES services delivery to the urban poor. • Final MIS/M&E protocol and workshop. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Produced in preparation for the UES workshop in Nairobi. • Not materialised. • Deleted and replaced by performance review of Urban Water and Sanitation Boards. • Same as above. • Same as above. • Same as above. • This is a general formulation in WP-97 not further reflected in the documentation; this in spite of the fact that RWSG-ESA has recently played an apparently important role in defining the ToR for preparation of a UWSS policy document, nearing completion. • Not pursued. • For UES services to urban poor, see below. Performance review of UWSBs initiated; report originally planned for June 1998, still not ready. • Awaiting AFTU1 request; some initial work done by GoT, and RWSG-ESA. • 'Narrowed down' to a study on small-scale private sector participation, and is underway. • Dropped. • Deferred awaiting finalisation of study. • Dropped as such, but to some extent taken up under the UWSB performance review
---------------------------------------	--	--

Area of intervention	Outputs listed in the RWSG-ESA major output overview (Annex 5) but not as country outputs in WP-97 and WP-98	Comment
Rural Water Supply and Sanitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Advisory Committee of RWSS stakeholders to advise government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presumably relating to “Support the establishment of a RWSS Forum for sector-wide information exchange...” indicated under “Activities” in WP-98. The Committee is apparently established but has not had any meeting. The role of RWSG-ESA in its establishment is unclear.
Urban Environmental Sanitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional UES workshop (97) • Identification of community-based WSS component in Dar es Salaam Water Supply Project for World Bank financing; models for utility-community partnerships (99) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workshop indicated under “Regional UES” in WP –97. Held in Nairobi, Kenya. • Participation in project preparation

Annex 8

Revised RWSG-ESA budget for fiscal year 1999

Task	Budget amount (USD)
Eritrea RWSS	36,509
Ethiopia RWSS	80,989
Ethiopia UES	68,398
Kenya RWSS	82,791
Kenya UES	159,865
Malawi RWSS	252,080
Mozambique RWSS	224,745
Rwanda RWSS	73,129
Rwanda UES	81,860
Tanzania RWSS	34,705
Tanzania UES	68,380
Uganda RWSS	89,250
Uganda UES	47,273
Zambia RWSS	81,647
Zambia UES	60,330
Zimbabwe RWSS	75,901
Reg. RWSS Financing	51,057
Reg. PHAST	112,066
Reg. Gender & Participation	111,533
Reg. WUP	44,898
Reg. UES	90,463
Management	151,917
Cross Support	25,230
Unplanned	0
Knowledge Management	51,394
SUBTOTAL (activities & management)	2,156,410
Salaries Support Staff	139,383
Other (office, supplies, communications)	256,600
SUBTOTAL (support, office etc.)	395,983
TOTAL	2,552,394
Overheads:	
A Management	151,917
B Support' Staff	139,383
C Other (office, supplies, communications)	256,600
Total	547,900
A+B+C = 21.5 % of TOTAL	
B+C = 15.5 % of TOTAL	

Recent Sida Evaluations

- 99/21 Sida Support to the Energy Sector in Jordan. Rolf Eriksson, Edward Hoyt
Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation
- 99/22 Environmental Aspects in Credit Financed Projects. Gunhild Granath, Stefan Andersson,
Karin Seleborg, Göran Stegrin, Hans Norrström
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 99/23 Sida SAREC Marin Science Programs in East Africa. Stephen B. Olsen, James Tobey,
Per Brinck
Department for Research Cooperation, SAREC
- 99/24 Sweden's Assistance to Bosnia Herzegovina. A study of aid management and related policy
issues. Claes Sandgren
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 99/25 Psychiatry Reform in Eastern Europe. Nils Öström
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 99/26 Sida Projects in the Forestry Sector in Poland. Kristina Flodman Becker, Roland Öquist
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 99/27 FARMESA. Farm-level applied research methods in Eastern and Southern Africa.
Clive Lighthfoot, William W Wapakala, Bo Tengnäs
Department for Natural Resources and the Environment
- 99/28 The African Association of Universities (AAU) Study Programme on Higher Education
Management in Africa. Ad Boeren, Jairam Reddy
Department for Research Cooperation, SAREC
- 99/29 Apoyo al Programa Nacional Indigena en Bolivia. Lars Eriksson, Maria Cristina Mejia, Maria
del Pilar Sanchez
Department for Latin America
- 99/30 Support to the Micro-finance Sector in Bolivia. Lars-Olof Hellgren, Leonel Roland
Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation
- 99/31 Proyecto VNU Promotores del la Paz en Guatemala. Kristina Boman, Göran Schill,
Eberto de León
Department for Latin America
- 99/32 Programme Assistance to Mozambique. A joint donors review. Grayson Clarke,
Jens Claussen, Rolf Kappel, Jytte Laursen, Stefan Sjölander
Department for Africa
- 99/33 Technical Assistance to the Ministry of Planning and Finance in Mozambique. Dag Aarnes,
Svein Jørgensen
Department for Africa
- 99/34 PROSERBI. Integrated basic services program in Nicaragua. Elisabeth Lewin, Kristina Boman,
Marta Medina
Department for Latin America

Sida Evaluations may be ordered from:

Infocenter, Sida
S-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0)8 795 23 44
Fax: +46 (0)8 760 58 95
info@sida.se

A complete backlist of earlier evaluation reports may be ordered from:

Sida, UTV, S-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0)8 698 5099
Fax: +46 (0)8 698 5610
Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>



SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden
Tel: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Fax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
Telegram: sida stockholm. Postgiro: 1 56 34-9
E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>