



United Nations Environment Programme

**Mid-Term Evaluation Report
on Project No CC/IVC/2007/44 CP/3010-08-03 'Improving Water
Management and Governance in African Countries through Support in
Development and Implementation of IWRM Plans'**

Gunilla Björklund

Evaluation Office

March 2010

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	6
Attainments as of to date concerning objectives and planned results	6
Sustainability of project's outcomes as of today.....	6
Advantages in project implementation.....	7
Weaknesses in project implementation.....	7
1. Introduction to the Evaluation.....	10
1.1. Background and Project Context	10
1.1.1 Development of the Integrated Water Resources Management Concept	10
1.1.2 The 'IWRM 2005' project	10
1.1.3. The current Project.....	11
1.2. Objective, Scope, and Methods of the Evaluation.....	13
1.2.1 Objective and Scope.....	13
1.2.2 Methods	13
1.3 Evidence.....	15
1.4 Limitations	15
2. Project Performance and Impact.....	15
2.1. Attainment of Objectives and Planned Results (progress to date).....	15
2.1.1 Project objectives and planned results	15
2.1.2 Project Baseline	16
2.1.3 Effectiveness.....	17
2.1.4 Relevance	18
2.1.5 Efficiency	19
2.1.6 Conclusion	20
2.2. Assessment of Sustainability of Project Outcomes	20
2.2.1 The Financial factor	21
2.2.2 The Socio-political factors	22
2.2.3 The Institutional framework and governance factor.....	24
2.2.4 The Ecological factor	25
2.2.5 Conclusion	26
2.3. Catalytic Role	26
2.4. Achievement of outputs and activities	27
2.5. Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems	29
2.5.1. Monitoring & Evaluation Design	29
2.5.2. Monitoring & Evaluation Plan Implementation.....	30
2.5.3. Budgeting and Funding for Monitoring & Evaluation Activities.....	31
2.5.4. Long-Term Monitoring	31
2.5.5 Conclusion	32
2.6. Assessment of processes that affected attainment of project results.....	32
2.6.1. Preparation and Readiness.....	32
2.6.2. Country Ownership/Driveness	34

2.6.3. Stakeholder Involvement	35
2.6.4. Financial planning.....	36
2.6.5. UNEP Supervision and Backstopping.....	37
2.6.6. Co-financing and Project Outcomes and Sustainability	38
2.6.7. Delays and Project Outcomes and Sustainability	38
2.7 Specific Evaluation tasks.....	38
3. Ratings and Conclusions.....	40
3.1 Overall rating of the project performance to date.....	40
3.2 Conclusions	40
4. Lessons learned.....	41
5. Recommendations	42
Method.....	47
Description of Project Evaluation Parameters	48

Annexes:

I: Terms of References for the Mid-term Evaluation

II: Mission itinerary and meetings 29.10 – 18.11 2009

III: List of persons met and consulted

IV: List of documents consulted

V: Consolidated Responses to Evaluation Questionnaire

VI: Detailed project budget and expenditure per June 30th 2009

VII: Brief summary of the expertise of the Evaluator

Acronyms

ACP-EUWF	Africa, Caribbean, Pacific - European Union Water Facility
AFW	African Water Facility
AfDB	African Development Bank
AMCOW	African Ministers Council on Water
CSD	Commission on Sustainable Development
CWP	Country Water Partnership
DEPI	Division of Environmental Policy Implementation
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DHI	Danish Hydrological Institute
ECOWAS	Economic Commission of West African States
ECOWAS/WRCU	ECOWAS/Water Resources Coordination Unit
EU	European Union
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GWP	Global Water Partnership
GWP-WA	GWP- West Africa Water Partnership
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
JPoI	Johannesburg Plan of Implementation
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NFP	National Focal Points
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PMG	Project Management Group
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Attributable, Relevant and realistic, Time-bound
ToR	Terms of Reference
UDC	UNEP Collaborating Centre on Water and Environment
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNCED	UN Conference for Environment and Development
WARAP-IWRM	West Africa Regional Action Plan on IWRM
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development

Acknowledgements

The Evaluator wants to acknowledge all the very valuable support and guidance provided by UNEP and in particular by UDC-Water in enabling this Evaluation. Thanks go to Mr. Segbedzi Norgbey and his team for organizing the Evaluation and to Mr. Thomas Chiramba for providing much appreciated possibilities to discuss and sharing insights both during the field visit in Côte d'Ivoire and during tele-conferences.

Special thanks go to the team at DHI/UDC for their sharing of insights in the IWRM process and development in the region and for their crucial assistance in organizing the Evaluation as such. During the introductory days at DHI/UDC Mssrs Peter Koefoed Björnsen, Nick Ahrensberg, Niels Ipsen, Gorm Jeppesen and Gareth James Loyd, all provided very valuable background information to the Evaluation, including the written information produced during the project. The Evaluator appreciates all this assistance, which was a crucial introduction to the project, and the very kind hospitality provided by Niels Ipsen.

Without the assistance by in particular Nick Ahrensberg and Niels Ipsen it would not have been possible to arrange for practicalities that made the field trip at all possible. And it would definitely not have been possible to arrange for meetings with key people in the countries visited by the Evaluator without this much appreciated assistance. The Evaluator also wants to acknowledge the support provided during the field trip in the form of background information etc by Nick Ahrensberg and Niels Ipsen, but also by M. Grégoire Alé, who provided specific guidance in Guinea-Bissau and detailed information on Togo as well as language assistance. The very kind assistance and hospitality in Abidjan by Mssrs Niels Ipsen and Edmond Siesson is also much appreciated.

Further, the Evaluator wants to thank Mssrs Dam Aimé Mogbanté, Marwan Ladki and Ouango Athanase Compaore, who all contributed valuable insights from the perspective of GWP West Africa, and Mrs Florence Ardorino, technical advisor, ECOWAS-WRCU, who provided much needed information on ECOWAS. Dr Birguy Lamizana, former regional consultant as well as M Grégoire Alé assisted by providing information from a regional consultant's perspective.

Thanks and appreciations go also to all focal points, coordinators, governmental representatives and other stakeholders, including both Ministers and deputy ministers, in the countries visited for so openly having shared their time and insights for the benefit of the Evaluation.

Executive Summary

This is the Mid-term Evaluation of the UNEP Project ‘*Improving Water Management and Governance in African Countries through Support in Development and Implementation of IWRM Plans*’ (No. CC/IVC/2007/44 CP/3010-08-03) financed by the ‘European Commission Africa, Caribbean, Pacific (ACP)-EU Water Facility Actions in ACP Countries’. The project is implemented by the UNEP Collaborating Centre on Water and Environment (UDC) at the Danish Hydrological Institute (DHI) in partnership with the Global Water Partnership (GWP)-West Africa and the Economic Commission of West African States/ Water Resources Coordination Unit (ECOWAS/ WRCU).

The special focus is on seven West African countries: Côte d’Ivoire, the Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, Liberia, Sierra Leone and Togo. Identified specific outputs under the project would be: National Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) Roadmaps¹ in the Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea and Sierra Leone, IWRM Plans² for Côte d’Ivoire, Liberia and Togo, regional guidelines on development of IWRM Roadmaps and Plans, and documentation on best practices and case studies to enhance capacity.

Attainments as of to date concerning objectives and planned results

The project has demonstrated a certain degree of *effectiveness* in striving to put a multi-stakeholder consulting and decision-making process in place. It has almost succeeded to meet the objective of getting the IWRM roadmaps in place (three out of four), with some but not prominent delay in the IWRM plan procedure in the three IWRM plan-countries but with a weak recognition of integrating ecosystem services in the finalized roadmaps.

The planned outcome of the project will be consistent with what is specified in the “UNEP Water Policy and Strategy” and with the “UNEP Medium-term Strategy 2010-2013” if the implementation of the project follows the project plan. It does further ensure conformity with, and *relevance* to the country priorities.

The approach to providing support, and when needed additional assistance, by assigning international consultants to initiate the process but to work mainly with nationally anchored and less expensive consultants to drive the process in the countries seems to be a very efficient approach. The process of attracting co-financing for the continuation of the project has only been initiated which makes the *efficiency* difficult to assess.

Sustainability of project’s outcomes as of today

The Evaluation presents evidence that countries will be able to find some funding for some follow-up actions, but that political unrest in some countries might to some degree hamper the possibilities. There is a largely positive trend in socio-political aspects, including stakeholder involvement at civil

¹ An IWRM Roadmap includes identification of reform activities in the IWRM enabling environment that would be necessary to agree on an IWRM Plan. Such reforms may include reforms concerning the institutional framework as well as the legal framework, links to existing plans, etc. The Roadmap identifies what needs to be done.

² IWRM Plans sets out a national strategy that identifies the priority steps that must be taken to reform the water management system to meet IWRM principles. The IWRM Plan identifies how it needs to be done more concretely.

society-NGO level as well as at the broader ministerial level. The project provides a good basis for positive institutional/governance involvement. The Evaluator further finds it moderately likely that sustained ecological benefits will be achieved by the project's IWRM final planning outcomes, despite the current meager awareness of those benefits.

Advantages in project implementation

The findings of the project demonstrated that the governments and the different water-related ministries in the countries of implementation are involved in the process and the project has thus succeeded in securing *clear country ownership of the process*. *Stakeholder involvement* has been secured at the initiating national workshops to discuss background material and has mainly been maintained.

The project has built a very useful *implementation structure* with a Project Management Group (with representation from all the parties and with UNEP as chair, but without representation from the participating countries!) working as steering committee. At the implementation level quality assurance is provided by project advisors/international consultants, regional overview and advice by the regional consultants, and national data collection and analysis by national consultants. The latter are mainly former high-level water civil servants from the countries. An IWRM coordinator is responsible at national level.

The *financial planning* did not quite fit with the initial reality as the countries needed more support to set up a functioning structure than anticipated. This resulted in an initial over-use of international consultants and a delay in implementation start. But this initial over-spending paid back as the project has, to date, under-spent. Except for Guinea-Conakry, the project is mainly on track.

Weaknesses in project implementation

The countries are poor, and on their request the project included activities to assist both the IWRM Roadmap countries and the IWRM Plan countries in *mobilizing additional financial resources* for project implementation. The socio-political and economic situation in the countries is probably also the reason behind the currently less sufficient notion of the ecosystem roles in IWRM. The sustainability of the outcomes of the project will, most probably, depend on continued financial and technical support.

The main *weakness* of the project is its system for **Monitoring and Evaluation**, partly because the project was developed before the current UNEP Project Manual, with its system for a mandatory structure, was in place. The current structure for project monitoring and evaluation consists of: a system for *quality assurance* provided by international consultants/ project supervisors, annual, *written technical and financial reports* and narrative reports submitted by the project manager through UNEP. Reports are discussed by the Project Management Group (PMG) who *assess and reports back* from its bi-annual meetings. The fourth M&E element is the *mid-term and the terminal evaluations*.

The *lack of more systematic M&E*, in line with what is required under the current Evaluation Manual (and from the GEF for GEF-supported projects), including a regulated reporting system, is particularly unsatisfactory as the project is implemented in poor countries – even if these countries are currently also very committed.

Based on this assessment the Evaluation has the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1: On Project development and Implementation structure

To ensure full accountability the project could, for the remaining time, open up the Project Management Group, that is the Steering Committee for the project, with a seat for representative(s) of the implementation countries. The Agenda for the PMG meetings should be distributed to the countries, so that they are able to provide (written) inputs through their representative/s, and not only through the international and regional consultants, and thus be able to influence project implementation more directly.

Recommendation 2: On Sustainable Outcomes

To ensure sustainable outcomes, it is important that the countries are prepared for follow-up. This can be ensured by:

- the GWP-WA taking on a more supportive role concerning the CWPs and providing for networking among the countries;
- the ECOWAS ensuring participation by the countries within the ECOWAS' transboundary IWRM project for the river systems shared between participating countries;
- Project countries involving their ministries of the environment to produce reports on how they intend to proceed in a long-term perspective. This would need to include an ecosystem approach;
- Assisting the project countries in mobilizing financial resources for the follow-up.

Recommendation 3: On financial Planning

Funding left over in those countries that have validated and finalized their IWRM Roadmap should be used in their follow-up procedure towards an IWRM Plan as identified in the roadmap.

After an IWRM Plan-country has agreed on its IWRM Plan, remaining resources should be used for the IWRM implementation.

As a consequence of the general under-spending during the first half of the project life time and project needs that were not budgeted for, a revision of the budget should be done. This should then include the previous two items: the funding for a country representative in the PMG, and for a more specific Monitoring and Evaluation structure at country level as well as for the Terminal Evaluation.

Recommendation 4: On Monitoring and Evaluation

To ensure that the project achieves its expected environmental benefits, to assure that resources are properly spent during the final phase, and to bring the needed knowledge and insights to increase the quality of the project implementation, the M&E structure of the project needs to be improved. This could be done by:

- establishing a system within which the clear and structured linkages between existing elements of the project and their sequence is identified, a "Roadmap" for the actual project. This could be a more detailed Logical Framework;
- more time-bound reporting following specified criteria by the participating countries to a designated focal point in the management group, who compiles and reports to the PMG; and
- sufficient funding designated to the collection and analysis of the country reporting so that action may be taken if need be.

Recommendation 5: On UNEP's Supervision and Backstopping

UNEP needs to ensure that staffs have sufficient time to provide the needed supervision and backstopping of the project for its remaining time. Otherwise it will not be feasible to carry the responsibilities of the overall project management adequately. UNEP also has an important role in ensuring a stronger ecosystem management approach which should also be formulated as a project outcome. In order to avoid any confusion regarding the roles and responsibilities of UNEP/DEPI respective UDC it would be useful to clearly identify their roles.

1. Introduction to the Evaluation

1.1. Background and Project Context

1.1.1 Development of the Integrated Water Resources Management Concept

The integrated approach to water issues was already recognized, although less developed, at the Mar del Plata conference in 1977. Chapter 18 of Agenda 21 negotiated in the process leading to the UN Conference on Environment and Development, 1992, takes the following approach: “The holistic management of freshwater... and the integration of sectoral water plans and programmes within the framework of national economic and social policy, are of paramount importance for action in the 1990s and beyond.”

The Global Water Partnership (GWP), which was established in 1996, defines IWRM as “a process which promotes the coordinated development and management of water, land and related resources in order to maximize the resultant economic and social welfare in an equitable manner without compromising the sustainability of vital eco-systems”. According to GWP IWRM is not an end in itself but a means or a process of “achieving three key strategic objectives: 1) efficiency to make water resources go as far as possible; 2) equity, in the allocation of water across different social and economic groups; and 3) environmental sustainability, to protect the water resources base and associated eco-systems”.

In 2000, the international community agreed on a selected set of goals for poverty reduction and accelerated development in association with the Millennium Declaration, the MDGs, where water, although only explicit in one of the goals, plays an important role in all its uses. The MDGs are considered unattainable without improved water governance within an IWRM. The Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (JPOI), negotiated at the WSSD 2002, established as a target that all countries should “Develop integrated water resources management and water efficiency plans by 2005” where one of the objectives would be to “improve the efficient use of water resources”.

UNEP is requested by its Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum to “place a high priority on freshwater and to assist developing countries in strengthening their capacities to assess freshwater and develop and implement integrated water resources management plans through regional cooperation”, in this applying an ecosystem approach. In the light of the JPOI 2005-target, towards the implementation of UNEP’s Water Policy and Strategy, and in the framework of the UNEP Bali Strategic Plan for Technological Support and Capacity Building, UNEP is currently providing assistance to developing countries globally towards this JPOI-target. Such capacity development includes supporting the preparation of national IWRM Roadmaps leading to IWRM Plans. The 13th session of the Commission on Sustainable Development, CSD, in 2005, recognized that JPOI target might not be met by all countries although considerable progress had been made, and that support was needed to forward the process.

1.1.2 The ‘IWRM 2005’ project

The UNEP “IWRM 2005” Programme (2005-2008) responded to the need expressed at CSD 13, by providing assistance to governments upon request, in order to achieve acceleration of the implementation of the IWRM 2005 target by “ensuring that environmental aspects are adequately

incorporated in the strategies/roadmaps produced to achieve this target". This essentially involved supporting countries and sub-regions in devising and drafting individual "roadmaps" that outline activities necessary for the transition from an IWRM vision to an IWRM plan. Assistance was given in the form of financial and technical support, with DANIDA as the key financing partner. The sub-regions involved were South East Asia, Central Asia, Southern Africa, Central Africa, West Africa, North Africa, the Caribbean, and Central America, as well as two South American regions (Andean and Cone).

The strategy was both to help the specific countries that had formally requested IWRM planning assistance, and to use the experiences as a way of demonstrating possible IWRM development in neighboring states. The programme was executed in close collaboration with local partners, who helped to ensure that representatives from more than 60 countries participated in the various regional and national IWRM capacity building workshops and associated activities. The project became operational in May 2005 and was completed by December 2008.

The most important outputs of the project included: IWRM roadmaps and reports prepared by 19 countries (including Côte d'Ivoire, Liberia and Togo); a roadmap case book (which was used during the current project); a sub-regional policy and awareness dialogue at ministerial level; concept and issue papers and capacity building; and a detailed survey of IWRM status submitted to the CSD meeting in 2008.

1.1.3. The current Project

The West African Sub-region is well advanced in IWRM through a process that was initiated in 1998 (West African Conference on Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) in Ouagadougou) although some countries are lagging behind and thus are in need for support.

A significant portion of UNEP's assistance in IWRM has been carried out in Africa. This has resulted in the identification of capacity-building needs and gaps in implementation, as well as the identification of countries in most need of support and those ready to move from an IWRM Roadmap into the IWRM plan development stage.

Building on the outcomes (national IWRM strategies and roadmaps, as well as related needs assessments) of the "UNEP 2005 IWRM Target"-project and on the national needs-assessments in the framework of the UNEP Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity, the current project aims, through capacity-building and regional partnerships, to support the development of national IWRM roadmaps (in Gambia, Guinea Conakry, Guinea Bissau and Sierra Leone), and the implementation of the national IWRM Roadmaps leading to national IWRM plans (in Liberia, Togo and Côte d'Ivoire).

Partners to the project are: the UNEP, DHI Water & Environment (UDC), the Water Resources Coordination Unit (WRCU) under the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the Global Water Partnership (GWP) through its West Africa Water Partnership (GWP-WA). DHI/UDC is also project manager and responsible for the day to day management

The overall *objective* of the project is to improve water management and governance in West Africa with the long term goal of livelihood security and environmental sustainability. A specific objective is to promote and support preparation of IWRM plans in the targeted countries with special focus on environmental aspects.

The *activities* under the project are, to:

- 1.1 Expand national stakeholder networks ensuring broad representation (especially women and vulnerable communities), through establishment/ strengthening of Country Water Partnerships. (With WRCU/ECOWAS and West Africa Water Partnership).
- 1.2 Raise awareness of stakeholders on the importance of an environmental approach, and on country specific issues, in on-going or planned IWRM processes, and mobilising participation through workshops and awareness materials. (With WRCU/ECOWAS and West Africa Water Partnership).
- 2.1 In partnership with Global Water Partnership (GWP), development of environment related IWRM information and tools to add to the global GWP IWRM toolbox.
- 3.1 Training of government representatives and stakeholders, based on IWRM needs and priorities addressing country specific issues.
- 4.1 IWRM planning needs assessments in Gambia, Guinea Conakry, Guinea Bissau and Sierra Leone, and technical assistance to spearheading institutions.
- 4.2 Technical assistance to develop IWRM road maps for Gambia, Guinea Conakry, Guinea Bissau and Sierra Leone.
- 5.1 Technical assistance to develop IWRM plans for Côte d'Ivoire, Liberia and Togo.
- 5.2 Final plan development (for Côte d'Ivoire, Liberia and Togo), and technical assistance to spearheading institution in negotiations of institutional arrangements.
- 6.1 Preparation of case study guidelines and documentation of best practices, based on experiences and lessons learned through supported IWRM processes, to be included in GWP IWRM toolbox and published.

The *challenges* the project has to deal with in these countries are

- Weak institutional set-up and capacity for implementing IWRM;
- Unsecured funding beyond the project to assure the continuation of the IWRM process;
- Political instability and civil unrest; and
- Inclusive and complex nature of IWRM.

Some of the countries still have some way to go in establishing a sufficiently broad stakeholder network.

The current status of the project

Currently, draft IWRM roadmaps have been finalized, presented and validated by the Gambia, Sierra Leone and Guinea Bissau. The IWRM roadmap for Guinea Conakry has been delayed due to political unrest but work to develop an IWRM roadmap has been resumed in mid November. There seems to be a clear interest in pursuing the work on the roadmap although the current political situation makes scheduling very difficult.

Case studies have been developed for the Gambia, Guinea Bissau and Sierra Leone building on their respective roadmap processes. The case studies intend to provide an opportunity to learn from these processes. Training sessions on IWRM have been conducted for stakeholders in all seven target countries. These initial training sessions were essential as the actual work on the roadmaps presupposes initial capacity building.

Liberia presented in early November its consolidated National IWRM Policy and implementation plan. The Ivory Coast is in the final stage in preparing a draft plan for Water Resources Management

but has still some way to go before being able to start an IWRM. With the assistance of several well placed national consultants, the plan could be finalized in August/ September 2010. Togo is currently aiming for a draft IWRM plan in May/June 2010. This will happen with the assistance of national consultants who have been involved in the previous project ('IWRM 2005') and one key regional consultant.

In most of the countries there is a clear buy-in at ministerial level, which sometimes is not fully met among other stakeholders. This is partly because of their difficulties (financial, institutional and organizational) to develop organized cooperation between all stakeholders like e.g. the Country Water Partnerships. This has been demonstrated in the responses to the Questionnaire (See Annex V).

Country Water Partnerships are established in Guinea (currently dormant), Ivory Coast and Togo, which could be used for the strengthening of national stakeholder networks. These CWPs have been evaluated under the project and found weak and not focused. They lack human as well as financial support. Consultative meetings on the establishment of CWPs have been held in the Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Liberia and Sierra Leone. These countries are very interested in establishing a CWP but so far there are little possibilities to find adequate host organizations and strong leaders to ensure vital CWPs. This is partly due to inadequate financing.

1.2. Objective, Scope, and Methods of the Evaluation

1.2.1 Objective and Scope

The objective of this Mid-term evaluation (MTE) is to assess operational aspects, such as project management and implementation of activities under the project and also the level of progress towards the achievement of the objectives by this stage of the project implementation. The Evaluation seeks to assess project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results.

The Evaluation is further assessing the progress that has been made to date in the implementation of the project activities. More specifically the Evaluation shall ensure all relevant aspects, e.g. the project's relevance, appropriateness, impacts of arrangements and activities under the project etc. are covered (see the Terms of Reference in Annex 1). As this is a Mid-term Evaluation, any detailed assessments related to time-bound activities are done with caution and mostly only to assess whether the project is on track.

The Evaluation aims to ascertain whether the project is on course in delivering the outputs needed to achieve the intended results, and to provide recommendations on successful project implement in the remaining period.

1.2.2 Methods

The general Evaluation methodology is set out in the Terms of Reference (see Annex 1). The Evaluation consisted of the following steps³: planning, data collection, validation of baseline and project targets, analysis, report writing and consultations. The Evaluations was conducted between mid October and late December 2009.

Planning Phase

³ Although these steps were largely taken in chronological order, there was a significant amount of back and forth and reiteration.

The planning phase consisted of an initial documentation review, the scoping of the main issues, reviewing the ToR, determining the most appropriate mission itinerary, collecting documentation and finalizing logistical arrangements. This phase also consisted of discussions over the phone with UNEP staff as well as with the UDC in Denmark to plan the visit to the DHI office outside of Copenhagen, as well as the field visits to Burkina Faso (for meetings with the partners including ECOWAS/WRCU and GWP/WA), and to the participating countries Liberia, Sierra Leone, Guinea Bissau and Ivory Coast. The assistance by the UDC team in arranging the field trip was in fact absolutely crucial for the success of the mission.

The planning phase included the development of systems for the desk review and the semi-structured interviews to be undertaken both at DHI and in the countries visited. During that phase a Questionnaire was constructed and was sent out to IWRM focal points and key stakeholders in the participating countries. Thus the planning phase resulted in the best possible approach to collect adequate data for the validation of baselines, the analysis of the project status and how it should lead to effective IWRM in the different countries.

Data Collection Phase: Desk review; Evaluation of specific products; Interviews with key partners

The data collection phase included the in-depth desk review of the project documents, outputs, monitoring reports, relevant correspondence, workshop reports and project technical outputs etc.

Among the evaluated documents were the official policy documents and the validated IWRM Roadmaps. As the project is not primarily a research project, peer reviewed books or scientific papers do not exist so far. A list of documents reviewed and evaluated is presented as Annex IV.

The interviews with the DHI-staff and the stakeholders in the countries visited were conducted as semi-structured interviews. The interview questions were adjusted to the interviewees' roles in the project implementation.

The aim of the Questionnaire was to secure as detailed information as possible from the different project countries, to be able to evaluate whether they were "on track" or where and how they might lag behind. The Questionnaire (translated into French by DHI) was filled out and returned by six out of the seven project countries. Only Guinea Conakry, being in a situation of severe political unrest, was not able to respond. The consolidated responses can be found in Annex V.

Validating the Baseline and target that should indicate whether the project is on track

The project document and the Logical Framework describe the baseline, the IWRM status at the project initiation, and the target indicators for success. However, the indicators are not fully SMART⁴, and not optimal to assess the project's advancement.

The assessment against the baseline is therefore also based on the rating of nine different evaluation parameters of the project as specified in the ToR. The Evaluation is based on a mixture of what is available in the Logical Framework and what is specified under 'Methods' in the ToR.

Analysis Phase: Evaluation Parameters

⁴ SMART indicators should be 'Specific, Measurable, Achievable & Attributable, Relevant & Realistic, and Time bound & Timely & Track able & Targeted

The Analysis Phase is based on the findings of the Validating Phase. Those findings are rated and analyzed using the different evaluation parameters (as detailed in chapter 2 and in the ToR).

1.3 Evidence

UNEP guidelines require that *sufficient* and *convincing* evidence be collected to support the finding of the Evaluation. The Evaluator has made every effort to collect independent, verifiable evidence and first- person accounts in the time given. Evidence not directly seen or heard by the Evaluator was not taken into account.

1.4 Limitations

The major limitations and their corresponding implications to this Evaluation were the following:

There was an extreme shortage of time, particularly for the field missions (two days per participating country). This meant that only a limited number of places could be visited. Time for the planning phase and the desk review (14 days) and the analysis and report drafting (3 weeks) was also much too limited as specified in the ToR. In fact, to produce a viable Evaluation twice that time was needed by the Evaluator.

As this is a Mid-term evaluation, some of the questions or parameters in the ToR were not applicable. This has been remarked on in the text.

2. Project Performance and Impact

2.1. Attainment of Objectives and Planned Results (progress to date)

This subchapter determines the extent to which the project objectives can be expected to be achieved, whether and to what extent they are considered relevant or prioritized by the respective countries, and, to the extent possible, whether the project can be regarded as cost-effective. It determines whether the procedure to achieve results is the most effective, or whether the project should undertake corrective modifications.

2.1.1 Project objectives and planned results

The overall objective of the project is “to improve water management and governance in West Africa with the long term goal of livelihood security and environmental sustainability”.

The specific objective is “to promote and support preparation of IWRM plans in the targeted countries with special focus on environmental aspects”.

The project is striving to achieve the following results:

- * Increased awareness on importance of environmental approach and considerations in IWRM, and stakeholders empowered and committed to participate in IWRM processes;
- * Increased access to relevant IWRM information and tools;
- * Capacity built of key water managers and decision makers on IWRM planning;

- * Empowered institution to spearhead the implementation of IWRM plans;
- * National roadmaps for the IWRM target in The Gambia, Guinea Conakry, Guinea Bissau and Sierra Leone;
- * IWRM Plans developed for Liberia, Togo and Côte d'Ivoire; and
- * Documentation on best practices, case studies and guidelines to enhance replication.

2.1.2 Project Baseline

The baseline situation is the situation that existed at the beginning of the project and which would likely have been prevailing had the project not have been initiated. An important question therefore is: “What is the baseline situation and what would have happened anyway regardless of the project?” For a project that is implemented in several countries, there exists a baseline concerning the IWRM application in West Africa generally. But there also exist ‘individual baselines’ for each project country:

- *Côte d'Ivoire* developed and presented an IWRM Roadmap under the Ministry of Environment, Water and Forestry (2007). Côte d'Ivoire participated during that process as one of the countries in the ‘IWRM 2005’-project.
- *Liberia* developed and presented an agreed IWRM Roadmap under the Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy early 2008 (draft 2007), and the National Water Policy 2009 (draft 2007). Liberia was also a participating country of the ‘IWRM 2005’-project.
- *Togo* developed and presented an IWRM roadmap stepwise during 2007 at the Directorate of Water and Sewage. A National Water Law and a National Water Policy were both presented under the same Directorate the same year.

According to a survey undertaken by the ECOWAS-WRCU⁵ in all the seven project countries, policy makers had demonstrated, to different degrees, an understanding of the IWRM process. *Côte d'Ivoire*, *Liberia* and *Togo* also involved important stakeholders, including NGOs, in the process. Due to the unstable political situation the IWRM Action Plan and project portfolio for *Côte d'Ivoire* lacked completed legislation/ regulation. A new IWRM Roadmap resulted from the ‘IWRM 2005’ project and was presented later in 2007. *Liberia* initiated the development of an IWRM project portfolio and its funding structure in 2007.

Within the four “Roadmap countries” of the project (*the Gambia*, *Guinea*, *Guinea-Bissau* and *Sierra Leone*) only *the Gambia* demonstrated any involvement in the process (according to the ECOWAS-WRCU survey of 2007). *Guinea* was executing some IWRM projects, but again, due to political unrest in the country this process was and is very unstable.

According to the survey legislation/ regulation related to IWRM in all four Roadmap countries was not updated or incomplete, as in *The Gambia* and *Sierra Leone*. The existing legislation/ regulation in *Sierra Leone* was also in conflict with the traditional access right to water and not in line with other sectors. *Guinea*, *Guinea Bissau* and *Sierra Leone* were lacking personnel to take care of the application as well as means for the personnel. The levels of understanding among policy makers as

⁵ As was reported during an IWRM training session in Ouagadougou in March 2007 (according to the UN Water Status Report on IWRM and Water Efficiency Plans, May 2008)

well as the lack of personnel and means in the “Roadmap” countries are important aspects of the baseline situation.

2.1.3 Effectiveness

The Evaluation considered how and to what extent the relevant indicators of achievement under the overall objective and under the specific objective are identifiable at this point in time so that a Mid-term review is feasible. The Evaluation also tries to identify whether there are any obvious reasons for a delay.

Indicator 1:

“Multi-stakeholder consultative and decision making process, as well as IWRM Plan implementation mechanism in place, - improving water governance, - and contributing to the achievements of MDG and Country specific targets in terms of equity, economic development, and environmental sustainability.”

This SMART indicator was designed to verify whether the targeted countries have reached *“Improved water management and governance (in target countries) towards poverty alleviation and environmental sustainability”*.

This indicator can be seen as a three step-indicator, where the contribution to the achievement of the MDGs and the specified country targets depend on the improved water governance and the “multi-stakeholder consultative and decision-making process”. Both depend on the outcome of the project. Currently the “multi-stakeholder consultative and decision-making process” is in place in all countries, maybe with an exception for Guinea. But none of the countries has any implementation mechanism for IWRM Plans in place although the process for the “IWRM Plan countries” was initiated already during the ‘IWRM 2005’-project, when these countries were among the Roadmap-countries. Normally an “IWRM Plan Implementation Mechanism” is understood as a mechanism for implementing the actions of the IWRM Plan itself and therefore not expected to be in place before the Plan is finalized. This means that it is difficult to make any assessment based on this part of the indicator. All the “Roadmap” countries except Guinea have their agreed Roadmaps towards the IWRM Plan in place, and following a Roadmap towards an IWRM Plan is of course important. As the roadmaps are specific to each individual country, it is not possible to estimate whether the individual IWRM Plan countries have reached half-way or not.

Indicator 2:

“By the end of the project intervention: The Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea Conakry and Sierra Leone to own nationally negotiated roadmaps and Côte d’Ivoire, Togo and Liberia to own nationally negotiated plans. Conservation, rehabilitation and sustainable management of ecosystem services (from hill to oceans) are properly integrated in the IWRM roadmaps and plans.”

This SMART-indicator shall verify the degree of achievement regarding the specific objective *“Promote and support preparation of IWRM plans in the targeted countries with special focus on environmental aspects”*.

This is an indicator including two sub-indicators, one concerning the extent to which the countries now ‘own’ their negotiated Roadmaps or Plans, the other concerning to what extent ‘sustainable management of ecosystem services’ has been properly integrated in the Roadmaps and Plans. The first one has been reach by approximately 50%. The Gambia, Guinea-Bissau and Sierra Leone now own

their nationally negotiated roadmaps and Liberia is on its way towards an IWRM Plan by launching its IWRM Policy. The available documentation does not include sufficient evidence that the second issue have been fully addressed. However, the responses to the Questionnaire (See Annex V) indicate that this issue has not always been prioritized.

The rating at Mid-term based on the identified criteria is rather difficult as the Logical Framework does not identify what would be the situation at mid-term. Overall, there is a recognizable delay in producing the IWRM plans and the process in Guinea is delayed due to the political situation. Management of ecosystem services is poorly integrated in the finalized roadmaps and does not fully meet the objectives. The multi-stakeholder consultative and decision-making process is in place in all but one country, but whether that is a result of the implementation of this project or an outcome of the IWRM 2005 in those countries that participated in that is also difficult to assess.

Rating: Satisfactory

2.1.4 Relevance

The project approach is relevant to UNEP's Water Policy and Strategy with its overall goal "to contribute substantively to environmental sustainability in the management of all water resources, utilizing integrated ecosystem approaches", as well as to its 'Strategic principles' both the 'Conceptual principles' and the 'Operational principles', directly applying the latter::

- "Build national and regional capacity: implementing the Bali Strategic Plan
- Build on existing programmes and partnerships and form new partnerships
- Promote multi-stakeholder participation".

As the project is focused on improving water management and governance in West Africa by supporting IWRM processes, it is clearly meeting the objectives of the UNEP Water Policy and Strategy.

The project is designed to systematically review the current status of the enabling environment and to integrate improved strategies in the development of the IWRM roadmaps and plans. Such improved strategies also include national policies and legislation that integrate with the water sector. The project implementation thus ensures conformity with, and relevance to the country priorities.

The results the project aims at are in full consistency with the "UNEP Medium-term Strategy (MTS) 2010-2013 and its Water Policy and Strategy and Country Priorities". The Strategic direction of the project meets what is specified in the MTS, specifically under the cross-cutting priorities of "Ecosystem management" and "Environmental governance". It also complies with what is specified under "Implementing the priorities and objectives" in that the project is based on and provides for "Sound science for decision-makers:... monitoring and assessment". Important components are "Awareness-raising, outreach and communications", "Capacity-building and technology support: Bali Strategic Plan", and "Cooperation, coordination and partnerships". The financing of the project will hopefully, as mentioned in the amended activities 4.3 and 5.3, attract additional funding for follow-up activities and thus contribute to "Sustainable financing for the global environment".

Further, the project approach is consistent with the EU Strategy for Africa as it is supporting African 'efforts to achieve the MDG', it will promote 'access to water supply and sanitation' and the 'management of environmental diversity'. It is also fully consistent with the ACP-EU water strategy as expressed in the specific objective of the initial ACP-EU Water Facility in 2004: "Boost the

sustainable delivery of water and sanitation infrastructure and *improve water governance and Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) practices* in ACP countries by helping to address the financial gap”.

The outcomes and outputs⁶ of the project are in the Project document/ Logical Framework grouped under the heading of “Expected results”. And what is specified as items 4 (expected roadmaps), item 5 (expected IWRM Plans) and item 6 (documentation of best practices, case studies and guidelines) are all expected outputs of the project. But they can also be seen as inputs in the process to reach the expected outcomes of the project, which are the items 1 (Increased awareness on the importance of environmental approaches...), item 2 (Increased access to relevant IWRM information and tools), and item 3 (Capacity built of key water managers and decision makers on IWRM planning).

Conclusion: The planned outcomes of the project are, as specified in the project document and Logical Framework, consistent with what is specified in the “UNEP Water Policy and Strategy” and with the “UNEP Medium-term Strategy 2010-2013” and its Water Policy and Strategy. So far the project outcomes have not been achieved but as is demonstrated, including by the validated IWRM Roadmaps and by the increased political “buy-in” to the IWRM-process, important progress has been made. It does further ensure conformity with, and relevance to the country priorities. It is further in full consistence with the specific objective of the ACP-EU Water Facility, which is the main funding source of the project. Thus, the objectives and planned results of the project are indeed relevant.

Rating: **Highly Satisfactory**

2.1.5 Efficiency

As the inputs, costs and implementing time now has resulted in outputs such as the three out of four IWRM Roadmaps, and the reason for the fourth not being in place is rather the political impasses in Guinea than lack of adequate inputs, the project can at least be assessed as moving in the right direction. As the perceived outputs from the IWRM plan countries are scheduled to be delivered during the first half of 2010, this part would also demonstrate efficiency, but currently this is not possible to prove.

The slowing-down of the project implementation in Côte d’Ivoire and Togo was due to one international consultant’s longer sick-leave. It sped-up again when the specific additional support was provided to the countries. Tailor-made support for these countries was thus the most efficient as well as the least-cost-option to address the delays.

The UNEP, DHI/UDC and GWP-WA are all providing in-kind contribution, but the project has not so far leveraged additional resources. The Activities 4.3 and 5.3 are aiming at supporting the countries in their efforts to attract additional resources. These Activities were added upon request from the countries. The aim of Activity 4.3 is to assist in mobilizing additional resources to *implement* the Roadmaps towards IWRM Plans in the Roadmap countries, and the aim of Activity 5.3 to assist in mobilizing resources in the IWRM Plan countries to *implement* their IWRM Plans. In both cases are these resources to be used for the follow-up of the project. The possible leverage of additional

⁶ The terminology concerning “results”, “outcomes”, “outputs” and “inputs” in the project document is not always clear. This could be the case when an output (such as contracting a consultant) can be transferred into an input (e.g. his/her work is the input).

resources would of course in both cases relate to a successful outcome of the project in the respective country.

As was discussed in the sub-chapter on effectiveness, the criteria identified do not give any exact figures of whether the project at mid-term has produced half of its expected outputs. Some of the outputs are depending on others; there was an initial delay depending on that the initial mobilization and planning period required a longer period which was gained later due to a stronger project foundation. Comparison of the different items of the project budget and the expenditure under these items for the period January 2008 to June 2009 (See Annex VI) shows that the activities budgeted for during this period have been carried out, and they have according to reports produced (See list of documents reviewed, Annex IV, and Responses to Questionnaire, Annex V) produced expected outputs for all countries except for Guinea Conakry. The expenditures for these items are, however, less than what is budgeted for. According to this comparison the project performance at mid-term, thus must be regarded as cost-effective.

Rating on this criterion, which should also be based on whether the project is attracting co-financing – where the process according to the project plan has now just been initiated, is however difficult and is based on the fairly brief comparison.

Rating: Satisfactory

2.1.6 Conclusion

The project has demonstrated a certain degree of *effectiveness* in striving to get a multi-stakeholder consulting and decision-making process in place and has almost succeeded to meet the objective of getting the IWRM roadmaps in place (three out of four), with some but not prominent delay in the IWRM plan procedure in the three IWRM plan-countries but with a weak recognition of integrating management of ecosystem services in the finalized roadmaps.

The planned outcomes of the project will be consistent with what is specified in the “UNEP Water Policy and Strategy” and with the “UNEP Medium-term Strategy 2010-2013” if the implementation of the project follows the project plan. It does further ensure conformity with, and *relevance* to the country priorities.

The *cost-efficiency* of the project is currently more difficult to estimate. The approach to provide support, and when needed additional support, by assigning international consultants to initiate the process but work mainly with nationally anchored and less expensive consultants to drive the process in the countries seems to be a very efficient approach. The comparison between expenditure and budget allocation for different items also demonstrate cost-efficiency. The process of attracting co-financing for the continuation of the project, however, has only been initiated which makes the efficiency difficult to assess (See further under item 2.2.1).

Overall rating: Satisfactory

2.2. Assessment of Sustainability of Project Outcomes

Sustainability of the project is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts after the project funding ends, and it is depending on key conditions that will promote or undermine the persistence of benefits. The Evaluation ascertained the extent to which

barriers to sustaining the intended outcomes have already been identified and addressed and how project outcomes will be sustained and enhanced over time.

2.2.1 The Financial factor

To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on continued financial support?

What is the likelihood that any required financial resources will be available to sustain the project outcomes/benefits once the EU/UNEP assistance ends?

The transition from sectoral water management to the JPoI agreed Integrated Water Resources Management, which West African countries now are following is a long process. The project will contribute to the process, but the transition will require more time and additional external support to be completed.

For the four countries generating IWRM road maps, the project provides a detailed overview of the requirements to develop the first IWRM plan and thus constitutes an important and necessary instrument to solicit external financial and other support.

For the three countries generating IWRM plans, the project contributes to the inclusion of financial mechanisms to sustain the IWRM process from national or sub-regional resources, etc. The plan itself provides the basis for water resources management financing under the national budgets and defines the needs for additional external support.

The implementing institutions of the project have agreed, upon request from the Authorities in the project countries, to add two activities on assistance in mobilizing additional financial resources. Under these additional activities the following has been undertaken:

- * In *IWRM Roadmap countries*: During initial scoping missions and performed training and working sessions potential external partners such as AfDB/African Water Facility, UNDP, UNICEF, DFID, OXFAM etc. have been informed about the project, and potential donors were invited to the Roadmap validation sessions.

The EU, AfDB, World Bank, UNICRF and FAO have expressed interest in supporting Roadmap countries. The Roadmap countries shall, once their Roadmaps are finalized, prepare donor coordination meetings, which has so far not taken place. During the field visit a donor in Sierra Leone even urged the country to submit an application.

The project has provided extra funding for a detailed reform study in the Gambia that has following suit submitted a request to AfDB on institutional reforms, human resources, capacity building and decentralization of the IWRM awareness.

UNICEF is considering some awareness raising activities in Sierra Leone.

In Guinea Bissau, the donor funding still mainly goes to the sector activity. EU is providing funding for a project to use solar energy for accessing water supply and UNDP and EU had a donor meeting at the end of November to coordinate funding to the implementation of the Water Supply and Sanitation policy.

- * In *IWRM Action Plan countries*: Possible external partners were informed about the project initiation and content and possible partners are invited to major events.

The project management team is in contact with AfDB, Tunis, who expressed interest in supporting implementation of activities under IWRM Action Plans. AfDB is expected to provide follow-on support to a reform study.

In Liberia UNICEF co-financed the validation of the IWRM Policy while EU and UNICEF are co-financing the IWRM secretariat. The Water Supply and Sanitation Policy received financial contributions from the World Bank. Liberia has also submitted a request to AfDB for funding on institutional reforms, which has been approved by AfDB and will commence by the end of 2010.

To what extent are there likely financial barriers to sustaining the intended outcomes of the project?

The main financial barriers are within Guinea, where the donors, due to the politically very unstable situation now, have drawn back. However, several of the countries where the project is implemented have very recently experienced internal war or conflicts, but as the situation gets more politically stable donors have returned. It is difficult to estimate whether and when that could also be the case with Guinea, but as there is still an interest in the country for pursuing the project, which was demonstrated during a recent visit by the international consultant to the project, an increasing political stability in the country may once again attract donors.

The most promising sign now is the increasing interest for funding IWRM activities in the region from the African Water Facility at the African Development Bank. If the countries start to invite donors to coordination meetings for funding of their IWRM-related activities, the AWF interest may also attract other types of funding, maybe from the private sector, as was suggested by Guinea Bissau as a response to the Questionnaire (Appendix V).

Financial Sustainability Rating: **Moderately likely**

2.2.2 The Socio-political factors

The long-term sustainability of the project-derived outcomes is depending on key conditions. One important key condition that may have an impact on the persistence of the project benefit is the social aspects. The project is implemented in least developed countries, LDCs, where the meeting of the MDGs is very important. Several of the countries are now developing or have just developed their second Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) which all stress the social aspect as an important fundament. All the countries (except for Guinea Conakry that did not respond) have in their response to the Questionnaire (Annex V) clearly stated the importance of the IWRM-principle in their PRSPs, which underlines the importance they attach to it and the linkages to the social sustainability.

To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on socio-political factors?

Ideally, all the governments' policies, not only in the seven countries where the project is implemented, should reflect the need of integrating water management in all sector policies. And, ideally, there should be full cooperation between the different ministries in countries over water, as well as involvement and collaboration with all stakeholders. The ongoing trend with respect to socio-political sustainability of IWRM is positive. This positive trend has been clearly demonstrated within the work under the umbrella of the Global Water Partnership, where the 'participatory approach' (as agreed at the Dublin Conference in 1992) is fundamental. The trend was also evident from the outcomes of the 'IWRM 2005' project, which included a distinct increase in countries with IWRM roadmaps or plans. In fact, the socio-political sustainability is the actual framework for the IWRM. The IWRM-process is defined as a participatory, multi-sectoral planning and management process and

the outcomes of an IWRM project are thus extremely dependent on socio-political factors, social as well as political.

What is the likelihood that the level of stakeholder ownership will allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?

The management partnership with GWP in this project is a basis to ensure participation by civil society, private sector and NGOs in the process. The strong interest by the countries to strengthen or to establish Country Water Partnerships demonstrate the perceived need among stakeholders to establish strong networks that would ensure public participation in the process. The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) concluded under the auspices of the UNEP in July 2008 between the three parties implementing the project, the UNEP/DHI UDC-WATER, the WRCU of the ECOWAS and the GWP West Africa recognizes among the roles of the GWP/WA, to “Promote and coordinate public participation and facilitate the mobilization of stakeholders and Country Water Partnerships for the planning needs assessments and technical assistance in development of IWRM road maps” and “...action plans”.

The Country Water Partnerships of Côte d’Ivoire, Guinea and Togo were all evaluated under this project. All of them included links to the governments and relevant ministries and they had strong chairmen. This would be a positive factor when collaborating in a participatory IWRM-process. But lack of adequate funding and of strong host organization still result in them being rather weak partners.

The management partnership with ECOWAS and its Water Resources Coordination Unit is strengthening the participation at the government level. According to the above mentioned MoU ECOWAS/WRCU shall “Liaise – at the highest level (Ministers in charge of water resources) – with the Governments in the seven target countries.” And by seeing to “the conformity of national IWRM processes and outcomes with the Regional Water Policy adopted by the ECOWAS Heads of State and Government” the process should be anchored at the highest political level.

Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are there any likely socio-political barriers to sustaining the intended outcomes?

The most important role in ensuring a wide stakeholder participation and political anchorage of the IWRM project lies with the countries themselves.

All the seven countries have held stakeholder meetings as part of the scoping and planning procedure. This procedure also included identification of the project anchorage. The countries have not only identified the “head” Ministry for water but also established close linkages to other Ministries or organizations in charge of other aspects of water use or management.

The strong collaboration with relevant ministries were for example demonstrated during the Evaluator’s visit to Liberia, which included visits to the Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy (head ministry where the IWRM-secretariat is housed), Division of Environmental and Occupational Health, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Public Works including its department of Rural Development, and the Liberian Water and Sewage Company. The visit also included meetings with the minister as well as several deputy ministers at the Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy. And the Minister was the one carrying the National IWRM Policy to be presented at the African Water Week in Johannesburg, in November.

The visit to Guinea Bissau also included a meeting with some of the stakeholders, who are involved in the country process such as the General Directorate for Water Resources (the IWRM-responsible for the project), the Ministry of planning, Ministry of tourism, Ministry of finance, Ministry for energy, ministerial representatives for geology and mining, for urban sector, for sustainable development, for sustainable resources, for environment and for organizations such as CREPA and the Red Cross.

The countries attach importance to the issues of political anchorage as well as the one of public participation in the process. As the process is owned at high civil servant level in the responsible ministry it is not totally depending on who is the responsible minister – even if he as in Liberia and in Sierra Leone has expressed and demonstrated a clear interest for pursuing the IWRM policy. The politically rather insecure situation in several countries is, however, an uncertain factor.

Socio-political Sustainability Rating: **Likely**

2.2.3 The Institutional framework and governance factor

To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on issues relating to institutional framework and governance?

What is the likelihood that institutional (and technical⁷) achievements, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for the project objectives to be met?

The institutional framework and governance system that is needed to be in place for an IWRM system to be sustained in a long term perspective shall be addressed within the roadmap or plan. Plans as well as roadmaps will according to the project document “focus on the institutional arrangements/reforms required for IWRM, the enabling environment in terms of policies and legislation, and the various management instruments required to implement IWRM (economic, communication, information, strategic, etc.)”.

According to a survey presented by ECOWAS: “IWRM in West Africa, 2007 situation” all the seven countries where the project is being implemented except Guinea were in the process of rewriting their Water Policy to integrate IWRM principles. All countries had one or more specific water laws except Togo, where it was in preparation, and Liberia, where legal aspects linked to water still only exists in the Public Health Law (according to the National IWRM Policy, published under this project November 2009).

The water laws of Sierra Leone (1963) and of the Gambia (1979) are the oldest and least encompassing among the remaining. The water law is hardly ever sufficiently harmonized with other national legislation such as environmental, land-use, agriculture or health legislation, which will be needed to make the legal framework sufficiently strong for a sustainable IWRM implementation.

Guinea, Guinea Bissau and Liberia claimed to have a national body where cross-sectoral coordination at the over-all level could take place, and Côte d’Ivoire, Guinea and Togo had established CWPs as a platform where interaction with stakeholders at the national level can take place. In the case of Côte d’Ivoire, the Gambia, Guinea and Togo the IWRM aspect was at that time appearing in the PRSPs, in the MDG development strategy, in the Agricultural Plan and in the National Environmental Action Plan, but only in Côte d’Ivoire did the IWRM appear in an Energy Development Plan.

⁷ “Technical achievements” should be understood as “soft” technology, in this case the IWRM Roadmaps and IWRM Plans.

The facts demonstrated by the ECOWAS' survey of the 2007 situation show some of the requirements to apply a long-term sustainable IWRM system and to what degree they were met in 2007, at the start of the project. The training sessions during the project implementation have to a large extent emphasized the need for a sustainable institutional framework and a governance system, as well as the need to provide the required technical know-how. And although not all the countries have yet the framework in place, the roadmaps, both the ones that were developed prior to the project as a requisite for the "IWRM Action Plan"-countries and the ones developed under the existing project, clearly demonstrate that the countries, including the ones to implement the IWRM, are fully aware of the institutional and governance prerequisites for a successfully implemented IWRM Plan. The system should allow for accountability and transparency but it is at this stage not possible to evaluate to what extent that will be secured. That said, the politically insecure situation and lack of enough financial resources might still pose a barrier towards an early implementation.

Institutional and Governance Sustainability Rating: Moderately likely

2.2.4 The Ecological factor

Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits?

IWRM as one of its cornerstones and by definition needs to build on *environmental sustainability*. IWRM as elaborated in the 'UNEP's Water Policy and Strategy' provides an ecosystem-based approach to water resources management which encompasses both water quality and quantity. The process of IWRM in this project aims at achieving the optimum balance of economic development, social development, environmental protection and sustainable natural resources management.

Environmental benefits might, however, be at risk when the ecological tradeoffs inherent in almost any water project are not highlighted and communicated to stakeholders and decision-makers. Such ecological tradeoffs may include those linked to the pre-eminent risk of climate change. But in poor countries land mismanagement, pollution or short-term economic benefits might be more obvious risks. This might be one reason for the difficulties the countries had to respond to the question in the Questionnaire (Annex V): "To what extent has the project to date resulted in increased awareness of the importance of environmental approaches and considerations, including such related to ecosystem services, in IWRM?" Only two of the responding 5 countries delivered a positive answer, Guinea Bissau and Liberia. Guinea Bissau responded that the project had redirected the governmental approach from a sectoral towards an IWRM approach, thus including environmental considerations. Liberia referred to a discussion that occurred during its multi-stakeholder dialogue on the Water Resources Issues Assessment Method. However, during the final stage of the project when the countries will be forced to apply a wider and more long-term approach to how they start implementing their IWRM roadmaps or their IWRM Action Plans, the environmental perspective will, no doubt, become more evident. But there is definitely a need to pronounce it by raising environmental awareness!

A project on Integrated Water Resources Management does not include activities that in themselves pose a threat to the environmental sustainability of the project outcomes. And the project activities as such do not imply environmental risks such as water pollution etc. The risks to environmental sustainability from a management-related project could rather be a consequence of mismanagement where the concerns for the environment are not integrated as a factor. Lack of environmental

awareness pose a fundamental risk that environmental aspects are not included in the IWRM. The project aims to address that issue; hence the degree to which this will succeed is the most important determinant of the environmental sustainability of the project.

Environmental Sustainability Rating: Moderately Likely

2.2.5 Conclusion

In conclusion, sustainability of project outcomes, in light of where the project currently is in terms of implementation is Moderately Likely. The rating is building on the impressions of the four aspects, which are all rated as Moderately Likely. The Evaluation presented evidence that countries will be able to find some funding for some follow-up actions, but that the political unrest might to some degree hamper the possibilities. There is a largely positive trend in socio-political aspects including stakeholder involvement at civil society-NGO level as well as at the broader ministerial level, and the project provides a good ground for positive institutional/governance involvement. The Evaluation further finds it Moderately Likely that sustainable ecological benefits will be achieved by the work towards IWRM Plans and Roadmaps, despite the current meager awareness of those benefits among the national implementing teams, as was demonstrated during the field visits.

Rating on Sustainability of Project Outcomes: Moderately Likely

2.3. Catalytic Role

The catalytic and replicable effect of the project would primarily be ensured by what is prepared under the activity 6.1 “Preparation of case studies guidelines and documentations of best practices, based on experiences and lessons learned through supported IWRM processes, to be included in GWP IWRM toolbox and published”.

This part of the project aims at generating increased awareness and capacity through the following outputs:

- * 4 case studies on IWRM road mapping (Gambia, Guinea, Guinea Bissau and Sierra Leone)
- * 3 case studies on IWRM plan preparation (Togo, Côte d’Ivoire and Liberia);
- * Issue specific documentation on 13 case studies, developing 13 IWRM management tools
- * Guidelines on IWRM road mapping
- * Guidelines on IWRM preparation
- * Technical guidelines on environmental approaches to IWRM extracted from training material.

As the results are to be included and published in the GWP toolbox the effect is intended to be multiplied and allow for experience exchange with those utilizing the tool box. It is developed with the purpose to ensure that lessons learnt and experiences coming out of the project can be replicated in other geographic areas, as suitable.

What has been prepared so far, is a compilation and analysis of the case studies on IWRM road mapping for the Gambia, Guinea Bissau and Sierra Leone, who have all successfully developed and validated their IWRM roadmaps. The approach to achieve replicability is clearly demonstrated by the

themes to be considered by the countries when submitting their material. These themes are the following:

- **Problems** of water resources management that need to be addressed
- **Context** in which the problems and solutions need to take place
- **Decisions and actions taken** in order to execute the (IWRM roadmap) process
- **Outcomes** of the decisions and actions taken
- **Lessons learnt** that will be of value to others involved in similar situation
- **Relevance of the case to IWRM** i.e. how the case exemplifies the problems and solutions associated with IWRM
- **Contacts and references** to be used if more information is required.

The output presented so far is very promising as a tool that will assure replicability of the full outcomes of the project. It is necessary to ensure that also the other outputs envisaged will do so. As they need to build on the outputs under the other parts of the project where some are still in the production process, this is important as a vital step in the process. It is, however, currently impossible to evaluate the total catalytical role the project will play when finalized. This evaluation therefore is based on the case study report that is so far delivered and on the notion on what the project intend to present. But as the latter is not further specified it is not possible to give this item the highest grade even if the existing report might motivate that.

Rating: Satisfactory

2.4. Achievement of outputs and activities

The project now being more than half way through the implementation time has delivered some outputs that should be considered very useful, in particular for the countries themselves in their continued IWRM process but also to the other countries that are in the process of developing an IWRM plan. Due to different circumstances the timeliness of the products has varied between countries, but in several occasions project management has successfully responded to delays (See 2.1.5). The character of the project does not make it possible to present any detailed timeline according to which different outputs could be delivered, which could be easily understood by the definition of the Activities under the project. And as there is no or little necessary sequential timeline that the different activities need to follow to be useful to the final outcome from a country perspective, the timeliness of the delivery of each output is less important.

Table 1: Delivered Outputs, usefulness and quality at national and regional level

Activity	Delivered output	Usefulness, quality and possible impact
1.1 Expand national stakeholder networks through establishing/strengthening of CWPs	Evaluation of existing CWPs (Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea and Togo). Preliminary consultative meetings with target countries without CWPs. Contacts with possible donors. GWP/WA agreed to continue assisting.	The evaluation of the existing CWPs clearly demonstrate their need for financial, political and institutional support, which is an important point of departure in the process within the countries currently without CWPs. The delivered project outputs are, thus, timely and useful for further expanding of the networks.
1.2 Raise stakeholder awareness of importance of	Training material developed, initial stakeholder training and working sessions conducted. Stakeholders validated the IWRM Roadmap of	Both the training material that has been developed and used, the validation at workshops with 70-80

environmental approach, and on country specific issues, in on-going or planned IWRM processes. ⁸	Gambia in May 2009. Stakeholders validated the IWRM Roadmap of Guinea Bissau in June 2009. Stakeholders validated the IWRM Roadmap of Sierra Leone in June 2009. National IWRM Policy in Liberia delivered, November, 2009.	participating stakeholders, and the preparation and formal stakeholder discussion of the Roadmaps and the Policy have contributed to an increased awareness of the complex, over-arching approach of the IWRM, including its environmental aspects. Hence, these outputs are important, timely and useful for the further process.
2.1 Development of environmental IWRM info and tools for GWP IWRM toolbox.	Preliminary Water Resources Issues Assessments conducted in national river basins of Côte d'Ivoire, the Gambia, Guinea, Liberia, Togo and Sierra Leone and draft cases for the GWP tool box prepared in June 2009.	The GWP tool box case studies will be used by other countries when finalized. So far only some drafts have been prepared, as expected at this stage.
3.1 Training of governmental representatives and stakeholders on IWRM needs and priorities addressing country specific issues.	1. Country specific training material, which is evaluated and used during sessions. 2. The outcomes of the sessions are to be used in the IWRM situation analysis for all target countries.	This is an example of the concrete utilization of developed training material within the countries. Useful and timely outputs that is used as inputs to the further process.
4.1 IWRM planning needs assessment in Roadmap countries	IWRM situation analyses were prepared for the Gambia, Guinea, Guinea Bissau and Sierra Leone, based on the planning needs assessments that were undertaken at the beginning of the project.	This activity was, and should be, undertaken early in the process. The assessments that were the actual outputs of this activity were used to prepare the IWRM situation analyses.
4.2 Technical assistance to develop IWRM Roadmaps.	National and Regional consultants contracted for assistance with IWRM Roadmap process. Final IWRM roadmaps prepared for the Gambia, Guinea Bissau and Sierra Leone in place in mid 2009.	The IWRM roadmaps are developed to be used by the countries in their process towards the IWRM plan. They are, thus, to be seen as very useful instruments to the countries themselves but also to other countries, following the same process.
4.3 Assist Roadmap countries in mobilizing additional financial resources to develop and implement their IWRM Action Plans.	The output so far has been expression of interest from some donors in supporting IWRM roadmap-related activities in roadmap countries but no concrete agreement.	Countries with finalized roadmaps will prepare donor (coordination) meetings, which will be an output of this activity. The assistance in mobilizing resources is important, but the countries themselves must own this process.
5.1 Technical assistance to develop IWRM plans in 'IWRM plan-countries'.	National and Regional consultants contracted for assistance with the IWRM process. Work plan agreed for the finalization of a Water Policy and IWRM Plan in Togo	The countries' implementation process depends on their regional and national consultants. Consultants that have often filled important water related positions in a country are thus able to provide multifold backstopping. Contracting consultants is a timely and important output.
5.2 Final plan developed.	No outputs so far as the final plans are expected to be in place by the end of the project.	This output is not supposed to be in place before the end of the project.

⁸ This activity is closely linked to activities 4.1, 4.2, 5.1 and 5.2 concerning generation of IWRM roadmaps and plans, which include key awareness workshops.

Technical assistance for institutional arrangements.		
5.3 Assist Action plan countries in mobilizing additional financial resources to implement their IWRM Action Plans.	Contact between the Project Management Group and the AfDB in Tunis.	The contact has been established but the possible impact is still pending the finalization of the IWRM Plans.
6.1 Preparation of case studies guidelines and doc of best practices.	ECOWAS/WRCU is preparing a note containing guidelines and methodologies for IWRM planning in the region. Expected to be finalized first half of 2010. 3 case studies for the countries that have finalized their roadmaps have been presented.	As most of the work under this activity are still either in preparation or yet to be done, it is difficult to estimate whether the outputs will be as useful as they are expected. However, this is an important activity and the output and outcome are crucial.

As this is a Mid-term Evaluation of an IWRM-project (with its political character), the evaluation of achieved outputs from the activities is very difficult. Completions of activities and outputs are not necessarily intended to be equally distributed over the implementation time and not necessarily sequential. The immediate impacts resulting from an output are very seldom possible to evaluate purely on their own merit. But even though there have been some delays during project implementation, the amount and quality of the outputs delivered by mid-term of the project implementation period is satisfactory.

Rating: Satisfactory

2.5. Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

2.5.1. Monitoring & Evaluation Design

The project, as it was developed prior to when the existing UNEP Evaluation Manual (2008)⁹ was in place, has no developed Monitoring and Evaluation Plan to continuously monitor activities but a reporting procedure that is very informal. The “internal regional review of the project progress and management” on the UNEP internal agenda, is not a documented evaluation but an item for discussion at bi-monthly internal meetings at UNEP-DESI.

⁹ According to the UNEP Evaluation Manual, 2008 (http://hqweb.unep.org/eou/PDFDOCS/Evaluation_Manual_2008.pdf)

“A broad M&E plan should be developed during project formulation and included in the project document. The M&E plan complements the highly summarized M&E information that is the log-frame. The M&E plan developed will need to be revised and adapted during project start-up. The plan should include:

- The logical framework
- Indicators
- Outcome and impact monitoring
- Baseline information (or plans for obtaining baseline information)¹⁸ and the methodology
- Operational monitoring, (progress monitoring) including risk and ‘quality control measures
- Financial monitoring, monitoring of project expenditure, co-financing contributions and expenditure, contributions in-kind and financial auditing
- M&E roles and responsibilities
- Mid-term reviews and Terminal Evaluations
- A fully-costed budget for M&E.”

Thus the project document does, not meet the requirements for M&E project design as of now and there are no resources budgeted for ongoing M&E during project implementation, except for the Mid-term and the Final Evaluations. No M&E procedures were included in the project document. The current UNEP guidelines call for an M&E Plan to contain a budget, a baseline with data and a methodology, SMART indicators of success and evaluation studies at specific times, to assess results.

The explanations offered by the project managers why there is no formal M&E in place that could a) help ensure the project achieves expected environmental benefits, b) guiding the project progress, c) assure resources are properly spent, and d) bring insights to project manager to increase the quality of the project implementation, are the following:

1. the project structure, and in particularly the existence of international consultants/project supervisors (in accordance with the procedure at DHI) are assuring quality control as they are regularly in contact with IWRM teams in the different countries,
2. the Project Management Group has an assessment function and reports back from its meetings that are held twice a year, and
3. annual technical, financial and narrative reports are to be submitted by the project manager through UNEP providing evaluation of progress and the work plan and budget for the next period. Such short reports have been delivered building on reports from the different countries. These reports have presented the facts, including background to any delays, for the different countries. Any concerns have then been acted on.

The quality assurance by the international consultants/project supervisors ensures a more frequent monitoring than the other two systems but neither of these systems provide for any criteria against which ongoing evaluation can be done. Despite these reporting tools, the project document provides too few details as to how the M&E will be implemented, except for the brief notes presented in the Logical Framework. And even if no detailed requirements concerning a M&E plan was in place when the project was initiated there is little doubt that such a plan would have been and still would be useful, a plan in which specific indicators should be identified for monitoring of progress during the final part of the project. Even though there were reporting tools including for quality assurance in place, the design of M&E has been too vague and monitoring criteria not identified, which is the reason for the rating.

Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory

2.5.2. Monitoring & Evaluation Plan Implementation

The basic monitoring and reporting that is undertaken within the project include a tracking of results that are less detailed, based on the indicators presented in the Logical Framework (“inventory of outputs/services”).

The Project Management Group, the Steering Committee for the project, has no M&E role but the different partners shall report from their perspectives.

The Logical Framework requires “objectively verifiable, SMART, indicators of achievement”. These indicators are used in the annual report. But they are not used for any further analysis. No project staff member was given the task of M&E. Experience from other projects shows the most effective way to

address M&E is to have one member of the project team be clearly responsible for monitoring, and be given adequate resources to do this.

Implementation of a well developed M&E Plan should ensure the possibility to intervene and to take corrective actions related to project performance and output delivery. Such plan would require monitoring based on performance and on indicators.

The project has decided to solve this by using a system of consultants and project supervisors. There are national consultants appointed for the participating countries. They are generally former ‘water directors’ etc. of the countries and are continuously overseeing the work at national level. There are also some regional consultants, who are assisting groups of countries and will, thus, be able to provide guidance from a broader perspective. And the DHI, where the implementing and managing UDC unit is housed, requires as project quality assurance that the project also have Project Supervisors. These supervisors are the ones assuring the close links between the project and its implementation in the countries. Their role is not to undertake any actual monitoring and evaluation, but they are providing the important information about the progress of the project that is needed to take proper action if a country is not “on track”. Their important role was clearly demonstrated when a delivery delay occurred (due to a team member’s sick leave) and was met with extra-support.

To summarize, at the outset the project’s M&E framework was weak and inadequate, it was under-resourced, and few attempts has so far been made to improve it during implementation. But steps are taken within the project to assure good quality in implementing the project, in particularly through the structure of Project Supervisors. The experiences of the system and its non-consistent reporting, however, demonstrate its weakness. Negative results such as insufficient guidance could otherwise have been reacted to more swiftly.

Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

2.5.3. Budgeting and Funding for Monitoring & Evaluation Activities

The only line items concerning M&E activity that was budgeted for were the Mid-term and Terminal Evaluation. The project budget allocated a total of US\$35,000 (i.e. approximately of 2% of the total budget), an amount that is fairly low for a regional project, to cover comprehensive mid-term and terminal evaluations. A small portion of overall staff costs went to time spent developing the two narrative reports for the project. And unspecified cost in terms of time is spent for “internal regular review of the project progress and management” where UNEP is providing in-kind contribution. Overall M&E costs for the project are likely to be in the range of around 3% - unless more funding is secured to establish a more detailed M&E system to track progress performance and impact during the final phase of the project. Currently the budgeting for M&E is well below the recommended 5% for GEF projects. Hence, funding of the project M&E system has had shortcomings, which needs to be attended to.

Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory

2.5.4. Long-Term Monitoring

As an important part of the project under the Activity 6 “Preparation of case studies guidelines and documentation on best practices, based on experiences and lessons learned through the supported IWRM processes” long-term monitoring of the impacts of the project will be provided. Each

individual country process will be documented, which of course need to be based on monitoring, as a case study. And based on lessons learned and thus documented, guidelines will be prepared. Additionally the case studies of best practices will be used to further develop and demonstrate the 13 different “tools” of the GWP IWRM toolbox.

This approach, if followed, will ensure that not only long-term monitoring of results will be provided for but that this monitoring will be utilized to provide for successful future application of the IWRM roadmap and plan procedure. Of course, this is still to be proven.

Rating: Highly Satisfactory

2.5.5 Conclusion

The project was designed and initiated before the current Evaluation Manual (2008) where a mandatory M&E Plan is required for UNEP projects. It has a system for quality insurance in place that also aims at keeping track of whether it is following the project plan. Experiences during the project implementation have demonstrated that in a more immediate and short-term perspective this may not be sufficient. And even if the project supervisors and the regional consultants would provide for some over-sight in “their countries”, their main responsibilities do not include continuous monitoring of project performance. And although the mid-term and terminal evaluations are budgeted for in the project budget, this does not securing continuous monitoring during the project run.

Activities related to documentation of best practices, based on experiences and lessons learned will ensure a more long-term evaluation of project performance and impacts.

As the inclusion of a fully developed M&E Plan builds on an M&E Manual that was launched after the initiation of the project, it is difficult to evaluate the performance based on this criterion. But the arguments for a more developed system are still strong, which is the reason for the over-all rating.

Overall M&E rating: Moderately Satisfactory

2.6. Assessment of processes that affected attainment of project results

2.6.1. Preparation and Readiness

The impetus for a project of this kind was gained early in the region, starting already in 1998 at the West African Conference on Integrated Water Resources Management when the governments were urged to take proper steps towards creating a framework for IWRM. In March 2000 a Ministerial Follow-up Committee approved the West Africa Action Plan (WARAP) for IWRM. In December 2001 the ECOWAS Authority of Heads of State established the Permanent Framework for Coordination and Monitoring of IWRM and of the follow-up to the Action Plan. The Water Resources Coordination Unit, WRCU, was established within the ECOWAS executive secretariat and made responsible for regional integration programs.

The project builds on this regional IWRM process using WRCU as the pathway of regional coordination and supporting the aims of the programmes established under WARAP-IWRM, in particular the support to National Integrated Water Resources Management plans in the countries lagging most behind in the process.

Assistance to the regional IWRM process in West Africa from the Global Water Partnership, GWP, since the 1998 Conference has amongst others led to the creation of the West African Water Partnership, GWP/WA, in 2002 and to the creation of a number of Country Water Partnerships, the ones in Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea and Togo were all established in 2006. The project builds on experience from these processes and the partnership with GWP/WA in supporting the seven targeted countries.

UDC with assistance from DANIDA has responded to the WSSD IWRM 2005 target by providing support to accelerating the IWRM process in selected countries in various regions (UNEP 2005 IWRM Target Project). This support in West Africa has led to the generation of IWRM roadmaps scheduling and allocating responsibilities to actions required to preparing initial IWRM plans in Togo, Liberia and Côte d'Ivoire. This project builds on and expands these efforts by supporting the process of initial IWRM plan preparation in these countries. The project, further, building on these experiences, supports the generation of IWRM roadmaps in the Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau and Sierra Leone.

The Memorandum of Understanding agreed and signed by the three partners under the auspices of UNEP at the beginning of the project in 2008 regulates how the project is executed by UDC in collaboration with ECOWAS/WRCU and GWP/WA. And the intended involvement and activities of different stakeholder groups and partners are identified in the project document.

This clearly explains that the;

- * capacities of the executing institutions and counterparts were properly considered when the project was designed;
- * lessons from other relevant projects were properly incorporated in the design of the project;
- * partnership arrangements were properly identified and roles and responsibilities were negotiated prior to implementation; and
- * availability of counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), passage of enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements were in place at project entry.

The project's objectives, the overall objectives and the specific objective, are not very detailed - not even the "specific objective" was in reality specific but more encompassing – and address the objectives of the project, without giving much guidance. The project components, the activities, are more specific with proposed, somewhat optimistic time-schedule. The Project Management Group at the outset of the project held several planning meetings with all different partners to ensure mutual understanding. These meetings also included the initial scoping and planning missions by the UDC country advisors in the seven project countries involved.

To what extent have the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document been closely followed? Have committees etc. established for the project implementation enabled effective and efficient implementation?

How effective, efficient and adaptable is the management of the project? The supervision of project activities and project execution arrangements – at policy decision/Project Management Group level? At day to day project management/Implementation Team level?

The main mechanisms that have been put in place are the *Project Management Group* and the *Implementation Team* with staff from UDC, ECOWAS-WRCU and GWP-WA.

The PMG holds meetings twice a year as the project Steering Committee. The project coordinator is in contact with the members when need be.

All roles are identified in the project document as are the different roles of the beneficiaries such as National Governments; Water resources management responsible agencies at national and local levels; Water resources dependent agencies at national and local levels; NGOs; Water and waste water service providers; and Community based organizations – all of these comprising the IWRM network/partnership in the different countries.

As this fairly complicated structure was for most of the countries already to some extent in place as part of the normal set-up it has filled its functions to date and provided effective project management at overall level as well as at day-to-day project management level. It is foreseen that if the continuing process follows the same lines in the different countries this will provide for a very good outcome of the project.

Rating: Highly satisfactory

2.6.2. Country Ownership/Drivenness

A main condition identified as necessary to achieve the objectives of the project is identified in the project Logical Framework as “governments continue to be committed to IWRM approaches for water governance, and to supporting the processes with national means.” The LogFrame further recognizes that “All countries and partners have expressed their commitment to participate”, which is one of the pre-condition to get the project started.

Strong country ownership is being demonstrated by the roadmap countries in their efforts to involve all national partners as stakeholders in the IWRM process.

The following quotation from Liberia’s National IWRM Policy, developed within the process clearly describes its commitment to the issue and its reason for driving its IWRM-process: “It is the vision of the People of Liberia that by 2015 the country’s water resources will be developed integrally with land and other natural resources, and managed in an efficient, environmentally sound, equitable and responsible manner, with due consideration to all varied and competing uses, in order to satisfy present societal needs and demands for water and water related goods and services, and to preserve the ecological functions of water resources, without compromising the ability of future generations to satisfy those same needs.”

At the validation process of the Gambian IWRM Roadmap in June 2009, the permanent secretary heading the process confirmed the government of the Gambia’s commitment to the global and regional agenda to move from traditional, sectoral approach to an integrated approach to water management which was demonstrated by its commitment to this process.

From the responses by the 6 country responding to the distributed questionnaire, as from the interviews during the field trip, it has become evident that the ongoing or just finished revision of the PRSPs in the countries is incorporating the IWRM approach (See Annex V).

The coordinating and responsible role in the countries concerning the implementation of the project is with the ministry in charge of water, which also become evident during the field visits. And the process is driven by civil servants at high level, with due support from the political level. It is very

important that the ones with the key responsibility to coordinate the project implementation, the driver and the coordinator are placed at high level but below the political level. That would mean that the commitment to the process will survive even with a new political leadership.

In conclusion, the project seemed to have continued the good work of having the countries commit themselves to the project and to the outcome of the project and, hence, to demonstrate a keen interest in successful outcomes.

Rating: Highly Satisfactory

2.6.3. Stakeholder Involvement

Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in project's design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation? Did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?

The initial phases of implementing the project in the countries, both the IWRM roadmap countries and the IWRM plan-countries, included a 'scoping and planning' phase, where important information material was collected, including from stakeholders. This information collection included knowledge from appropriate governmental entities, community groups, local governments etc. After in-depth analysis and work on backgrounds on application of IWRM in the countries, national workshops were held.

The aim of those initial workshops in the IWRM roadmap countries and in the IWRM plan countries was awareness building, information exchange and discussions. Factual reports, describing the work during the different workshops and with inputs from the participants were produced by the countries and discussed but no surveys or written feed-backs were produced. The participating group included representatives for all the ministries concerned, donors and NGOs. In the continued process that group became enlarged. For instance in Liberia there has all through the process been and continues to be close cooperation between all the relevant ministries, local governments and other relevant organizations. At a later workshop in the process, the group of participants had been extended and included representatives for civil society and for the local governments. That ensured including *the perspectives of those who would be affected and those who might affect the outcomes*.

The roadmap process in Sierra Leone was initiated in May 2008 with a workshop that had representation of Government sectoral institutions involving environment, agriculture, water etc. The validation stakeholder forum included participants from government, parastatal, private sector, NGOs and donors.

During the mission the Evaluator had two meetings with larger groups of stakeholders, including both representatives for relevant ministries, civil society and NGOs; in Bissau, where a group of 20 participants were invited to discuss with the Evaluator, and in Abidjan, where the Evaluator participated in a regular meeting. In both cases it was evident that the stakeholder group used to be consulted.

The Togo has developed an institutional structure consisting of an Inter-ministerial committee, and a multi-stakeholder forum, together composing the "Group of 25", which has the responsibility to develop the process towards the IWRM plan.

In summary, the process of finding a single *mechanism* to identify and engage stakeholders for stakeholder involvement in the different countries is not possible. It is important that the *collaboration/interaction* with the partners and institutions is working effectively, which it is, at least where it has been possible to assess. And the reports from the public awareness activities that have been arranged so far, as well as the recently released brief publication from the roadmap processes, appear to have been useful. Such outcome needs to be ensured for the IWRM plan countries as well.

Rating: Highly satisfactory

2.6.4. Financial planning

In order to facilitate a smooth project implementation the budget is administrated directly by UDC following the financial reporting procedures towards UNEP stated in the general project management manual. Financial reporting to EU-ACP is done by UNEP in according to the requirements given in the project document. The project costs compared to the budget for the year 2008 and first half of 2009 is enclosed (See Annex VI).

So far the project has only received the first payment from the EU according to the contract and did only request the second payment at the end of September 2009. The reason for not requesting this payment that should cover the period January – December 2009 was, according to UNEP, that the UNEP counterpart funding from Norway that was to be used needed to be spent first as these funds had to be used by mid 2009. Disbursement from the EU was deferred until then, hence the delayed expenditure of the EU resources. It will now be used to cover all remaining activities.

So far only the first financial report has been delivered by UNEP to the EU. This report covers the period December 2007 – June 2009, which is the first half of the project. To be able to find out how the financial resources have been used during the first year, the Evaluation has been using data from the “Real Previous Period” in the “Forecast Budget & follow-up” that was accompanying the “Request for payment 2” that was sent to the EC in Abidjan 29 September 2009. The “Real Previous period” is the break-down of the expenditures encumbering the project during the period 15/12/07 – 31/12/08. These figures were compared with the budgeted sums under the same headings for the same period. This exercise gave two very interesting results:

- The spending on international experts was much higher than anticipated in the budget, both in terms of fees, travel, per diem and in terms of support staff and office-space at the DHI/UDC.
- The regional experts, national consultants and some of the national multi-stakeholder dialogues have used less, and sometimes much less funding than anticipated.

According to reporting from several sources, the reason behind both these results is the same. Even though Côte d’Ivoire, Liberia and Togo, under the IWRM 2005-project had prepared their roadmaps, still everything was not laid on to start implementing the project in the seven countries. The start-up period requested a lot of arrangements and support by the international experts. This was even more so in the roadmap countries under this project, the Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau and Sierra Leone. And this resulted in a delay in implementation initiation, which was a reason behind less use of regional and national consultants during that period. The Project Document did not include a mobilization phase which would have been essential, particularly for regional projects involving several countries with diverse institutional setups and capacities, according to UNEP.

According to the data as presented in the Quarterly expenditure report on allocation, expenditure and balance covering the period January 2008 to June 2009 (Annex VI) the total expenditure during that period was less than what was allocated for. This included not only budget allocations for consultants, which are supporting the countries in their work, but also budget allocation for National multi-stakeholder dialogues and working sessions. This means that the Roadmap countries the Gambia, Guinea-Bissau and Sierra Leone, after having presented and validated their Roadmaps, which should be the final activity in these countries, have not used the funding allocated to be used during the IWRM-process in those countries.

Expenditure for national multi-stakeholder dialogues in the IWRM Plan countries Liberia, Côte d'Ivoire and Togo are somewhat different, because they have reached different stages in their processes. This kind of differences has, of course been very difficult to plan for. But over-all the expenditure is less than the budget allocation.

The budget allocation to the different items has over-all been somewhat higher than what has been expended. A reason to that might have been a careful spending of the resources but also the delay in process that the political insecure situation, particularly in Guinea Conakry has resulted in. Part of the remaining allocated resources will therefore need to be spent on what they are budgeted for. The most evident diversion from budget allocation is the budgeting for consultants/experts, which has been explained above. Although the financial planning overall is reasonably satisfying, there is a need for a budget revision in order to ensure best use of the over-allocated resources. It is recommended that this revision will allow for the remaining allocated funding to the countries be used to ensure a swift follow-up process in order for them not to loose momentum in the process towards an IWRM plan. Such revising of the budget should also aim at attracting additional funding from other sources.

Rating: Satisfactory

2.6.5. UNEP Supervision and Backstopping

According to the project document UNEP/DEPI has the overall project management responsibility, but in reality, UNEP relied on UDC to manage the project on UNEPs behalf. UNEP's capacity to provide frequent supervision of the project is mainly hampered by lack of staff. Even if, according to the project document, UNEP provides in-kind contribution to the project by 50% of a position, this is simply not possible under the current staffing situation at UNEP/DEPI. UNEP is chairing the meetings of the Project Management Group, is participating in key presentation meetings, is reviewing and commenting on progress and financial reports and has regular co-ordinations with the Project manager at UDC and representatives of partner institutions. UNEP was responsible for preparing the ToRs for this Evaluation and did also meet the Evaluator in Abidjan for discussions and participated during debriefing with the EU.

But time and work overload does not allow UNEP to spend the time with the project that would be necessary to provide efficient and effective supervision and backstopping. And as UNEPs outpost centre in West Africa has been closed, UNEP is not able to provide any support from the region but is relying on the UDC.

According to UNEP/DEP UDC was created specifically to provide hands on and specialized input to on-the-ground initiatives such as this one to avoid establishing an elaborate structure at UNEP HQ and the additional supervision and backstopping should be to complement UDC and not to assume its responsibilities.

The Evaluation has not, however, seen any evidence that the less intensive level of supervision and backstopping provided by UNEP has served as constrain to the project implementation other than maybe that a more vivid intervention from the UNEP/DEPI might ensure a stronger ecosystem approach. In order to avoid any confusion regarding the roles and responsibilities of UNEP/DEPI respective UDC it would be useful to clearly identify these roles.

Rating: Moderately satisfactory

2.6.6. Co-financing and Project Outcomes and Sustainability

The financing for the project is by the EU-ACP Contribution and the financial contributions by UNEP and the other partners, partly as in-kind contribution. No other co-financing is being applied or foreseen.

2.6.7. Delays and Project Outcomes and Sustainability

The implementation of the activities on the ground commenced somewhat later in 2008 than anticipated and as presented in the work plan. The reason behind this was that the initial mobilization and planning period required a longer period. This, however, seemed to benefit the project as when the implementation arrangements were established, the implementation has overall gained speed. The project is on course in three of the four IWRM Roadmap countries, the Gambia, Guinea-Bissau and Sierra Leone, all of which have concluded, presented and validated their Roadmaps. The political situation in the fourth country, Guinea, resulted in early autumn that activities were stalled and although during a visit made to the country by the appointed national consultant in late November, the situation seemed to have improved slightly, it is still too insecure for any schedule of activities to be reliable.

Activities in the three IWRM planning countries, Côte d'Ivoire, Liberia and Togo, are advancing, and even if neither country so far has finalized its plan, this is according to information from the UDC-supervisors and the regional consultants, most probably to be the case during the first half of 2010.

The delays in the processes in Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea and Togo that resulted from a long sick-leave of the UDC-supervisor for these countries, which resulted in a lack of sufficient human support to those countries, was attended to when it became evident. Côte d'Ivoire is provided with a new supervisor/advisor and extra resources for national consultants. Togo is also provided with a new supervisor/advisor and extra resources for a regional consultant, and for Guinea the former chairman of GWP-WA is now acting national consultant. All these additional facilities are highly qualified expert from the region and with diplomatic skills. Hence, the process in Côte d'Ivoire and Togo has gain speed and results are produced.

2.7 Specific Evaluation tasks

The Terms of Reference requested this Evaluator to undertake some specific evaluation tasks. However, most of what is identified under these specific tasks is already dealt with under the previous issues in this chapter. This is clarified below.

The **relevancy** and **appropriateness** of the project strategy, work programme and activities in relation to emerging issues in water, the environment and development, particularly to the priorities of the involved countries, the objectives of UNEP, and the EU Strategy for Africa is high as have already

been alerted to above (See 2.1.4). The relevance and appropriateness to EU's strategic support to Africa is also discussed in that subchapter as the project fully addresses what is defined in the special objective of the ACP-EU Water Facility, the main funding source, in that the EU Water Facility by supporting the project contributes to "... *improve water governance and Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) practices) in ACP countries by helping to address the financial gap*".

Already in 1998 the West African Conference on IWRM urged their governments to work towards this goal. Three of the countries, Côte d'Ivoire, Liberia and Togo had their roadmaps in place as a result of the IWRM 2005-project and the other are the West African countries lagging most behind related to this. They all claim this is an important priority in their sustainable development. The strategy, the work programme and the activities are fully relevant both to the cross-cutting priorities and objectives to 1) "strengthen the ability of countries to integrate climate change responses into national development processes", and 2) assisting "countries utilizing the ecosystem approach to enhance human well-being", as specified in the UNEP Medium-term Strategy 2010-2013; and to the need for Social and Environmental dynamics and the EU's response strategy to meet this, as expressed in the EU Strategy for Africa.

The "**contribution of the project towards coherence between national strategies/ roadmaps and programs with the regional programs and transboundary river basins...**" is a task that according to the MoU between the three parties implementing the project, the UNEP/DHI UDC, the ECOWAS/WRCU and the GWP-WA is the responsibility of the ECOWAS. ECOWAS has the responsibility of mainstreaming the project into the regional WARAP-IWRM and shall "assist in harmonizing the project workplans with that of the Regional Plan and other related regional activities under the ECOWAS", which also includes the ECOWAS activities concerning transboundary river basins. In this process ECOWAS is working with its National Focal Points, who are based within the government and who are also national coordinators for this project. Concrete examples of maximizing coherence is that the National Focal Point for Guinea-Bissau is also the focal point for the Fouta Djallo (where the sources of the main rivers of the region are) and for the IWRM of the Kayanga and Gebe transboundary river basin and is cooperating with the other relevant NFPs.

The issue concerning the **degree to which the collaborative implementation of the activities** have contributed to **strengthen regional institutions, number of international agreements etc.** was put to the countries in the Questionnaire (Appendix V), but a main response is "not applicable" or "not yet". This issue might rather be dealt with in a terminal evaluation.

Linkages between government departments, the private sector, development partners, UN agencies, civil society and NGOs are established in the countries. This is the basis for the multi-stakeholders' dialogues and discussed in sub-chapter 2.6.3.

The main assessment of the **appropriateness and effectiveness of publication and communication of information** should be done as part of the terminal evaluation as so far very little has been published and distributed (which is fully in accordance with the project document) except for what is required as outputs under project activities.

What has been published to date is:

- A webpage <http://www.unepdhi.org/iwrwestafrica/>
- A leaflet on "Improving water governance and management in West Africa", and
- A case booklet "Roadmaps for water management in West Africa" distributed *inter alia* at the African Water Week in Johannesburg, November 2009.

The project *web-page* needs to be updated and could and should be much better used for information exchange. The 2 page *leaflet* was produced at the initiation of the project and includes only very brief information. The *case booklet* is a 23 pages nicely printed document containing case studies from The Gambia, Guinea Bissau and Sierra Leone. It describes for the countries identified problems, context, decisions and actions taken, outcomes, lessons learnt, and relevance of the case to IWRM. It aims at assisting other countries on their roads to IWRM. It is well written and nicely illustrated and will, no doubt, be very useful.

3. Ratings and Conclusions

3.1 Overall rating of the project performance to date

The rating of the parameters presented in the following table builds on the narrative analysis in chapter 2. It forms the basis for the conclusions and the lessons learned and recommendations for the final phase of the project.

3.2 Conclusions

The project is developed on a very solid basis in that agreed commitments to develop an IWRM system for water management exists for the West African region already since 1998 and the West Africa Regional Action Plan on IWRM was adopted by the West African heads of states in 2000. The three parties implementing the project, the UNEP DHI UDC, the ECOWAS-WRCU, and the GWP-WA with the DHI-UDC as project manager, are complementing each other in what they bring to the project. And in three of the countries where the project is implemented, Côte d'Ivoire, Liberia and Togo, IWRM roadmaps were developed under the "UNEP 2005 IWRM Target"-project, which has also served as lessons learned to the project. Hence, the project and its planned outcomes are very relevant.

The project has built a very useful implementation structure with a Project Management Group (with representation from all the parties and with UNEP as chair, but without representation from the participating countries!) working as steering committee. At the implementation level quality assurance is provided by project advisors/international consultants, regional overview and advice by the regional consultants, and national data collection and analysis by national consultants. The latter are mainly former high-level water civil servants from the countries. An IWRM coordinator is responsible at national level. The governments and the different water-related ministries are all involved in the different countries and the project has succeeded in securing a clear country ownership of the process. Stakeholder involvement has been secured all from the initiating national workshops to discuss background material.

The financial planning did not quite fit with the initial reality as the countries needed more support to set up a functioning structure than anticipated, which resulted in an initial over-use of international consultants and a delay in implementation start. But this initial over-spending paid back as the project has to date in total under-spent despite it is mainly on track (except for Guinea-Conakry).

The institutional framework to implement the project is in place in the countries, but that does not necessary mean that the framework for implementing the outcomes of the project is. The governments are committed to implement the project, but they are often rather weak but with a few persons acting

as driving forces. The countries are poor, and on their request the project added activities to assist both the IWRM Roadmap countries and the IWRM Plan countries in mobilizing additional financial resources for the implementation of the outcomes. The socio-political and economic situation in the countries is probably also the reason behind the currently less sufficient notion of the ecosystem roles in IWRM. The sustainability of the outcomes of the project will, most probably, be depending on continued support, financial as well as human.

The main weakness of the project is its system for Monitoring and Evaluation, which is partly depending on that the project was developed before the current UNEP Evaluation Manual, with its system for a mandatory structure, was in place. The current structure to provide for project monitoring and evaluation consists of four different elements without clear linkages: There is a system for quality assurance provided by international consultants/project supervisors (according to the DHI rules), annual, written technical and financial reports and narrative reports are submitted by the project manager through UNEP. These reports are discussed by the PMG who has an assessing function and reports back from its bi-annual meetings. The fourth M&E element is the mid-term and the terminal evaluations. The lack of more systematic M&E, in line with what is required under the current Evaluation Manual and under the UNEP/GEF, including a regulated reporting system, is particularly unsatisfactory as the project is implemented in rather weak and poor countries – even if they are currently also very committed.

4. Lessons learned

The catalytic and replicable effect, which would be a “lessons learned” from the project, would primarily be ensured by what is prepared under the activity 6.1 “Preparation of case studies guidelines and documentations of best practices, based on experiences and lessons learned through supported IWRM processes, to be included in GWP IWRM toolbox and published”, which should build on the rest of the project outcomes. The GWP IWRM tool box is intended to be used as “lessons learned”.

What has been prepared so far, is a compilation and analysis of the case studies on IWRM road mapping for the Gambia, Guinea Bissau and Sierra Leone, who have all successfully developed and validated their IWRM Roadmaps. The output presented so far is very promising as a tool and will most probably assure replicability of the full outcomes of the project. Hence, will this positive trend continue, the implementation of the project will provide for useful “lessons learned”.

The “Lessons learned” from the project implementation at Mid-term are both useful lessons for the project continuation and lessons for other projects:

- An important issue related both to project design and execution is the need to ensure that a proper “enabling environment” is in place at the initiation of the project by allowing extra time and resources for that purpose initially. Experience from the current initial phase of the project demonstrated clearly that the countries needed more support to set up a functioning structure than anticipated and extra resources for international experts had to be allocated.
- The initial activity in the Roadmap countries was the “fact finding” and a national stakeholder workshop where the facts and their context, the water situation and the actual state of the IWRM were discussed and worked with. The most important ‘lesson learned’ from that process is the need to early on in the process involve different stakeholders in order to get a “buy-in” to the process – by ministers, UN-agencies, water authorities, NGOs etc. This was a “lesson learnt”

already from the 'IWRM 2005' project but was further emphasized and developed during the initiation of this project.

- There is also a need for information exchange that is currently not fully met. Several country representatives expressed a wish to be able to more frequently exchange 'lessons learned' with teams or stakeholder groups from the other participating countries. This could have been facilitated by for instance ensuring the project webpage being active and updated.

5. Recommendations

Based on the Evaluation and its conclusions the Evaluator has the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1: On Project development and Implementation structure

To ensure full accountability the project could, for the remaining time, open up the Project Management Group, that is the Steering Committee for the project, with a seat for representative(s) of the implementation countries. The Agenda for the PMG meetings should be distributed to the countries, so that they are able to provide (written) inputs through their representative/s, and not only through the international and regional consultants, and thus be able to influence project implementation more directly.

Recommendation 2: On Sustainable Outcomes

To ensure sustainable outcomes, it is important that the countries are prepared for follow-up. This can be ensured by:

- the GWP-WA taking on a more supportive role concerning the CWP and provide for networking among the countries;
- the ECOWAS ensure participation by the countries within the ECOWAS' transboundary IWRM project for the river systems shared between participating countries;
- project countries involving their ministries of the environment to produce reports on how they intend to proceed in a long-term perspective. This would need to include an ecosystem approach;
- assisting the project countries in mobilizing financial resources for the follow-up.

Recommendation 3: On financial Planning

Funding left over in those countries that have validated and finalized their IWRM Roadmap should be used in their follow-up procedure towards an IWRM Plan as identified in the roadmap.

After an IWRM Plan-country has agreed on its IWRM Plan, remaining resources should be used for the IWRM implementation.

As a consequence of the general under-spending during the first half of the projects life time and project needs that were not budgeted for, a revision of the budget should be done. This should then include the previous two items: the funding for a country representative in the PMG, and for a more specific Monitoring and Evaluation structure at country level as well as for the Terminal Evaluation.

Recommendation 4: On Monitoring and Evaluation

To ensure that the project achieves its expected environmental benefits, to assure that resources are properly spent during the final phase, and to bring the needed knowledge and insights to increase the quality of the project implementation, the M&E structure of the project needs to be improved. This could be done by:

- establishing a system within which the clear and structured linkages between existing elements of the project and their sequence is identified, a “Roadmap” for the actual project. This could be a more detailed Logical Framework;
- more time-bound reporting following specified criteria by the participating countries to a designated focal point in the management group, who compiles and reports to the PMG; and
- sufficient funding designated to the collection and analysis of the country reporting so that action may be taken if need be.

Recommendation 5: On UNEP’s Supervision and Backstopping

UNEP needs to ensure that staffs have sufficient time to provide the needed supervision and backstopping of the project for its remaining time. Otherwise it will not be feasible to carry the responsibilities of the overall project management adequately. UNEP also has an important role in ensuring a stronger ecosystem approach which should also be formulated as a project outcome. In order to avoid any confusion regarding the roles and responsibilities of UNEP/DEPI respective UDC it would be useful to clearly identify their roles.

Annex 1: Terms of Reference for the Mid Term Evaluation

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Mid Term Evaluation of Project No CC/IVC/2007/44 CP/3010-08-03

Improving Water Management and Governance in African Countries through Support in Development and Implementation of IWRM Plans

Background

In December 2007, UNEP and the European Commission signed an agreement for the funding and implementation of the Action: *'Improving water management and governance in African countries through support in development and implementation of IWRM Plans'* over a 36 month period with specific focus on seven West Africa countries: *Cote d'Ivoire, the Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Guinea Conakry, Togo, Liberia and Sierra Leone.*

This Action supports the achievement of the Johannesburg Plan of Action target on IWRM and water efficiency plans by 2005. It is a key action in the UNEP water programme contributing towards the implementation of the UNEP Water Policy and Strategy and the achievement of its objectives of improving water governance through the adoption and implementation of IWRM principles as well as ecosystem based approaches.

The objectives of the Action are:

- To *"Improve water management and governance in West Africa with the long term goal of livelihood security and environmental sustainability."*
- To *"Promote and support development and implementation of IWRM plans in the targeted countries with special focus on environmental aspects."*

The results expected to be achieved from the Action are:

- Increased awareness on the importance of environmental approaches and their consideration in IWRM,
- Stakeholders empowered and committed to participate in IWRM processes,
- Increased access to relevant IWRM information and tools,
- Capacity built of key water managers and decision makers on IWRM planning,
- Empowered institutions to spearhead the implementation of IWRM plans.

Some key specific outputs expected from the Action are:

- National roadmaps for the IWRM Plans in The Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau and Sierra Leone.
- IWRM Plans for Côte d'Ivoire, Liberia and Togo.
- Regional guidelines on developing roadmaps and plans on IWRM.
- Documentation on best practices and case studies.

The total budget for the Action is EURO 1,595,712,000 with EURO1,189,103 coming from the European Commission ACP-EU Water Facility Actions in ACP Countries. However, the agreement

stipulated that funding beyond the initial EURO 654,371.97 from the European Commission would be made available subject to a positive outcome of a Mid-Term Evaluation to be organized by UNEP.

These TORs are intended to guide the Expert to undertake the Evaluation of the above mentioned Action which has been under implementation since the beginning of 2008.

The objective and scope of the Evaluation

The objective of this mid-term evaluation (MTE) is to assess operational aspects, such as project management and implementation of activities and also the level of progress towards the achievement of the objectives. The evaluation will assess project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results. The risks to achievement of project outcomes and objectives will also be appraised.

The Evaluation will:

- ascertain whether the Action is on course
- provide **recommendations** on how to implement the Action successfully in the remaining period to deliver the project outputs and achieve the intended results.

The Evaluation will assess the progress that has been made to date in the implementation of the Action by

- examining planned activities, outputs and outcomes against results achieved so far.
- assessing the relevancy of the activities undertaken.
- reviewing the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation of activities.
- assessing the appropriateness of anticipated Action activities and implementation approaches for the remaining period of the Action.

Specific Tasks

The **Evaluation shall**, among others, **undertake the following specific tasks:**

- ❑ Determine the relevancy and appropriateness of the current Action strategy, the work programme and activities in relation broadly to emerging issues in water, the environment and development and specifically to the priorities of the involved countries; the objectives of UNEP, (the Medium Term Strategy themes – ecosystem management and climate change) as well as those of the EU Strategy for Africa.
- ❑ Evaluate the progress made to date in implementing the activities in the Action's plan based on the relevant indicators¹⁰ and means of verification established in the Logical Framework of the project using the standard rating system presented under the section: Method below.
- ❑ Review the quality, relevance and immediate impact of the activities undertaken in relation to meeting a) the needs of the direct target groups in the involved countries and b) the objectives of the relevant UNEP programmes and the EU Strategy for Africa by analyzing outputs such as¹¹:

¹⁰ Beyond the project indicators, indicators for various IWRM categories such as water allocation (licensed water users, economic benefit and social goals of the water allocation, etc), pollution control (water quality complying with water quality objectives, etc), water monitoring (water resource monitoring, water allocation permit holders, etc), basin planning, economic and financial management (charges and fees for water allocation, etc), stakeholders participation (meetings, workshops, etc), information management (data base availability) could also be drawn upon where relevant and appropriate to illustrate progress towards adopting and implementing IWRM.

¹¹ The intended impact of the project is in the form of moving African countries towards adopting IWRM principles in frameworks (laws and institutions) and practice to ultimately ensure water supply and sanitation to the poorest people; develop sustainable and equitable

- Technical reports, methodological guidelines, planning reports, environmental data / national situation analysis on IWRM, roadmaps and plans.
 - Workshops and seminars at national and regional levels through desk reviews and comparison with similar events conducted under other programmes and in particular the UNEP global IWRM and Water Efficiency Plans by 2005 project.
- ❑ Assess the contribution of the Action towards coherence between national strategies/road maps and programs with the regional programs and transboundary river basins for more equitable and sustainable decisions related to water resources.
 - ❑ Review the appropriateness of technical assistance and support provided to the collaborating national and regional teams and institutions.
 - ❑ Assess the appropriateness of the institutional arrangements for overall Action and national implementation including the participation of key stakeholder groups in the planning and execution of activities. Ascertain their effectiveness and flexibility (organization, staffing, sharing responsibilities, effective coordination mechanism between actors, the support structure, and relationship between the key partner institutions; the functioning and role of the Project Management Group).
 - ❑ Assess the degree to which the collaborative implementation of the activities in the Action has contributed to strengthening regional and national institutions; number of international agreements and arrangements, the exchange of information between key actors and capacity-building; and creating regional, national and local ownership of the activities and outputs of the Action.
 - ❑ Assess the extent to which the Action has forged appropriate frameworks for effective partnerships and linkages between government departments, the private sector, development partners, UN agencies, civil society and NGOs for the sustainability of activities and outputs of the Action.
 - ❑ Assess to what extent the implementation of the activities of the Action and the respective outputs have leveraged funding from other development partners.
 - ❑ Review the planning, the execution, the monitoring of progress of the Action and determine their effectiveness in ensuring quality backstopping, quality assurance and control of deliverables. Ascertain the quality and timeliness of reporting to the Project Management Group, UNEP and the EC.
 - ❑ Assess the appropriateness and effectiveness of the publication and communication of information on the results of the activities of the Action to a larger target group.

transboundary water resource management; implement cross sectoral coordination to ensure equitable, sustainable and appropriate distribution of water between users; to address water security and climate changes.

- Assess the financial management of the Action so far and establish the cost effectiveness of its implementation. Ascertain the future sustainable financing sources (taxes, tariffs, transfers) for the processes initiated by the Action.

- Make recommendations on activities to be implemented under the Action during the remaining time for the delivery of all the outputs and accomplishment of the desired objectives. This may include:
 - Future direction of the Action considering the current discourse in water resources management and areas in which the Action can make a significant contribution given implementation experiences to date.
 - In the areas of emerging challenges of building resilience of ecosystems and adapting to change, recent areas of thematic focus of UNEP.
 - Assess how the desire of member states for support beyond the development of IWRM plans (the plans for reforms in water governance) and in the implementations of the reform plans and in particular demonstrating the implementation of IWRM principles could be met in the final stages of the Action.

- Identify problems and weaknesses encountered in the process of developing, implementing and monitoring the Action; and present practical recommendations for the improvement of the delivery of the Action in the remaining period.

Method

The Evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner. The project manager and other relevant staff and stakeholders will be kept informed and regularly consulted .

The following are the main approaches for collecting and analyzing data:

- A. Desk review of the Action documents, outputs, monitoring reports and relevant correspondence.

- B. Evaluation of specific products, including publications in international journals, peer reviewed books, research results, web-pages.

- C. Interviews with the management of the Action in Copenhagen and Nairobi including members of the Project Management Group, and other relevant staff of key partner institutions. Representatives of collaborating and participating institutions shall be consulted as appropriate through email or phone. In addition to visiting Copenhagen, Ougadougou, four countries – Liberia, Cote D'Ivoire, Guinea Bissau and Sierra Leone (two each of Roadmap and IWRM Planning countries) will be visited.

The success of the implementation of the Action in the first period will be rated on a scale of 1 to 6 with 1 being the highest rating and 6 being the lowest and covering the following aspects:

- Attainment of objectives and planned results
- Cost-effectiveness
- Sustainability of processes initiated by the Action
- Replicability and catalytic effects
- Achievement of outputs and activities
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Stakeholder participation
- Implementation approach in the first half of the project duration and that envisaged in the remaining project period
- Financial planning

Description of Project Evaluation Parameters

A. Attainment of objectives and planned results (progress to date):

The assessment of project results seeks to determine the extent to which the project objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved and their relevance. While assessing a project's outcomes the evaluation will seek to determine the extent of achievement and shortcomings in reaching the project's objectives as stated in the project document and also indicate if there were any changes and whether those changes were approved (at mid-term the emphasis is on progress made to date). If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluator should seek to estimate the baseline condition so that achievements and results can be properly established (or simplifying assumptions used).

- *Effectiveness*: Evaluate how, and to what extent, the stated project objectives have been met, taking into account the "achievement indicators" specified in the project document and logical framework¹².
- *Relevance*: In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with UNEP's Medium Term Strategy and country priorities? The evaluation should also assess the whether outcomes specified in the project document and or logical framework are actually outcomes and not outputs or inputs.
- *Efficiency*: Cost-effectiveness assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project's outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. Include an assessment of outcomes in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost-effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was then did that affect cost-effectiveness? The evaluation should assess the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing to project implementation and to what extent the project leveraged additional resources.

B. Assessment of Sustainability of project outcomes:

Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts after the UNEP project funding ends. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ends. ***At mid-term, identification of any likely barriers to sustaining the intended outcomes of the project is especially important.*** Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, e.g. stronger institutional capacities or better informed decision-making. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability

¹² In case in the original or modified expected outcomes are merely outputs/inputs then the evaluators should assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and if yes then whether these are commensurate with the realistic expectations from such projects.

of outcomes. The evaluation should ascertain to what extent follow-up work has been initiated and how project outcomes will be sustained and enhanced over time. In this case, sustainability will be linked to the continued use and influence of scientific models and scientific findings, produced by the project.

Four aspects of sustainability should be addressed: financial, socio-political, institutional frameworks and governance, and ecological (if applicable). The following questions provide guidance on the assessment of these aspects:

- *Financial resources.* To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on continued financial support? What is the likelihood that any required financial resources will be available to sustain the project outcomes/benefits once the EU/UNEP assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market trends that support the project's objectives)?
- *Socio-political:* To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on socio-political factors? What is the likelihood that the level of stakeholder ownership will allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- *Institutional framework and governance.* To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance? What is the likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for, the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? While responding to these questions consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency and the required technical know-how are in place.
- *Ecological.* Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits?

As far as possible, also identify the potential longer-term impacts considering that the evaluation is taking place at mid-term and that longer term impact is expected to be seen in a few years time. Frame any recommendations to enhance future project impact in this context. Which will be the major 'channels' for longer term impact from the project at the national and international scales? The evaluation should formulate recommendations that outline possible approaches and necessary actions to facilitate an impact assessment study in a few years time.

C. Catalytic role

The mid-term evaluation will also describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project. What examples are there of replication and catalytic outcomes that suggest increased likelihood of sustainability? Replication is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects or initiatives. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out. No ratings are requested for the catalytic role.

D. Achievement of outputs and activities:

- Delivered outputs: Assessment of the project's success in producing each of the programmed outputs to date, both in quantity and quality as well as usefulness and timeliness.
- Assess to what extent the project outputs produced so far have the weight of authority / credibility, necessary to influence policy and decision-makers, particularly at the national or regional levels.

E. Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- **M&E design.** Did the project have a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives? The Mid-term Evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for project design of M&E and the application of the Project M&E plan. The evaluation shall include an assessment of the quality, application and effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation plans and tools, including an assessment of risk management based on the assumptions and risks identified in the project document. The M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, method, etc.), SMART indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified.
- **M&E plan implementation.** Was an M&E system in place and did it facilitate tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives throughout the project implementation period. Were Annual project reports complete, accurate and with well justified ratings? Was the information provided by the M&E system used during the project to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs? Did the Projects have an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?
- **Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities.** Were adequate budget provisions made for M&E made and were such resources made available in a timely fashion during implementation?
- **Long-term Monitoring.** Is long-term monitoring envisaged as an outcome of the project? If so, comment specifically on the relevance of such monitoring systems to sustaining project outcomes and how the monitoring effort will be sustained.

F. Assessment of processes that affected attainment of project results.

The evaluation will consider, but need not be limited to, consideration of the following issues that may have affected project implementation and attainment of project results:

- i. **Preparation and readiness.** Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Were capacities of the executing institutions and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to implementation? Was availability of counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), passage of enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?
 - Ascertain to what extent the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document have been closely followed. In particular, assess the role of the various committees established and whether the project document was clear and realistic to enable effective and efficient implementation, whether the project was executed according to the plan and how well the management was able to adapt to changes during the life of the project to enable the implementation of the project.
 - Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency and adaptability of project management and the supervision of project activities / project execution arrangements at all levels (1) policy decisions: Steering Group; (2) day to day project management;

- ii. **Country ownership/Driveness.** This is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements. Examples of possible evaluative questions include: Was the project design in-line with the national sectoral and development priorities and plans? Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? Were the relevant country representatives, from government and civil society, involved in the project? Did the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project?
- iii. **Stakeholder involvement.** Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in project's design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation? For example, did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns? Did the project consult and make use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the design, implementation and evaluation of project activities? Were perspectives of those that would be affected by decisions, those that could affect the outcomes and those that could contribute information or other resources to the process taken into account while taking decisions? Were the relevant vulnerable groups and the powerful, the supporters and the opponents, of the processes properly involved? Specifically the evaluation will:
- Assess the mechanisms put in place by the project for identification and engagement of stakeholders in each participating country and establish, in consultation with the stakeholders, whether this mechanism was successful, and identify its strengths and weaknesses.
 - Assess the degree and effectiveness of collaboration/interactions between the various project partners and institutions during the course of implementation of the project.
 - Assess the degree and effectiveness of any various public awareness activities that were undertaken during the course of implementation of the project.
- iv. **Financial planning.** Did the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds. Specifically, the evaluation should:
- Assess the strength and utility of financial controls, including reporting, and planning to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for a proper and timely flow of funds for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables throughout the project's lifetime.
 - Present the major findings from the financial audit if one has been conducted.
 - Did promised co-financing materialize? Identify and verify the sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing.
 - Assess whether the project has applied appropriate standards of due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.
 - The evaluation should also include a breakdown of actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances), financial management (including disbursement issues), and co- financing.
- v. **UNEP Supervision and backstopping.** Did UNEP Agency staff identify problems in a timely fashion and accurately estimate its seriousness? Did UNEP staff provide quality support and advice to the project, approved modifications in time and restructure the project when needed? Did UNEP Agencies provide the right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix, frequency of field visits?
- vi. **Co-financing and Project Outcomes & Sustainability.** If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for this? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

- vii. **Delays and Project Outcomes & Sustainability.** If there were delays in project implementation and completion, the evaluation will summarise the reasons for them. Did delays affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if so in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The *ratings will be presented in the form of a table* with each of the categories rated separately and with **brief justifications for the rating** based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The rating system to be applied is specified in Annex 1:

1. Evaluation report format and review procedures

The report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain; the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should provide information on when the evaluation took place, the places visited, who was involved and be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. The report should include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons.

Evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete and balanced manner. The evaluation report shall be written in English, be of no more than 50 pages (excluding annexes), use numbered paragraphs and include:

- i) An **executive summary** (no more than 3 pages) providing a brief overview of the main conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation;
- ii) **Introduction and background** giving a brief overview of the evaluated project, for example, the objective and status of activities;
- iii) **Scope, objective and methods** presenting the evaluation's purpose, the evaluation criteria used and questions to be addressed;
- iv) **Project Performance and Impact** providing factual evidence relevant to the questions asked by the evaluator and interpretations of such evidence. This is the main substantive section of the report and should provide a commentary on all evaluation aspects (A – F above).
- v) **Conclusions and rating** of project implementation success giving the evaluator's concluding assessments and ratings of the project against given evaluation criteria and standards of performance. The conclusions should provide answers to questions about whether the project is considered good or bad, and whether the results are considered positive or negative;
- vi) **Lessons learned** presenting general conclusions from the standpoint of the design and implementation of the project, based on good practices and successes or problems and mistakes. Lessons should have the potential for wider application and use. All lessons should 'stand alone and should:
 - Specify the context from which they are derived
 - State or imply some prescriptive action;
 - Specify the contexts in which they may be applied (if possible who when and where)
- vii) **Recommendations.** High quality recommendations should be *actionable* proposals that are:
 1. Implementable within the timeframe and resources available
 2. Commensurate with the available capacities of project team and partners

3. Specific in terms of who would do what and when
 4. Contain results-based language (i.e. a measurable performance target)
 5. Include a trade off analysis, when its implementation may require utilizing significant resources that would have otherwise been used for other project purposes.
- viii) **Annexes** include Terms of Reference, list of interviewees, documents reviewed, brief summary of the expertise of the evaluator / evaluation team, a summary of co-finance information etc.. Dissident views or management responses to the evaluation findings may later be appended in an annex.

The ratings will be presented in the form of a table. (See Annex 1). Each of the categories should be rated separately with brief justifications based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The following rating system is to be applied:

HS	= Highly Satisfactory
S	= Satisfactory
MS	= Moderately Satisfactory
MU	= Moderately Unsatisfactory
U	= Unsatisfactory
HU	= Highly Unsatisfactory

All annexes should be typed (annexes are not included in the 45-page requirement).

Both the draft and final report shall be written in English and submitted in electronic form in MS word Format by mid January 2010 directly to:

Mr. Segbedzi Norgbey, Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit
 UNEP, P.O. Box 30552
 Nairobi, Kenya
 Tel : +254 20 762 3387
 Fax : +254 20 7623158
 Email segbedzi.norgbey@unep.org

The Chief of Evaluation will share the report with the following individuals for review and comment:

1. Mr. Thomas Chiramba,
 Head, Freshwater Ecosystems Unit
 UNEP/Division of Environmental Policy Implementation
 P. O. Box 30552 - 00100
 Nairobi, Kenya
 Tel: +254 20 762 4749
 Fax: +25420 762 4249
 Email : Thomas.Chiramba@unep.org
2. Mr. Per Per Bøgelund Hansen, Acting Director
 UNEP-DHI Centre
 Agern Allé 5

DK-2970 Hørsholm
Denmark
Tel : +45 4516 9200
Direct : +45 4516 9568
Fax : +45 4516 9292
Email: pbh@dhigroup

3. Mr Laurent Frémolle, Attaché Chargé de programmes infrastructures
Délégation de la Commission européenne en Côte d'Ivoire
Av. du Dr. Crozet, 18, Immeuble Azur
01 B.P. 1821 Abidjan 01
Côte d'Ivoire
Tel : +225 20.31.83.50
Fax: +225 20.21.40.89
Cell: +225 45.90.68.92 / 08.44.04.18
Email: Laurent.Fremolle@ec.europa.eu

2. Timing and resources for the evaluation

The Evaluation shall be conducted during the period of 15th October 2009 – 15th January 2010 (1.5 months spread over three months) and a draft report shall be available for comments by 15th December 2009.

The Expert will be travelling to the project sites to Abidjan (CoteD'Ivoire), Ougadougou (Burkina Faso) and three other involved countries (Liberia – Monrovia, Guinea Bissau –Bissau, Sierra Leone – Freetown) is included in this period. Comments to the final draft report will be sent to the consultant after a maximum of 2 weeks. After incorporating the comments, the consultant will submit the preliminary report by 30th December 2009 and a final report by 15th January 2010.

Lump Sum Option

The expert will receive an initial payment of 30% of the total amount due upon signature of the contract. A further 30% will be paid upon submission of the draft report. A final payment of 40% will be made upon satisfactory completion of work. The fee is payable under the individual Special Service Agreement (SSA) of the evaluator and is inclusive of all expenses such as travel, accommodation and incidental expenses.

Qualifications of Expert for the Evaluation

The Evaluation shall be undertaken by an independent Evaluator contracted by the UNEP EOU. The evaluator will work under the overall supervision of the Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit, and should not have been associated with the design or implementation of the Action. The Evaluator should have the following qualifications: (i) have an advanced university degree in relevant disciplines and should have demonstrated expertise in the area of water resources planning and management with special reference to environmental issues and IWRM in developing countries, (ii) The candidate should have at least 10 years of work experience in the above-mentioned field or in related fields. Previous experience in the review of UN programmes will be an advantage.

In case, the Expert cannot provide the products in accordance with the TORs, the timeframe agreed, or his products are substandard, the payment to the Expert could be withheld, until such a time the products are modified to meet UNEP's standard. In case the Expert fails to submit a satisfactory final product to UNEP, the product prepared by the Expert may not constitute the Evaluation Report

Annex 1. OVERALL RATINGS TABLE AND RATING GUIDANCE

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating)		
Sub criteria (below)		
Effectiveness		
Relevance		
Efficiency		
Sustainability of Project outcomes (overall rating)		
Sub criteria (below)		
Financial		
Socio Political		
Institutional framework and governance		
Ecological		
Achievement of outputs and activities		
Monitoring and Evaluation (overall rating)		
Sub criteria (below)		
M&E Design		
M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)		
Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities		
Catalytic Role		
Preparation and readiness		
Country ownership / drivenness		
Stakeholders involvement		

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
Financial planning		
UNEP Supervision and backstopping		
Overall Rating		

RATING OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS

Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Unsatisfactory (U) The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Please note: Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall rating of the project for achievement of objectives and results **may not be higher** than the lowest rating on either of these two criteria. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes a project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.

RATINGS ON SUSTAINABILITY

A. Sustainability will be understood as the probability of continued long-term outcomes and impacts after the UNEP project funding ends. The Mid-term evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ends. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, i.e. stronger institutional capacities, legal frameworks, socio-economic incentives /or public awareness. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes.

Rating system for sustainability sub-criteria

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows.

Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Likely (ML). There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability

Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an Unlikely rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than Unlikely, regardless of whether higher ratings in other dimensions of sustainability produce a higher average.

RATINGS OF PROJECT M&E

Monitoring is a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing project with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, its design, implementation and results. Project evaluation may involve the definition of appropriate standards, the examination of performance against those standards, and an assessment of actual and expected results.

The Project monitoring and evaluation system will be rated on ‘M&E Design’, ‘M&E Plan Implementation’ and ‘Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities’ as follows:

Highly Satisfactory (HS): There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Satisfactory(S): There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The Project had no M&E system.

“M&E plan implementation” will be considered a critical parameter for the overall assessment of the M&E system. The overall rating for the M&E systems will not be higher than the rating on “M&E plan implementation.”

All other ratings will be on the UNEP six point scale.

UNEP Performance Description	Alternative description on the same scale
HS = Highly Satisfactory	Excellent
S = Satisfactory	Well above average
MS = Moderately Satisfactory	Average
MU = Moderately Unsatisfactory	Below Average
U = Unsatisfactory	Poor
HU = Highly Unsatisfactory	Very poor

ANNEX 2 RISK FACTOR TABLE

*Evaluators will use this table to summarize risks identified in the **Project Document** and reflect also **any new risks** identified in the course of the evaluation in regard to project implementation. The Notes column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk as relevant.*

INTERNAL RISK Project management										
Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be	NOTES
Management structure	Stable with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood	Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others	Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems							
Governance structure	Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet periodically and provide effective direction/inp	Body(ies) meets periodically but guidance/inp ut provided to project is inadequate	Members lack commitment (seldom meet) and therefore the Committee/body does not fulfil its							

	uts		function							
Internal communications	Fluid and cordial	Communication process deficient although relationships between team members are good	Lack of adequate communication between team members leading to deterioration of relationships and resentment / factions							
Work flow	Project progressing according to work plan	Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall implementation	Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation							
Co-financing	Co-financing is secured and payments are received on time	Is secured but payments are slow and bureaucratic	A substantial part of pledged co-financing may not materialize							

Budget	Activities are progressing within planned budget	Minor budget reallocation needed	Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget							
Financial management	Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for	Financial reporting slow or deficient	Serious financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds							
Reporting	Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues	Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues	Serious concerns about quality and timeliness of project reporting							
Stakeholder involvement	Stakeholder analysis done and positive	Consultation and participation	Symptoms of conflict with critical							

	feedback from critical stakeholders and partners	process seems strong but misses some groups or relevant partners	stakeholders or evidence of apathy and lack of interest from partners or other stakeholders							
External communications	Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public understand project and are regularly updated on progress	Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is successfully transmitted	Project existence is not known beyond implementation on partners or misunderstandings concerning objectives and activities evident							
Short term/long term balance	Project is meeting short term needs and results within a long term perspective, particularly sustainability and	Project is interested in the short term with little understanding of or interest in the long term	Longer term issues are deliberately ignored or neglected							

	replicability										
Science and technological issues	Project based on sound science and well established technologies	Project testing approaches, methods or technologies but based on sound analysis of options and risks	Many scientific and /or technological uncertainties								
Political influences	Project decisions and choices are not particularly politically driven	Signs that some project decisions are politically motivated	Project is subject to a variety of political influences that may jeopardize project objectives								
Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary											

Annex 3

Review of the Draft Evaluation Report

Draft reports submitted to UNEP EOU are shared with the corresponding Programme or Project Officer and his or her supervisor for initial review and consultation. The DEPI staff and senior Executing Agency staff provide comments on the draft evaluation report. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. The consultation also seeks agreement on the findings and recommendations. UNEP EOU collates the review comments and provides them to the evaluators for their consideration in preparing the final version of the report. General comments on the draft report with respect to compliance with these TOR are shared with the reviewer.

Quality Assessment of the Evaluation Report

All UNEP Mid Term Reports are subject to quality assessments by UNEP EOU. These are used as a tool for providing structured feedback to the evaluator.

The quality of the draft evaluation report is assessed and rated against the following criteria:

Report Quality Criteria	UNEP EOU Assessment	Rating
A. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives in the context of the focal area program indicators if applicable?		
B. Was the report consistent and the evidence complete and convincing and were the ratings substantiated when used?		
C. Did the report present a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes?		
D. Were the lessons and recommendations supported by the evidence presented?		
E. Did the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?		
F. Did the report include an assessment of the quality of the project M&E system and its use for project management?		
UNEP EOU additional Report Quality Criteria	UNEP EOU Assessment	Rating
G. Quality of the lessons: Were lessons readily applicable in other contexts? Did they suggest prescriptive action?		
H. Quality of the recommendations: Did recommendations specify the actions necessary to correct existing conditions or improve operations ('who?' 'what?' 'where?' 'when?'). Can they be implemented? Did the recommendations specify a goal and an associated performance indicator?		
I. Was the report well written? (clear English language and grammar)		
J. Did the report structure follow EOU guidelines, were all requested Annexes		

included?		
K. Were all evaluation aspects specified in the TORs adequately addressed?		
L. Was the report delivered in a timely manner		

Quality of the MTE report = $0.3*(A + B) + 0.1*(C+D+E+F)$

EOU assessment of MTE report = $0.3*(G + H) + 0.1*(I+J+K+L)$

Combined quality Rating = $(2* \text{'EO' rating} + \text{EOU rating})/3$

The Totals are rounded and converted to the scale of HS to HU

Rating system for quality of mid-term evaluation reports

A number rating 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly Unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.

ANNEX II: Mission itinerary and meetings 29.10 – 18.11 2009

Mid Term Evaluation of Project No CC/IVC/2007/44 CP/3010-08-03 Improving Water Management and Governance in African Countries through Support in Development and Implementation of IWRM Plans

Date	Time	Subject	Persons
29 Oct-Arrival DHI from Sweden	App. 10:00 – 11:00	Welcome & installment at DHI	Peter Koefoed Bjornsen/Nick Ahrensberg
	11:00-11:30	UDC – Set-up & Activities	Peter Koefoed Bjornsen/Gareth James Lloyd
	11:30-12:00	IWRM 2005 and the ACP-EU project	Nick Ahrensberg/Niels Ipsen
	12:30 – 13:00	IWRM 2005 and the ACP-EU project - continued	Nick Ahrensberg/Niels Ipsen
	14:00-15:00	Project implementation in the Gambia and Guinea Bissau	Gorm Jeppesen
30 Oct - DHI	09:00-10:00	Project implementation in Sierra Leone and Guinea	Nick Ahrensberg
	10:00-10:30	Project implementation in RCI	Niels Ipsen
	10:30-11:00	Project implementation in Togo	Gorm Jeppesen
	12:00-12:30	Lunch	
	12:30-13:00	Project implementation in Liberia	Nick Ahrensberg
	13:00-14:30	Project budget & expenditures	Nick Ahrensberg/Per Bøgelund Hansen
	15:30 - ?	Wrap-up	Peter Koefoed Bjornsen/Nick Ahrensberg/Niels Ipsen
31 Oct		Afternoon meeting & early dinner	Nick Ahrensberg
01 Nov		Departure - Ouagadougou	Evaluator/Nick Ahrensberg
02 Nov – 03 Nov		Meetings with ECOWAS/WRCC and GWP/WA	Meetings with: Birgur Lamizana, reg. consultant Dam Aimé Mogbanté and Marwan Ladki, GWP/WA Ouango Athanase Compaore, consultant Guinea Florence Ardorino, ECOWAS/WRCC Göran Björkdal, Swedish Embassy/Sida
04 Nov		Departure Ouagadougou to Monrovia	Evaluator/Nick Ahrensberg
05 Nov – 06 Nov		Meetings with relevant government representatives, National consultant, EU representative and other donors	Minister Eugene H Shannon Former deputy Minister John G. Thomas Dep. Min Saye H. Gwaikolo/Jefferson W. Wylie/ Anthony D. Kpadeh/ Oliver B. Kulah, IWRM Secretariat

			Paul Smith, EU/EC Hamidou Maiga, UNICEF Moses Massa, UNDP Joseph M. David, MoHSW Goveco Karwee/ Andrew S. Boikpats, MoPW Clarence Momoh, LWSC
07 Nov		Departure Monrovia to Accra	Evaluator/Nick Ahrensberg
08 Nov		Departure Accra to Freetown	Evaluator/ N.A.
09 Nov – 10 Nov		Meetings with relevant government representatives, National consultant, EU representative and other donors	Minister Ogunlade Davidson, MoEWR Deputy Minister Martin A.B. Kamara IWRM focal point Usman C. Conteh Sam B. Goba/ Lamin K.S. Souma, WS division, MoEWR Abdul Bangura, AfDB Victor Kinyanjui, UNICEF Matthias Reusing/ Ritchie Jones, EU/EC
10 Nov		Departure Freetown to Dakar	Evaluator
11 Nov		Departure Dakar to Guinea Bissau	Evaluator/Grégoire Alé
12 Nov – 15 Nov		Meetings with relevant government representatives, National consultant. EU representative. Discussions with regional consultant on project implementation in Togo.	Secrétaire d'Etat Barros Bagar Banjai, Inussa Balde, MoENR Paulino Sousa de Azinhaga, MoENR João Lona Tchedna, Meteorologie National Alexandre Chabral, focal point IPCC Riccardo Claudi, EU/EC Valentin Traore, UNDP Katrin Lopes Rodrigues, UNICEF
16 Nov		Departure Guinea Bissau to Abidjan	Evaluator/Grégoire Alé
17 Nov – 18 Nov		Meetings with relevant government representatives, National consultant, CWP representative, EU representative and UNEP-DEPI representative. Debriefing with EU representative, UNEP representative and DHI/UCC representative.	Dir. Michel N'Guessan Bi Tozan, MoEWF Sous Dir. Fernand Kouame, MoEWF Albert Goula, National consultant, N'Dri Koffi/ Francois Koatio, CWP Laurent Fremolle, EU/EC Thomas Chiramba, UNEP-DEPI
18 Nov		Departure Sweden	Evaluator

Annex III: List of persons met and consulted

At DHI

Nick Ahrensberg, project manager
Peter Koefoed Bjørnsen, director UDC
Niels Ipsen, initiator of the project and former director UDC now consultant for Côte d'Ivoire
Gorm Jeppesen, manager for Gambia, Guinea Bissau and Togo
Gareth James Loyd, advisor

In Burkina Faso

Birguy Lamizana, former regional consultant (Gambia, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone)
Dam Aimé Mogbanté, executive secretary, GWP West Africa
Marwan Ladki, technical advisor, GWP West Africa
Ouango Athanase Compaore, former chair GWP/West Africa, now consultant for Guinea
Florence Ardorino, technical advisor, ECOWAS-WRCU
Göran Björkdal, first secretary, Swedish Embassy

In Liberia

Eugene H Shannon, Minister of Lands, Mines and Energy
Hon. John G Thomas, rtd deputy minister Min of Lands, Mines and Energy,
rtd chairman IWRM secretariat
Hon. John C Nylander, deputy minister, Min of Lands, Mines and Energy
Carlton S. Miller, assistant minister for Mineral Explor&Environmental Research, Min of
Lands, Mines and Energy
Saye H. Gwaikolo, technical assistant Minister, Min. of Lands, Mines and Energy
Jefferson W Wylie, Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy and chairman of IWRM-secretariat
Anthony D. Kpadeh, assistant director, Liberian Hydrological Services
Oliver B. Kulah, IWRM National Consultant, Liberian Hydrological Services
Paul Smith, project manager (infrastructure) European Commission, Liberia
Hamidou A. Maiga, Wash Specialist, Child Survival Programme, UNICEF
Joseph M. David, Acting Director, Division of Environmental Health, Ministry of Health
Govego Woloba Karwee, Director, National Rural Water & Sanitation, Dept of Rural
Development and Community Services, Ministry of Public Works
Andrew S. Boikpats, community services, Ministry of Public Works
Clarence M. Momoh, technical services manager

In Sierra Leone

Prof. Ogunlade R. Davidson, Minister of Energy and Water Resources
Hon. Martin Alex Bash Kamara, deputy minister, Min of Energy and Water Resources
Usman Chery Conteh, administrative officer Min of Energy and Water Resources, focal point
for the IWRM road map
Sam B. Goba, senior executive engineer, Water Supply division, Min of Energy and Water
Resources
Lamin K.S. Souma, senior executive engineer, Water Supply division, Min of Energy and
Water Resources
Abdul Bangura, infrastructure specialist, AfDB

Victor Kinyanjui, WASH Manager Child Survival and Dev. UNICEF
Matthias Reusing, head of Rural Development section, EU
Ritchie Jones, project officer, EU

In Guinea Bissau

Grégoire Ale, consultant and focal point for IWRM, specialist GWP and CWP

Barros Bagar Banjai, Secrétaire d'Etat de L'Environnement et Developpement Durable
Inussa Baldé, Directeur General des Ressources Hydriques, Min of Energy and Natural Resources

Paulino Sousa de Azinhaga, Chef de Service Hydrologie, focal point for Fouta Djallo and for IWRM Kayanga/Gebe, Min of Energy and Natural Resources

João Lona Tchegna, Directeur General de la Meteorologie National

Francisco Gomes, Departement de la recherché et application, Meteorologie National

Malam da Silva, Direction General de la Meteorologie Nationale

Alexandre Chabral, Secretariat pour l'Environnement et Developpement Durable/Direction General de l'Environnement, focal point IPCC

Riccardo Claudi, Expert à la C.E., EU

Valentin Traore, Chargé de Programme, UNDP

Katrin Lopes Rodrigues, Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Officer, UNICEF,

And 11 members of the stakeholder group that has been involved in the IWRM Road map procedure.

In Ivory Coast

Dr N'Guessan Bi Tozan Michel, Directeur de Direction des Ressources en Eau, Direction Générale des Eaux et Forêts, Ministère de l'Environnement, des Eaux et Forêts

Dr Fernand Kouame, Sous Directeur, Evaluation et Mobilisation des Ressources en Eau, Direction des Ressources en Eau, Min de l'Environnement, des Eaux et Forêts

Jacques Kraidi, Ingenieur Hydraulic, Sous Directeur Reglementation et Contrôle, Min de l'Environnement, des Eaux et Forêts

Dr Albert Goula Bie Te, Consultant and Advisor to the Direction des Ressources en Eau

N'Dri Koffi, Chairman, Côte d'Ivoire Water Partnership

Francois Kouatio, Executive Secretary, Côte d'Ivoire Water Partnership

Thomas Chiramba, Programme Officer, UNEP-DEPI

Laurent Fremolle, Attaché, Chargé des Programmes Infrastructures, EU Delegation to Côte d'Ivoire

ANNEX IV: List of documents reviewed

- EC. ACP-EU Water Facility Actions in ACP Countries. Application to the 9th EDF by UNEP for the project “Improving Water Management and Governance in African Countries through support in development and implementation of IWRM Plans”. CC/IVC/2007/44. Annex I Description of the Action. Logical framework for the project. Annex B: Budget for the Action.
- Memorandum of Understanding. Concluded under the auspices of the UNEP between the three parties implementing the project ACP-EU CC/IVC/2007/61. 1) The UNEP DHI Centre for Water and Environment, 2) the Water Resources Coordination Unit of the ECOWAS, 3) the GWP West Africa, July 2008.
- “IWRM-2005”. UNEP support for achieving the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation target of ‘IWRM and Efficiency Plans by 2005, with support to developing countries.’ Final Evaluation Report, May 2009 by Jeffrey F. Griffin.
- UN Water: Status Report on IWRM and Water Efficiency Plans. Prepared for the 16th Session of the Commission of Sustainable Development, May 2008.

Global Water Partnership documentation:

- Lessons from Integrated Water Resources Management in Practice. Policy brief 9. GWP Technical Committee (TEC).
- Planning for a water secure future. Lessons from water management planning in Africa.
- Action Plan for IWRM: Lessons and Questioning in the Process of IWRM Plan Development of RAWD-I in Mali and Senegal. August 2009.
- Mali. Capitalizing the Development Process of the Action Plan for IWRM and its Implementation. GWP/WA July 2009
- Senegal. Capitalizing the Development Process of the Action Plan for IWRM and its Implementation. GWP/WA July 2009

ECOWAS documentation:

- Water Resources Coordination Unit:PFCM Statutes and its Organs. Rules of Procedure. June 2006.
- West Africa water resources policy. Elaborated in collaboration with UEMOA and CILSS. Policy document. December 2007.
- IWRM in West Africa, 2007 situation. WRCU/ECOWAS March 2008.

UNEP Strategy documents:

- Water Policy and Strategy of UNEP (to be in operation 2007 – 2012)
- United Nations Environment Programme. Medium-term Strategy 2010 – 2013. Environment for Development.
- Ecosystem Management Programme. A new approach to SUSTAINABILITY.

ACP-EU Water Facility documentation:

- The water facility in detail. http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/acp/regional-cooperation/water/in_detail/index_en.htm (accessed 2010-01-26)
- Mid term review and analysis of the Water Facility I tranche and II tranche (500ME) and Energy Facility (220ME). Final Report, Volume 1 Main Report. Executive summary.

DOCUMENTATION FOR THE SPECIFIC COUNTRIES

- Document on Case Stories for Guinea Bissau, The Gambia and Sierra Leone.
- Roadmaps for water management in West Africa. Case studies from The Gambia, Guinea-Bissau and Sierra Leone. Development of IWRM Plans. November 2009
- Reviews of the Country Water Partnerships (PNE):
Rapport de Synthese Generale de la Revue

Rapport provisoire de la revue de PNE de Côte D'Ivoire

Rapport provisoire de la revue de PNE de Guinée

Rapport provisoire de la revue de PNE du Togo

The Gambia

- IWRM Roadmap Process: The Gambia Country Report. By Momodou Njie, national consultant. March 2008.
- Training Workshop on the Water Resources Issues Assessment Method (WRIAM). By Momodou Njie. December 2008.
- Minutes of the National Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) Roadmap Validation Workshop for The Gambia Held on the 5th May 2009, at Paradise Hotel, Banjul.
- IWRM Roadmap for the Gambia. Banjul, May 2009.
- The Gambia. Water Resources Reform Project. Final Report. June 2009.

Guinea-Conakry

- Aide-mémoire de la mission effectuée par Gérard Cougny, expert GIRE, UCC-Water, a Conakry (Guinée) du 17 au 20 mars 2008.
- Situation de la GIRE en Guinee debut 2008 et Propositions pour la suite du processus. Rapport provisoire par Ciradiou Baldé. Avril 2008.

Guinea-Bissau

- Updated Situational Analysis Guinea Bissau. Liste commentee du contenu du rapport de la Guinee-Bissau.
- Rapport Session de formation sur “principles et instruments de Gestion Integree des Ressources en Eau”. Mai 2008.
- La Guinée-Bissau: Feuille de route GIRE 2009-2015. Mars 2009.

Liberia

- Liberia Road Map: Steps leading to the development of IWRM 2008-2015. Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy. April, 2008.
- Review of Water Resources Issues Assessment Method (WEIAM) of Liberia. Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy. August, 2009.
- Minutes of the Briefing Meeting on the Status of the IWRM process – February, 2008 from an IWRM Secretariat Working Session – September, 2008.
- Synthesis Report of the National Stakeholders’ Dialogue on IWRM process, June 11-12, 2009.
- National Integrated Water Resources Management Policy. Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy. November 2007. Agreed and launched November 2009.

Ivory Coast

- La Côte d’Ivoire sur le Chemin de la GIRE. Feuille de Route 2007-2015. Ministère de l’Environnement et des Eaux et Forêts. Mai 2007.
- Etat des Progres realizes en Matière de GIRE depuis l’Adoption de la Feuille de Route en Mai 2007. Rapport Provisoire par GOULA Bi Tié Albert.
- Atelier National de Presentation et Planification du Project. Synthese des Travaux. 18-19 février 2009.
- GWP/WA, Partenariat National de l’Eau de Côte d’Ivoire. Programme de Trvail 2009-2010 du PNE-Côte d’Ivoire.

Sierra Leone

- Questionnaire on IWRM: Sierra Leone. (Filled in with information from the country reports on IWRM).
- An Assessment of the Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) Issues in Sierra Leone. By Ing. Francis Moijue. April 2008.
- Draft Water and Sanitation Policy. Major issues for consideration by Water Sector Stakeholders. May 2008.
- Training and work session “Principles and Tools for Water Resources Management”, 30 to 31 May 2008 – Sierra Leone, Freetown. Session Report.

- Report on Stakeholders dialogue on Integrated Water Resources Management Roadmap for Sierra Leone. 12th June, 2009. Freetown.
- Road Map (Transition to...) for Integration Water Resources Management (IWRM) in Sierra Leone. June 2009.

Togo

- Projet de Politique Nationale de l'Eau. Ministère de l'Eau, de l'Assainissement et de l'Hydraulique Villageoise. Republique du Togo. Octobre 2009.
- Plan d'Action GIRE-Togo. Partier 1 – 2.5 (a rédiger).

Contracts, Terms of References and CVs for Regional and National Consultants for countries.

Project Management Reports

Draft Minutes of the meetings with the Project Management Group (PMG)

- 1st meeting 8 February 2008
- 2nd meeting 12 September 2008
- 3rd meeting 29 January 2009
- 4th meeting 16 June 2009
- “Launching Report” May 2008
- Narrative Report Period: 15 December, 2007 to 31 December, 2008
- Narrative Report Period: 31 January, 2009 to 30 June, 2009

Budget and Expenditure Reporting

- UNEP-Budget-USD. Project No:11800037-p
- UNEP Annual expenditure report: January 2008 to December 2008
- UNEP Quarterly expenditure report January 2008 to June 2009

Annex V: Responses to Evaluation Questionnaire

Consolidated Responses to Questionnaire

In support of the Mid Term Evaluation of the UNEP/EU Project No CC/IVC/2007/44 CP/3010-08-03

Otherwise known as the Action to:

'Improving water management and governance in African countries through support in development and implementation of IWRM Plans'

with specific focus on seven West African countries:

Côte d'Ivoire, the Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Guinea Conakry, Togo, Liberia and Sierra Leone.

Questions:

1. The over-all question concerns the progress that has been achieved today in the different countries, within the project and as a consequence of the project. Please, respond in some sentences to each of the questions "a" – "d"
 - a) Which steps has been taken in your country towards a nationally negotiated IWRM roadmap, respective a nationally negotiated IWRM plan? Such steps could include multi-stakeholder consultation and their consequences etc.

Côte d'Ivoire	The ones expected in the roadmap process were fully undertaken.
The Gambia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal launching of the project with NGOs, private sector, civil society etc. • National dialogue and training in WRIAM • National dialogue to elaborate roadmap • Validation of final roadmap with stakeholders and FAO, GWP/AO, ECOWAS-WRCC and UNEP. • Initiative to seek funding for follow-up of Roadmap from AfDB/AFW for: capacity building, institutional reform, legal framework and decentralization of the project. Hopefully to be initiated January 2010.
Guinea Bissau	<p>How to turn from the sectoral to an integrated approach most important. The IWRM roadmap is validated and translated into Portuguese to increase the IWRM awareness.</p> <p>It is further important to integrate the implementation of the Water and Sanitation strategic plan into the IWRM process. The implementation of the Water and Sanitation Plan is financed by UNDP. The financing of the IWRM action plan could hopefully be co-financed by EU and UNDP.</p>
Liberia	<p>Sensitization and awareness creation for multi-stakeholders participation in the formulation of the IWRM Policy since 2006 have been implemented with support from major External Support Agencies and donors.</p> <p>Roadmap preparations (December 2006 to April 2007), technical review of roadmap May 31, 2007, multi-stakeholders workshop June 11-12 2009.</p>

Sierra Leone	A multi-stakeholder consultation was held on 12 th June 2009 in which a road map was agreed upon by representatives various from parts of the country.
Togo	Work on IWRM plan under the project started December 2008 based on previous Roadmap work. Establishment of Steering Committee and Implementation team are, with national and regional consultants, developing the IWRM action plan that should be finalized in February 2010. The Steering Committee consists of the most important stakeholders in the water sector.

- b) To what extent is the outcomes of the project so far integrated in current planning, including concerning water resources? What kind of concrete examples are there? Please, describe whether these examples also demonstrate any clear value added related to climate change adaptation or mitigation!

Côte d'Ivoire	A water-working group has been established for awareness-raising among stakeholders (through journalists). The project is trying to find financing to finalize the Water Policy.
The Gambia	The government now turning from the sectoral approach to the integrated approach. The National Adaptation Programme for Action, November 2007, is also referring to IWRM.
Guinea Bissau	Some initiatives and studies such as those linked to the Climate Change programme, as well as the National program for promoting irrigation agriculture.
Liberia	<p>The Project produced the Liberia IWRM Policy which was accepted by the Liberian Cabinet in July 2009 as one of the Deliverables of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Programme. The draft IWRM Policy was presented to all stakeholders during a nationwide county consultation between November and December 2008. The IWRM Policy of Liberia has addressed climate change adaptation by ensuring that the EPA in Liberia takes the leadership for the protection of the environment in Liberia. The EPA has become a major member of the Water and Sanitation Board of Liberia.</p> <p>Information on the important river basins including strategic locations collected for planning purposes.</p>
Sierra Leone	The outcome is integrated into current Government plans for the sector
Togo	The project has been somewhat delayed but is now gaining speed again. The concrete results are integrated into the planning processes. It will be integrated into the National Water Policy that should be finalized in November 2010.

- c) Are there any concrete examples of that IWRM principles and guidelines are being integrated in sector strategies or PRSP reports?

Côte d'Ivoire	Yes, the IWRM principles are included into the PRSP.
The Gambia	Demonstrated in the PRSP II/2007, the Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Document 2009, National Water Policy 2006-07; the National Agricultural Investment Program 2009
Guinea Bissau	The above mentioned projects include hydrologic and hydraulic aspects in implementation. The General Directorate for Water Resources has requested that the PRSP II which is currently in developing shall include adequate reflections concerning water resources, including from a technical perspective.
Liberia	The IWRM Policy of Liberia has been integrated in the post-war PRSP to an extent that the sub-sectoral policies elaborated in the Policy have been drafted. Some have now been approved for example "Water Supply and Sanitation (WSS) Policy, the Energy Policy, the Food Security Policy", etc. The Water Supply and Sanitation Policy was also presented to the Liberian Cabinet on 23 November 2009. The Principle of "some water for all and not all for some" and Gender Mainstreaming were all captured in WSS Policy. Institutional reforms to ensure the sustainable management of the water resources were well articulated in the IWRM Sub-sectoral policy of WSS. The 2007 Liberia Demographic and Health Survey data shows that mortality levels in rural areas tend to be higher than in urban areas. Much of that is attributed to the consumption of unsafe drinking water, improper disposal of human and animal excreta in rivers, and poor sanitation.
Sierra Leone	The PRSP clearly spelt out the need for the integration of IWRM principles and practices in the water sector and economic development in the country.
Togo	The PRSP document in its third pillar is specifically referring to the improvement that will be gained by an IWRM approach. Togo in 2005 with financial support from UNDP, UN/DESA and FAO undertook strategic work towards an IWRM approach. Also the national water and sanitation programme contains linkages between IWRM – MDG – Water Supply and Sanitation

- d) To what extent can any positive result reported under a-c be regarded as a result of this project? What would have happened anyway?

Côte d'Ivoire	
The Gambia	Most of what is described under a-c can be related to the project. Most policies have not or just started to be implemented but it is expected that the integrated approach will be applied.

Guinea Bissau	GB has been working towards establishing an IWRM framework for many years. Now many different institutions are involved in the work and it is important that they are all applying the IWRM-approach. It is further important to ensure that the Water and Sanitation Strategic Plan will be integrated under the work on an IWRM Action Plan.
Liberia	Before 2006, the ideals of IWRM were not known in Liberia. The support from the Project has brought strong awareness to Liberia to vigorously pursue the adoption of IWRM Principles of course late but in line with the global actions which called for nations to develop IWRM Plans by 2005. Without the project, Liberia would have been struggling still doing business with the management of water resources in the “as usual manner”.
Sierra Leone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a result of the project, there has been an increased awareness of IWRM principles amongst various stakeholders. • Capacity was also increased amongst various stakeholders more especially government staff
Togo	The project ensures the possibility to develop the IWRM-process.

2. What are the primary results of the project’s work in your country/region so far? What is still remaining to be done?

Côte d’Ivoire	The IWRM process was re-initiated, and the work on elaborating of a IWRM Action Plan started. Revision of the National Water Policy. Implications for participating parties.
The Gambia	Most important the Water sector reform, which will be supported by the AfDB/AWF (see above). <u>Remain to be done:</u> Elaboration of the IWRM Action Plan, harmonization of legal frameworks, institutionalize of IWRM committee and Country Water Partnership if the Water Sector reform project is materialized.
Guinea Bissau	<p>The principle results are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The major part of institutions are aware of the necessity to include concern for water resources • The NGOs are active in the sector
Liberia	The creation of stakeholders’ participation, knowledge and awareness and generation of political will at high levels are milestone results in Liberia. What remain to be pursued are the formulation and implementation of essential IWRM Plan of Action which seriously include capacity building at National and Local Levels and amending legislation and policies accordingly.

Sierra Leone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity building • Awareness raising • Consultations towards the development of an IWRM Road map
Togo	<p><u>Undertaken so far:</u> Meetings with the Steering Committee, SC, development of MERQUIRE, a Rapid Assessment methodology for water resources, a Progress report on development of IWRM since July 2007 for this current project and identification of the 25 stakeholders, “Group of 25”, for a stakeholder dialogue (including relevant ministries, NGOs etc.). A work plan is developed, and documents for the National Policy as well as the IWRM Action Plan are currently under development, all to assist the IWRM-process.</p> <p><u>Remain to be done:</u> To mobilize the “group of 25” for the stakeholder dialogue and organize meeting. Recruit consultants for review of the CWP of Togo and for the finalization of the Roadmap, finalize the IWRM National Action Plan, awareness building and advocating for IWRM, organize a round-table on linkages between IWRM and MDGs, recruit a consultant to develop a structure to a “code de l’eau”. And the responsible Ministry should formalize the “Group of 25” into the “multi-stakeholder dialogue” that should exist under this project.</p>

3. How has the work under the project helped to further IWRM in your country/region so far? What remains to be done?

Côte d’Ivoire	Raising awareness among decision-makers of the need to produce the key documents (Water Policy, and IWRM Action Plan).
The Gambia	Today much closer cooperation between stakeholder institutions.
Guinea Bissau	We are using delicacy in dealing with different stakeholders including decision-makers, river basin authorities etc. to include them in the work on IWRM.
Liberia	The project greatly improved and furthered IWRM awareness in Liberia and continuation of the project is essential to ensure that IWRM plans are developed and implemented for the sustainable management of the natural water resources in Liberia. The project has further resulted in framing of key water deliverables by Liberia PRS. It has also improved donor - NGO coordination and networking amongst ministries and agencies.
Sierra Leone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has built capacity • It has created some awareness <p>Remains to be done:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further awareness raising is necessary

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of an IWRM Plan
Togo	The IWRM-process has been re-launched for Togo but the country still has a need for supplementary funding.

4. What have so far been the main strengths of the project's IWRM work in your region?

Côte d'Ivoire	Implications for participating partners.
The Gambia	<i>It has increased the understanding and the appreciation for the need for a national platform for consultation.</i>
Guinea Bissau	It is the development of the IWRM roadmap that has created the awareness of the IWRM concept.
Liberia	The creation of and support (since 2008) to the IWRM Secretariat based at the Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy have strengthened the development of IWRM immensely, but even more important has been the international communities willingness to assist Liberia in its post-war water sector development and growth.
Sierra Leone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The country's sectoral policy for water and sanitation in co-operates IWRM principles • Pursuing IWRM concepts broad principles is a key element of the country's PRSP
Togo	Capacity-building, including among the members of the Steering Committee has put them on the same level. The development of MERQURE has contributed to the understanding of the different water issues in the three river basins of the country.

5. What have been the main shortcomings and/or weaknesses of the project's IWRM work so far in your country? How could these shortcomings be addressed, will the project continue?

Côte d'Ivoire	The delay at start. The financial constrains means that it is not possible to finance the full IWRM Action Plan.
The Gambia	Due to tight budgetary allocations, the participation of stakeholders were prioritized and the fact that all dialogues were organized at central level made it more difficult to invite grass-root stakeholders such as Community Based Organizations (CBOs) who are very important entry points for dissemination.

Guinea Bissau	The national implementing agencies need to be organized so that it is possible to communicate with regional agencies when trying to identify and implement activities that should be part of an IWRM Action Plan.
Liberia	The short duration of international consultant (s) in Liberia is a major shortcoming and can only be addressed with stationing an International IWRM Advisor for IWRM in Liberia. The main shortcomings concerns needs that become more visible as the project has been progressing. These are not an actual part of the project but rather a follow-up to be.
Sierra Leone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no Country Water Partnership to support the country's IWRM agenda • Support the establishment of a CWP in the country • Limited awareness of IWRM amongst Politicians and or other Policy makers • Targeted awareness raising of these people
Togo	The delay caused by the sickness of the international consultant has been attended to by the recruitment of the regional consultant. This has now considerably accelerated the work on the project.

6. To what extent has the project to date resulted in increased awareness on importance of environmental approaches and considerations, including such related to ecosystem services, in IWRM? Please, give examples! What remains to be done?

Côte d'Ivoire	Nothing
The Gambia	Are still at an early stage of the process. Project impacts are still to be found.
Guinea Bissau	<p>The project has diverted the approach of the General Directorate for Water Resources towards applying IWRM, thus including environmental considerations. An example is the project on use of solar energy for water pumping.</p> <p>Water access at village level and in semi-urban areas still remains to be ensured.</p>
Liberia	The increased awareness on the importance of environmental approaches and consideration is at higher level in Liberia and is indicated by the holding of a national Multi-stakeholders' dialogue on the Water Resources Issues Assessment Method (WRIAM) in June 2009 in Gbarnga, Bong County in Liberia. The follow up actions to redress the identified water resource issues are now required. This can better be achieved with the formulations of water law and regulations in line with the IWRM Policy. More concretely, issues related to the ecosystem services and protection include the need to address water quality problems such as those related to impact on the rivers by the gold and diamond mining including small-scale operations, by erosion/sedimentation caused by deforestation, and by disposal of sewage in rivers and lagoons.
Sierra Leone	

Togo	So far no particular action clearly demonstrates increased environmental awareness. Stakeholders not yet mobilized.
-------------	---

7. To what extent has the project so far resulted in increased access to relevant IWRM information and tools? Please, give examples? What remains to be done?

Côte d'Ivoire	Nothing
The Gambia	Adequate training and information material have been supplied to all participants in training programs. Apart from the national dialogue, a TOT training was done in Gambia in 2008 and currently a training of Journalists is being organized by the ECOWAS-WRCC in Ghana.
Guinea Bissau	Increased access to IWRM information and tools means an increased need for financial resources for the implementation. This need exists all over the country, which has been documented by local authorities.
Liberia	The Project has facilitated the participation of members of the IWRM Secretariat along with some stakeholders' representatives in IWRM Tools Training in Banjul, The Gambia for English-speaking countries in West Africa in 2007 and 2008. The implementation of the conduct of IWRM Tools Training in Liberia and the set up of an IWRM Resource Information Center are essential. What remains to be done is continuing data collection to create a Management Information System, including for water quality and quantity monitoring and evaluation.
Sierra Leone	Capacity building resulted in increased capacities in <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the GWP ToolBox - an Introduction to WRIAM (Water Resources Assessment Method)
Togo	The development of the MERQURE has resulted in strengthen capacity as the Steering Committee has been strengthened by broader water sector representation for the benefit of understanding the diverse water problems in the different river basins. <u>Remain to be done:</u> Documentation of good practices.

8. How and to what extent has so far capacity been built or increased among key water managers and decision makers on IWRM planning? What remains still to be done?

Côte d'Ivoire	Not very much
The Gambia	The application of IWRM concerns behavioral change, the means to achieve this goal are either lacking or inadequate. The elaboration of the roadmap resulted in that stakeholders now have the capability to

	identify the shortfalls to address them in order to enhance decision making and to apply the IWRM in planning.
Guinea Bissau	Depending of the over-arching nature of water, a multi-management system is necessary. In particular as water may be a source of conflicts.
Liberia	The setup and support to the IWRM Secretariat is a major capacity building initiative. Financing the contracts of the national consultants in Liberian for the IWRM Plans formulation as embodied in the Project is also a contributing factor to increased capacity. The efficiency and need for cooperation at governmental level has been enhanced, as has the development of institutional frameworks which brings water utilities, partners-in-progress, the private sector and community groups to exchange views, contribute skills and take decisions on water supply and sanitation projects. The formulation of the IWRM Plans and implementation of the plans will eventually be required.
Sierra Leone	Capacity building among some key water managers and decision makers was undertaken in <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The principles of IWRM - The IWRM Planning cycle - GWP Toolbox - WRIAM - Development of an IWRM Road map , etc
Togo	All Steering Committee members and some universities and water-NGOs have benefitted by the development of MERQUIRE. <u>Remains to be done:</u> Strengthen capacity by experience-exchange with Burkina Faso or Benin.

9. Question for Gambia, Guinea Conakry, Guinea Bissau and Sierra Leone: Is there any IWRM roadmap published for your country? What steps have been taken to reach this goal? What remains to be done? Are the IWRM protagonists and stakeholders committed to constructively collaborate to and agree on the roadmap?

The Gambia	The IWRM Roadmap has been published. What remains is the elaboration of the Action Plan, stakeholders are more than willing to collaborate to and to agree on the roadmap
Guinea Bissau	The IWRM roadmap for GB has been validated and published in Portuguese and referred for comments to a majority of relevant institutions. Detail it and make it applicable at regional and local level still needs to be done. Comments during the validation process, however, demonstrate a clear interest.

Sierra Leone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholders from diverse socio-cultural background were involved the validation of the roadmap for IWRM in June 2009 - Some of the activities in the IWRM Road like <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o the establishment of a CWP o Formation of a Steering Committee to oversee the IWRM process <p>are yet to be undertaken</p>
---------------------	--

10. Question for Côte d'Ivoire, Liberia and Togo: How far has the work on the IWRM Plan progressed? What steps have so far been taken? What remains to be done? Are the IWRM protagonists and stakeholders committed to constructively collaborate to and agree on the IWRM Plan?

Côte d'Ivoire	The work on the IWRM Action Plan now being finalized towards validation at the end of January 2010.
Liberia	<p>The work on the IWRM Plans is in the initial stage with the roadmap being completed and consultants short listed for the awarding o the consultancy to formulate the plans. There is a high degree of commitment for constructive collaboration in drafting the IWRM Plans.</p> <p>Technical Review of the draft IWRM Policy (from the previous project) May 2007.</p> <p>The adoption of IWRM principles in April 2007.</p> <p>Further steps towards drafting the IWRM Roadmap at the June 2009 Multi-Stakeholders Dialogue in Gbarnga, Liberia during which over 40 persons participated.</p>
Togo	Reports on progress in elaborating the IWRM-plan to this Evaluation (9 November). The results of the MERQURE to the IWRM plan were validated 20 November 2009. The Steering Committee and the implementing group are reviewing the document. All are involved.

The means for implementation:

11. To what extent has the technical assistance and support that the collaborating national and regional teams and institutions have been provided with been appropriate and adequate to reach the goal?

Côte d'Ivoire	Through the water working-group.
The Gambia	The assistance is adequate. The regional team has been supportive.

Guinea Bissau	It has made possible the awareness building and the process linked to the IWRM roadmap
Liberia	<p>Technical assistance and support has been provided to establish coordination mechanisms and bodies to ensure management at lowest appropriate level, involvement of the private sector to an appropriate level, increase rural gender balanced participation in decision making and development of water resources management capacities and capabilities.</p> <p>The technical assistance and support received as a result of the Project are for now appropriate but inadequate given the enormity of the tasks at hand to implement IWRM Plans.</p>
Sierra Leone	This has been timely and appropriate
Togo	The assistance is currently appropriate.

12. Have the institutional arrangements for the national implementation of the project been appropriate and adequate? Have they ensured appropriate participation of key stakeholder groups? Response (from Liberia): The institutional arrangements for the national implementation of the Project are for now appropriate and adequate but need to be improved with the changing time and realities. Appropriate participation of key stakeholders has been ensured through multi-stakeholders' activities, examples, the validation of the IWRM Policy and the WRIAM Dialogue

To what extent has the following been enough effective and flexible:

- The organization
- The staffing
- The sharing of responsibilities
- Coordinating mechanism between the different actors
- The support structure
- The relationship between different key partner institutions
- The cooperation with the Project Management Group?

	a)	b)	c)	d)	e)	f)	g)
Côte d'Ivoire	Not particular	Not particular for the project	Especially during the actual phase	Participating parties during meetings	The Water Resources Directorate	Through the working group	Permanent relationship
The Gambia	Need for an institutional reform	Not adequate		Not adequate		Not adequate	
Guinea Bissau	Made it stabilized	Strengthen it	Strengthen and	New. Ministry of	Coop. with Mechanism	Excellent	Through the Stake-

			renewed	water Chef de file	for Fouta Djallon		holder group.
Liberia	Not enough effective but flexible.	Not enough effective and flexible.	Not enough but somehow flexible.	Existed but needs improvement	Not enough and flexible but could improve.	Enough effective and flexible.	Not enough but flexible.
Sierra Leone	Appopr.	Adequate	OK	OK	Adequate	OK	OK
Togo	SC 9 members, OK Implement team, EMO, 16 members OK, Group of 25 = SC+EMO	The members of EMO + SC and personnel from the DG for Water and Sanitation all participate.	The EMO coordinates the project implementation while the SC assure evaluation of the activities.		Efficient and supporting.	The project has not yet been working with the institutions of the participating org. Otherwise through stakeholder dialogue.	Good cooperation

13. To what degree has the collaborative implementation of the activities under the project contributed to
- a) Strengthening regional and national institutions

Côte d'Ivoire	Regional: Weak as only the GWP/WA participates without taking part. National: Yes.
The Gambia	Not applicable (only at roadmap stage)
Guinea Bissau	It has made it possible to carry out IWRM at national level.
Liberia	See below
Sierra Leone	
Togo	Through the Steering Committee.

b) The number of international agreements and arrangements

Côte d'Ivoire	No
The Gambia	Not applicable
Guinea Bissau	Work on the Gambia River agreement (OMVG), concerning Fouta Djallon (PRAI-MFD) and AGIR.
Liberia	See below
Sierra Leone	
Togo	None is signed during the project run.

c) The exchange of information between key actors of project implementation

Côte d'Ivoire	Regular meeting with Water working-group for information exchange.
The Gambia	Not applicable
Guinea Bissau	Exchange in particularly with the ones mentioned under (b).
Liberia	See below
Sierra Leone	
Togo	The project has contributed to a large extent to information exchange between the different actors.

d) Creating regional, national and local ownership of the activities and outputs of this Action/project?

Côte d'Ivoire	Not yet such impacts.
The Gambia	Not applicable.

Guinea Bissau	This collaboration has been strengthened; in particular as the same person is involved as focal point for what is mentioned under (b).
Liberia	See below
Sierra Leone	
Togo	As expected with the different activities under the project.

Response to 13 a-d by Liberia: The collaborative implementation of the activities under the Project contributed substantially to strengthen the support from WRCU of the ECOWAS regional body and the IWRM Secretariat in Liberia through participation in IWRM Training Seminars and Workshops in the region.

The cooperation in implementation between relevant ministries under the coordination of the Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy and with support from UNEP-UCC-Water, UNICEF-Liberia, UNDP-Liberia, AfDB and the World Bank has clearly contributed.

14. To what extent and how has this Action/project forged appropriate and effective partnerships and linkages between different stakeholders (government departments, the private sector, development partners, UN agencies, civil society, NGOs etc.) for the implementation of the Action/project and its sustainable outcome?

Côte d'Ivoire	Not yet any visible impacts. No such partnerships.
The Gambia	Despite the fact that the actions have not reach implementation stage, the preparation of the roadmap had brought in the opportunity for the first time the grouping together of partners and stakeholders and informal linkages forged through an ad hoc committee created to oversee the implementation of the actions.
Guinea Bissau	The activities under the project gained substantially by the establishment of the Country Water Partnership for GB.
Liberia	Through the creation of multi-stakeholders' participation and support to the IWRM processes during the past years. Major stakeholders have been given financial support to the IWRM activities through financing major projects and awareness and sensitization for IWRM adaptation as sustainable way for the management of water resources by increasing the political will towards IWRM. UNDP and UNICEF are active in rural areas. NGOs involved in WSS are Oxfam, Concern and Tear Fund. Donors and NGOs are fairly active in the water sector.
Sierra Leone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since the start of the project, stronger partnerships have been developed between the Govt. Departs of Water, Agriculture, Environment, Finance and economic Development, Health Ministries. • Development partners like AfDB, DFID, FAO, etc have also showed active interest in

	<p>IWRM activities in the country and an Agency like FAO has linked some future support to the its programs in Sierra Leone to our commitment to IWRM practices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Also INGOs like Action Contre la Faim have shown interest in the implementation of Sierra Leone IWRM Roadmap.
Togo	The project has revived the IWRM Steering Committee and established the “Group of 25”, consisting of the SC (incl. representatives for the adequate ministries), the private sector, the civil society and NGOs for a multi-stakeholder dialogue.

15. To what extent has this Action/project also leveraged funding from other sources? How?

Côte d’Ivoire	Not for issues related to what has been reported under the project.
The Gambia	A funding request is currently been made to the African Water Facility of the AfDB for some of the elements under the Roadmap, such as the institutional reforms, human resources and capacity building as well as the decentralization of the IWRM awareness. The proposal has been reviewed.
Guinea Bissau	Maybe it is needed to turn to the private sector for financing IWRM projects.
Liberia	The Project has highly leveraged funding from other sources through co-financing of major IWRM activities throughout the formulation of the IWRM Policy and other sub-sectoral policies. For example, UNICEF co-financed the validation of the IWRM Policy while EU and UNICEF also co-financed the IWRM Secretariat and Water Supply and Sanitation Policy received financial contributions from WB, NGO Consortium which received funding from DFID at various levels.
Sierra Leone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AfDB has indicated interest in supporting some IWRM activities as detailed in the IWRM Road map for Sierra Leone • UNICEF is considering some awareness raising activities • DFID say they might consider some activities in the IWRM roadmap at a later stage • etc
Togo	So far it has not leveraged funding from other sources.

PAYS :...Côte d'Ivoire

Soumis par (nom et fonction) :...Albert Goula Bi Tiè, National Consultant

Questions :

1. La question générale concerne les progrès qui ont été réalisés à ce jour dans les différents pays, au sein du projet et par suite du projet. Prière de répondre par quelques phrases à chacune des questions "a" - "d"
 - a) Quelles mesures ont été prises dans votre pays vers une feuille de route de GIRE négociée au niveau national et un plan de GIRE négocié au niveau national, respectivement ? De telles mesures pourraient comprendre des consultations de multiples parties-prenantes, une évaluation des conséquences, etc.

R : *Pas de mesures prises exceptionnellement vers une feuille de route.*

- b) Dans quelle mesure est-ce que les résultats du projet ont été intégrés jusqu'ici dans la planification actuelle, y compris ce qui concerne les ressources en eau ? Est-ce que vous avez des exemples concrets ? Prière d'indiquer si ces exemples démontrent également une valeur ajoutée évidente en matière d'adaptation ou d'atténuation du changement climatique !

R : *Le projet a favorisé la mise en place d'un groupe de travail sur l'eau (GTE) et permis la sensibilisation de groupes d'acteurs (Cas des journalistes)*

Le projet a conduit à recherché un financement pour finaliser le document de politique de leau

- c) Existe-t-il des exemples concrets de ce que les principes et les directives de GIRE ont été intégrés dans les stratégies sectorielles ou les rapports DSRP ?

R : *Oui la GIRE a été prise e compte dans le DSRP*

- d) Dans quelle mesure est-il possible de considérer des résultats positifs éventuels décrits en point "a" - "c" comme des résultats provenant de ce projet ? Quels résultats auraient été obtenus de toute façon ?

Prière de répondre brièvement mais soigneusement aux questions suivantes :

2. Quels sont les principaux résultats des travaux du projet dans votre pays/région jusqu'ici ? Que reste-t-il encore à faire ?

R : *Relance du processus GIRE en CI*

Lancement de l'élaboration du PAGIRE

Relance de la révision du document de politique nationale de l'eau

Implication des parties prenantes

3. Dans le cadre du projet, comment est-ce que le travail a contribué à développer davantage la GIRE dans votre pays/région jusqu'ici ? Que reste-t-il à faire ?

R : *L'implication des parties prenantes*

La sensibilisation des Autorités sur la nécessité d'élaborer les ocuments clés (Politique et PAGIRE)

4. Quels ont été jusqu'ici les principaux points forts du travail de GIRE du projet dans votre région ?

R : *Implication des parties prenantes*

5. Quels ont été les principaux défauts et/ou faiblesses du travail de GIRE du projet dans votre pays jusqu'ici ?
Comment peut-on aborder ces défauts; est-ce qu'il est prévu de continuer le projet ?

R : *Le retard pris au départ*

Le niveau de financement qui ne permet pas de financer le PAGIRE entièrement

6. Dans quelle mesure est-ce que le projet a résulté jusqu'ici en une sensibilisation augmentée à l'importance des approches et des considérations environnementales dans le cadre de la GIRE, y-compris celles liées à l'écosystème ? Prière de donner des exemples ! Que reste-t-il à faire ?

R : *Néant*

7. Dans quelle mesure est-ce que le projet a abouti jusqu'à présent à un accès accru à des informations et à des outils de GIRE pertinents ? Prière de donner des exemples ? Que reste-t-il à faire ?

R : *Néant*

8. Comment et dans quelle mesure est-ce qu'il a été créé ou augmenté jusqu'à présent du capacité parmi les gestionnaires principaux de l'eau et les décideurs clés de la planification de GIRE ? Que reste-t-il encore à faire ?

R : *Pas grand chose*

9. Question pour la Gambie, la Guinée Conakry, la Guinée Bissau et la Sierra Leone : Est-ce qu'une feuille de route de GIRE a été publiée pour votre pays ? Quelles mesures ont été prises pour atteindre cet objectif ? Que reste-t-il encore à faire ? Les protagonistes et les parties prenantes de GIRE, sont-ils engagés à collaborer de manière constructive et à se mettre d'accord sur la feuille de route ?

10. Question pour le Liberia, le Togo et la Côte d'Ivoire : Le travail sur le plan de GIRE, jusqu'au quel niveau a-t-il progressé ? Quelles mesures ont été prises jusqu'à présent ? Que reste-t-il à faire ? Les protagonistes et les parties prenantes de GIRE, sont-ils engagés à collaborer de manière constructive et à se mettre d'accord sur le plan de GIRE ?

R : *Niveau d'élaboration du PAGIRE : Travaux sur l'état des lieux en cours avec l'atelier de validation en fin Janvier 2010*

11. Dans quelle mesure est-ce que l'assistance et le soutien techniques reçus par les équipes et les institutions de collaboration nationales et régionales ont été appropriés et adéquates pour atteindre le but ?

R : *A travers le groupe de Travail sur l'eau*

12. Est-ce que les arrangements institutionnels pour la mise en œuvre nationale du projet ont été appropriés et adéquats ? Ont-ils assuré une participation appropriée des groupes de parties prenantes principales ? Dans quelle mesure est-ce que vous avez trouvé les point ci-dessous suffisamment efficaces et souples :

- L'organisation *Pas d'organisation spécifique*
- Le personnel *Pas de personnel spécifique au projet*
- Le partage des responsabilités *Plus précis dans la phase actuelle*
- Le mécanisme de liaison entre les différents acteurs *Implication des Parties prenantes à travers des rencontres*
- La structure de soutien *Direction des Ressources en eau*
- Les relations entre les différentes institutions de partenaires principaux *A travers le Groupe de Travail*
- La coopération avec le groupe de gestion du projet *relation permanente*

13. Dans quelle mesure est-ce que la mise en œuvre des activités dans le cadre du projet a contribué

- A renforcer les institutions régionales (*En partie très faible car seul le GWP WA participe sans véritablement prendre part*) et nationales (*Oui*)
- Au nombre de conventions et d'arrangements internationaux (*NON*)
- A l'échange d'informations entre les acteurs principaux de la mise en œuvre du projet (*Réunion régulière du GTE pour par la mise à disposition d'informations*)
- A encourager l'appropriation régionale, nationale et locale des activités et des résultats de cet action/ce projet (*Impacts non encore perceptible*)

14. Dans quelle mesure et comment est-ce que cette action/ce projet a établi des partenariats et des liens appropriés et efficaces entre différentes parties prenantes (départements gouvernementaux, le secteur privé, partenaires au développement, des agences de l'ONU, la société civile, les ONG, etc.) en vue de la mise en œuvre de l'action/du projet et son résultat durable ?

R : *(Impacts non encore visibles) – Absence de partenaires mobilisés dans le cadre du projet*

15. Dans quelle mesure est-ce que cette action/ce projet a la mobilisation du financement d'autres sources également ? Comment ?

R : *Pas de partenaires associés par rapport au projet*

Country: The GAMBIA.....

Submitted by (name and function): **Momodou S. JALLOW/ Principal Hydrologist &**

Focal Point IWRM Processes in The Gambia

Questions:

1. The over-all question concerns the progress that has been achieved today in the different countries, within the project and as a consequence of the project. Please, respond in some sentences to each of the questions "a" – "d"
 - a) Which steps has been taken in your country towards a nationally negotiated IWRM roadmap, respective a nationally negotiated IWRM plan? Such steps could include multi-stakeholder consultation and their consequences etc.

R.: *STEP1: The project started with a formal lunching in which a good number of Public, NGOs, Private and civil society Institutions and stakeholders in water were Invited to participate.*

STEP 2: A national dialogue and training in WRIAM was undertaken to further the understanding of IWRM processes by the project coordination Unit

STEP 3: Was marked by another national dialogue in which the stakeholders with the help of a local consultant had a dialogue to elaborate the national IWRM roadmap.

STEP 4: Validation of the final IWRM roadmap report with a larger participation of stakeholders Including Donor Agencies such as FAO, GWP/AO, ECOWAS-WRCC, UNEP for Example and the regional consultant were all invited to attend

STEP 5: Since the validation, an initiative was undertaken to seek funding for the follow up

Processes to the roadmap with ADB through their AWF window. This funding requested from ADB is intended to take care a few key elements of the roadmap in particular the capacity Building(training and equipment), Institutional reform, review of the water legal framework and the decentralization of IWRM process The project prepared for funding is at advance stage and hopefully by January 2010 the project may started

- b) To what extent is the outcomes of the project so far integrated in current planning, including concerning water resources? What kind of concrete examples are there? Please, describe whether these examples also demonstrate any clear value added related to climate change adaptation or mitigation!
- c) Are there any concrete examples of that IWRM principles and guidelines being integrated in sector strategies or PRSP reports?

R . *The IWRM roadmap project after having been completed did give government a second thought to get away from sectoral approach to water resources management and embrace the integrated approach, following the numerous problems associated with water currently being experience. Te embracing of IWRM is clearly evident in a number of policy documents such as the PRSP II/ 2007, The Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Document/ 2009, National Water policy 2006/7, The National Agricultural Investment Program/ 2009, The national Adaptation*

- d) To what extent can any positive result reported under a-c be regarded as a result of this project? What would have happened anyway?,

R : *The positive result of the project on (a-b) as evident is that without this concept water management would have remain in its traditional sect oral way of management which does not allow proper planning, development, management and protection of the resources.*

Most policies however, have not or have just started to be implemented, the overall impacts therefore of these policies cannot be assess as of now but it is expected that the issue of water will now be handled with the knowledge that it has both an economic as well as social function and therefore it is everybody's business to ensure its proper use and protection

- 2. What are the primary results of the project's work in your country/region so far? What is still remaining to be done?
- 3. How has the work under the project helped to further IWRM in your country/region so far? What remains to be done?

R: *The most important results of the project is the Water Sector Reform Project, This project developed intends to undertake the implementation of the reform of the Water Sector, human resources development, review of the water legal framework and the de-decentralization of IWRM processes and has virtually being accepted by AWF/ADB*

One of the outstanding outcome of the project has been that today stakeholder institutions in the water sector are much closer together than before where around table discussions are held on water that is perceived by all today that it is common good that is shared by all

The remaining things are mainly the overall elaboration of the action plan based on the roadmap particularly, in key areas such as the review and harmonization of the existing water related legislatures, the institutionalization of IWRM committee and Country Water partnerships assuming that the water sector reform project will materialized

4. What have so far been the main strengths of the project's IWRM work in your region?
5. What have been the main shortcomings and/or weaknesses of the project's IWRM work so far in your country? How could these shortcomings be addressed, will the project continue?

R: Amongst the strength of the Project in the IWRM work in the region or more specifically in the Gambia is that it has increased our overall understanding of the concept and its processes. It has helped us see for the first time and appreciate the need for a national platform for consultation.

Due to tight budgetary allocations, the participation of stakeholders were prioritized and the fact that all dialogues were organized at central level made it even more difficult to invite very important grassroots stakeholders eg Community Based Organizations (CBOs) who are very important entry points for dissemination

6. To what extent has the project to date resulted in increased awareness on importance of environmental approaches and considerations, including such related to ecosystem services, in IWRM? Please, give examples! What remains to be done?

R: *We are still at the preliminary level of the processes project impacts are yet to unfold*

7. To what extent has the project so far resulted in increased access to relevant IWRM information and tools? Please, give examples? What remains to be done?

R: *Adequate training materials and information sources have been given to all stakeholders that have participated in one program or another. Apart from the national dialogue participants, a TOT training was done in Gambia in 2008 and currently a training of Journalists is being organized by the ECOWAS-WRCC in Ghana*

8. How and to what extent has so far capacity been built or increased among key water managers and decision makers on IWRM planning? What remains still to be done?

R: *Since the IWRM processes are issues of behavioral change, the most outstanding means to achieve this goal are either lacking or inadequate.*

The elaboration of roadmap therefore has given stakeholders the capability to identify these shortfalls and hence make appropriate recommendations to address them in a view to enhance decision making and the application of the concept in IWRM planning

9. Question for Gambia, Guinea Conakry, Guinea Bissau and Sierra Leone: Is there any IWRM roadmap published for your country? What steps have been taken to reach this goal? What remains to be done? Are the IWRM protagonists and stakeholders committed to constructively collaborate to and agree on the roadmap?

R: Yes , The IWRM Roadmap has been published, The steps taken are as indicated in part One Question 1(a). What is remaining is the elaboration of the action plan, stakeholders are more than willing to collaborate to and agree on the roadmap

10. Question for Liberia, Togo and Côte d'Ivoire: How far has the work on the IWRM Plan progressed? What steps have so far been taken? What remains to be done? Are the IWRM protagonists and stakeholders committed to constructively collaborate to and agree on the IWRM Plan?

11. To what extent has the technical assistance and support that the collaborating national and regional teams and institutions have been provided with been appropriate and adequate to reach the goal?

R: The Gambia is quite satisfied and considers adequate the roles played by technical region team and all other supporters

12. Have the institutional arrangements for the national implementation of the project been appropriate and adequate? Have they ensured appropriate participation of key stakeholder groups? To what extent has the following been enough effective and flexible:

- a) The organization
- b) The staffing
- c) The sharing of responsibilities
- d) Cording mechanism between the different actors
- e) The support structure
- f) The relationship between different key partner institutions
- g) The cooperation with the Project Management Group?

R: The Gambia has only its IWRM roadmap elaborated and adopted in March 2009 in which a number of concerns were raised by the various stakeholders that have participated, pertinent amongst them were the need for Institution reform, Capacity building of all stakeholders, material support for data collection, elaboration of a communication strategy, harmonization of all water related legislatures and the need for a common forum for continuous dialogue etc.

This hence implies that the current institutional arrangement, staffing of the coordination body, the coordination mechanism, stakeholder relationship are inadequate for the implementation of the IWRM actions anticipated.

13. To what degree has the collaborative implementation of the activities under the project contributed to
- a) Strengthening regional and national institutions
 - b) The number of international agreements and arrangements
 - c) The exchange of information between key actors of project implementation
 - d) Creating regional, national and local ownership of the activities and outputs of this Action/project?

R: The level at which the collaborative implementation of the activities cannot be assessed noting that only a roadmap was developed.

However, regional agreements exist on shared river basins where exchanges of information are made

14. To what extent and how has this Action/project forged appropriate and effective partnerships and linkages between different stakeholders (government departments, the private sector, development partners, UN agencies, civil society, NGOs etc.) for the implementation of the Action/project and its sustainable outcome?

R: Despite the fact that the actions have not reach implementation stage, the preparation of the roadmap had brought in the opportunity for the first time the grouping together of partners and stakeholders and informal linkages forged through an ad hoc committee created to oversee the implementation of the actions

15. To what extent has this Action/project also leveraged funding from other sources? How?

R: With use of some of the elements of the roadmap elaborated, a funding request is currently been made with the African Water Facility of the ADB to take up the institutional reforms, human resources and material capacity building as well as the de- centralization of the IWRM awareness. A mission has been dispatched to the Gambia a review of proposal have been done

PAYS :.....GUINEE-BISSAU.....

Soumis par (nom et fonction) : Paulino Sousa de Azinhaga.

Questions :

1. La question générale concerne les progrès qui ont été réalisés à ce jour dans les différents pays, au sein du projet et par suite du projet. Prière de répondre par quelques phrases à chacune des questions "a" - "d"
 - a) Quelles mesures ont été prises dans votre pays vers une feuille de route de GIRE négociée au niveau national et un plan de GIRE négocié au niveau national, respectivement ? De telles mesures pourraient comprendre des consultations de multiples parties-prenantes, une évaluation des conséquences, etc.

R : Les mesures prises dans mon pays est la prise de conscience que il faudrait sortir de la gestion sectorielle des ressources en eau vers une gestion intégrée. Cela est comprise maintenant dans le pays mais il s'avère une nécessité d'une ample campagne de sensibilisation sur la GIRE. La feuille de route Guinée Bissau a été validée et traduite en portugais (distribuée) pour une meilleure compréhension des parties prenantes en la matière.

Dans le cadre de l'actualisation du Scéma Directeur Eau et Assainissement, il sera question dans son écriture de faire ressortir amplement cette notion de la GIRE. Cette actualisation a été financée par le PNUD et nous attendons un Financement de l'UE qui ont cofinancé ensemble avec le PNUD pour le financement d'un Plan d'Action GIRE de Guinée-Bissau.

- b) Dans quelle mesure est-ce que les résultats du projet ont été intégrés jusqu'ici dans la planification actuelle, y compris ce qui concerne les ressources en eau ? Est-ce que vous avez des exemples concrets ? Prière d'indiquer si ces exemples démontrent également une valeur ajoutée évidente en matière d'adaptation ou d'atténuation du changement climatique !

R : Comme je l'ai souligné dans la première réponse elle sera bien sûr intégrés dans l'écriture de la planification actuelle de même en ce qui concerne les ressources en eau. Des exemples concrets seront visible dans le Schéma Directeur Eau et Assainissement en actualisation. La Direction Générale (DGRH) a participé aux différentes études menées par le projet Changements Climatiques de la Guinée-Bissau ainsi que dans le Programme National de l'investissement Agraire(PNIA) par la promotion de l'irrigation.

- c) Existe-t-il des exemples concrets de ce que les principes et les directives de GIRE ont été intégrés dans les stratégies sectorielles ou les rapports DSRP ?

R : Comme énoncé ci-dessus, les projets qui émaneront et financés dans le cadre des changements climatique et promotion de l'agriculture, les principes et directives GIRE seront prises en compte car il y aura la participation des hydrologues et hydrauliciens au niveau de l'exécution de ces projets. Dans le cadre des nouvelles assises du Document Stratégique Nationale de la Réduction de la Pauvreté, nous avons demandé à cette instance de faire appel aux techniciens des ressources en eau pour participer à l'écriture de la nouvelle version de lutte contre la pauvreté.

- d) Dans quelle mesure est-il possible de considérer des résultats positifs éventuels décrits en point "a" - "c" comme des résultats provenant de ce projet ? Quels résultats auraient été obtenus de toute façon ?

R : Il faut dire, que pendant beaucoup d'années quelques services ont entendu cette notion GIRE. Mais présentement, a partir de ce projet un grand nombre d'institutions savent qu'il est nécessaire l'application de la GIRE dans leurs activités. Sur ce, la notion sera reprise fortement dans l'écriture du nouveau Schéma Directeur Eau et Assainissement ainsi dans l'étude du PANGIRE-GB.

2. Quels sont les principaux résultats des travaux du projet dans votre pays/région jusqu'ici ? Que reste-t-il encore à faire ?

R : Les principaux résultats sont :

- Sensibilisation de la majeure partie des Institutions faisant partie prenantes des ressources en eau
- Les ONGs agissant dans le Secteur

3. Dans le cadre du projet, comment est-ce que le travail a contribué à développer davantage la GIRE dans votre pays/région jusqu'ici ? Que reste-t-il à faire ?

R : Dans le cadre de ce projet, nous avons obtenu une grande sensibilisation des parties prenantes et ce qui reste à faire est au niveau des décideurs politiques et au niveau des bassins fluviaux qui sont des structures fonctionnelles et structurales pour la mise en œuvre de la GIRE.

4. Quels ont été jusqu'ici les principaux points forts du travail de GIRE du projet dans votre région ?

R : C'est dotée la Guinée Bissau d'une Feuille de route nationales de la GIRE et une grande sensibilisation de la notion GIRE.

5. Quels ont été les principaux défauts et/ou faiblesses du travail de GIRE du projet dans votre pays jusqu'ici ? Comment peut-on aborder ces défauts; est-ce qu'il est prévu de continuer le projet ?

R : des défauts et/ou faiblesse c'est d'organiser des ateliers nationaux comme au niveau des régions pour faire passer le message dans la pratique de cette notion GIRE en attendan les projets qui seront identifiés dans le cadre du Plan Action GIRE. En effet aucun retour en arrière est possible.

6. Dans quelle mesure est-ce que le projet a résulté jusqu'ici en une sensibilisation augmentée à l'importance des approches et des considérations environnementales dans le cadre de la GIRE, y-compris celles liées à l'écosystème ? Prière de donner des exemples ! Que reste-t-il à faire ?

R : *le projet a permis à la DGRH de penser seulement à l'application de la GIRE en tenant compte des considérations environnementales et ceci est visible depuis beaucoup de temps dans les différents projets hydraulique solaires.*

- a. *La gestion des points d'eau villageois*
- b. *La gestions des adductions semi-urbaines*

7. Dans quelle mesure est-ce que le projet a abouti jusqu'à présent à un accès accru à des informations et à des outils de GIRE pertinents ? Prière de donner des exemples ? Que reste-t-il à faire ?

R : *le projet a abouti à un accès accrus à des informations et à des outils de GIRE dans le cadre de la réalisation des différents ateliers financés par le projet et dont l'écho s'est fait sentir dans tout l'ensemble du pays car les autorités locales ont été invitées et documentées de cette notion ;*

8. Comment et dans quelle mesure est-ce qu'il a été créé ou augmenté jusqu'à présent du capacité parmi les gestionnaires principaux de l'eau et les décideurs clés de la planification de GIRE ? Que reste-t-il encore à faire ?

R : *Comme je l'ai souligné là-dessus les gestionnaires de l'eau ont compris la transversalité de l'eau d'où la nécessité de la gérée ensemble, car l'eau peut devenir une source de conflits.*

9. Question pour la Gambie, la Guinée Conakry, la Guinée Bissau et la Sierra Leone : Est-ce qu'une feuille de route de GIRE a été publiée pour votre pays ? Quelles mesures ont été prises pour atteindre cet objectif ? Que reste-t-il encore à faire ? Les protagonistes et les parties prenantes de GIRE, sont-ils engagés à collaborer de manière constructive et à se mettre d'accord sur la feuille de route ?

R : *la feuille de route GIRE a été validée et publié en portugais et remise à une majorité des institutions et sa distribution suit son cours. Ce qui reste à faire c'est la sensibilisation au niveau de toutes les régions du pays et la diffusion de la GIRE aux niveaux locaux. On sent que les parties prenantes sont bien engagés et à collaborer de manière constructive. En effet les parties prenantes ont fait des commentaires lors de la validation de la feuille de route GIRE GB.*

10. Question pour le Liberia, le Togo et la Côte d'Ivoire : Le travail sur le plan de GIRE, jusqu'au quel niveau a-t-il progressé ? Quelles mesures ont été prises jusqu'à présent ? Que reste-t-il à faire ? Les protagonistes et les parties prenantes de GIRE, sont-ils engagés à collaborer de manière constructive et à se mettre d'accord sur le plan de GIRE ?

11. Dans quelle mesure est-ce que l'assistance et le soutien techniques reçus par les équipes et les institutions de collaboration nationales et régionales ont été appropriés et adéquates pour atteindre le but ?

R : *En recevant ce projet qui a permis une certaine sensibilisation et a permis la Guinée Bissau d'avoir une feuille de route validée et diffusée*

12. Est-ce que les arrangements institutionnels pour la mise en œuvre nationale du projet ont été appropriés et adéquats ? Ont-ils assuré une participation appropriée des groupes de parties prenantes principales ? Dans quelle mesure est-ce que vous avez trouvé les point ci-dessous suffisamment efficaces et souples :

- a) L'organisation : *reste à consolider*
- b) Le personnel : *ressources avérées à cette gestion des ressources en eau*
- c) Le partage des responsabilités : *il est en création le Partenariat National de l'Eau ce qui représentera une nouvelle synergie dans le partage des responsabilités.*
- d) Le mécanisme de liaison entre les différents acteurs : *Un mécanisme est mis en place dont le Chef de file est les Ministère qui tutelle l'eau.*
- e) La structure de soutien : *les organisations sub-régionales. Car deux projet ont connu le jour au niveau de l'OMVG et du Projet des Gestion intégrée des Ressources Naturelles du Massif do Fouta Djallon et de ses extensions.*
- f) Les relations entre les différentes institutions de partenaires principaux : *excellentes.*
- g) La coopération avec le groupe de gestion du projet : *un Steakholder a été crée et ne cesse de s'amplifier*

13. Dans quelle mesure est-ce que la mise en œuvre des activités dans le cadre du projet a contribué
- a) A renforcer les institutions régionales et nationales : *en permettant d'avoir une connaissance un peu parfaite de la GIRE au niveau du pays*
 - b) Au nombre de conventions et d'arrangements internationaux : multiples : *OMVG, PRAI-MFD et AGIR.*
 - c) A l'échange d'informations entre les acteurs principaux de la mise en œuvre du projet : *déjà connus dans la sub-région, notamment l'OMVG et le PRAI-MFD et son PGIRN/MFD*
 - d) A encourager l'appropriation régionale, nationale et locale des activités et des résultats de cet action/ce projet : *l'encouragement est continu et je peux déjà dire qu'avec ma nomination en qualité de point focal officiellement cette appropriation sera mise en œuvre car je dirige en même temps le Projet de Gestion Intégrée des Ressources Naturelles du Massif du Fouta Djallon et le Projet de Gestion Intégrée des Ressources en Eau d'un fleuve partagé nommé la Kayanga/Géba. Et toutes les avancées seront prises en compte.*

14. Dans quelle mesure et comment est-ce que cette action/ce projet a établi des partenariats et des liens appropriés et efficaces entre différentes parties prenantes (départements gouvernementaux, le secteur privé, partenaires au développement, des agences de l'ONU, la société civile, les ONG, etc.) en vue de la mise en œuvre de l'action/du projet et son résultat durable ?

R : *les activités de ce projet a permis de comprendre aisément la création et la mise en place du Partenariat Nacional de l'Eau*

15. Dans quelle mesure est-ce que cette action/ce projet a la mobilisation du financement d'autres sources également ? Comment ?

R : *éventuellement s'adresser à la FAE pour l'obtention d'autres projets de caractère de GIRE*

Country: LIBERIA

Submitted by: IWRM Secretariat-Liberia (The National Coordinating Arm for Integrated Water Resources Management Processes and Practices in Liberia)

Questions:

1. The over-all question concerns the progress that has been achieved today in the different countries, within the project and as a consequence of the project. Please, respond in some sentences to each of the questions "a" – "d"

- a) Which steps has been taken in your country towards a nationally negotiated IWRM roadmap, respective a nationally negotiated IWRM plan? Such steps could include multi-stakeholder consultation and their consequences etc.

R: *In Liberia, sensitization and awareness creation for multi-stakeholders participation in the formulation of the IWRM Policy since 2006 have been implemented with supports from major External Support Agencies and donors.*

- b) To what extent is the outcomes of the project so far integrated in current planning, including concerning water resources? What kind of concrete examples are there? Please, describe whether these examples also demonstrate any clear value added related to climate change adaptation or mitigation!

R: *The Project produced the Liberia IWRM Policy which was accepted by the Liberian Cabinet in July 2009 as one of the Deliverables of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Programme. The draft IWRM Policy was presented to all stakeholders during a nation-wide county consultation between November and December 2008. The IWRM Policy of Liberia has addressed climate change adaptation by ensuring that the EPA in Liberia takes the leadership for the protection of the environment in Liberia. The EPA has become a major member of the Water and Sanitation Board of Liberia.*

- c) Are there any concrete examples of that IWRM principles and guidelines are being integrated in sector strategies or PRSP reports?

R: *The IWRM Policy of Liberia has been integrated in the PRSP to an extent that the sub-sectoral policies elaborated in the Policy have been drafted and some have now been approved for the examples “Water Supply and Sanitation (WSS) Policy, the Energy Policy, the Food Security Policy”, etc. The Water Supply and Sanitation Policy was also presented to the Liberian Cabinet on 23 November 2009 and awaits printing. The Principle of “water for some and not all for some” and Gender Mainstreaming were all captured in WSS Policy. Institutional reforms to ensure the sustainable management of the water resources were well articulated in the IWRM Sub-sectoral policy of WSS.*

- d) To what extent can any positive result reported under a-c be regarded as a result of this project? What would have happened anyway?

R: *Before 2006, the ideals of IWRM were not known in Liberia. The support from the Project has brought strong awareness to Liberia to vigorously pursue the adoption of IWRM Principles of course late but in line by the global actions which called for nations to develop IWRM Plans by 2005. Without the project, Liberia would have been struggling still doing business with the management of water resources in the “as usual manner”.*

2. What are the primary results of the project’s work in your country/region so far? What is still remaining to be done?

R: *The creation of stakeholders' participation and generation of political will at high levels are milestone results in Liberia. What remain to be pursued are the formulation and implementation of essential IWRM Plans of Action which seriously include capacity building at National and Local Levels.*

3. How has the work under the project helped to further IWRM in your country/region so far? What remains to be done?

R: *The project greatly improved and furthered IWRM awareness in Liberia and continuation of the project is essential to ensure that IWRM plans are developed and implemented for the sustainable management of the natural water resources in Liberia.*

4. What have so far been the main strengths of the project's IWRM work in your region?

R: *In Liberia, the creation of and support (since 2008) to the IWRM Secretariat based at the Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy have strengthened the development of IWRM immensely.*

5. What have been the main shortcomings and/or weaknesses of the project's IWRM work so far in your country? How these shortcomings could be addressed, will the project continue?

R: *The short duration of international consultant (s) in Liberia is a major shortcomings and can only be addressed with stationing an International IWRM Advisor for IWRM in Liberia.*

6. To what extent has the project to date resulted in increased awareness on importance of environmental approaches and considerations, including such related to ecosystem services, in IWRM? Please, give examples! What remains to be done?

R: *The Increased awareness on the importance of environmental approaches and consideration is at higher level in Liberia and is indicated by the holding of a national Multi-stakeholders' dialogue on the Water Resources Issues Assessment Method (WRIAM) in June 2009 in Gbarnga, Bong County in Liberia. The follow up actions to redress the identified water resource issues are now required. This can better be achieved with the formulations of water law and regulations in line with the IWRM Policy.*

7. To what extent has the project so far resulted in increased access to relevant IWRM information and tools? Please, give examples? What remains to be done?

R: *The Project has facilitated the participation of members of the IWRM Secretariat along with some stakeholders' representatives in IWRM Tools Training in Banjul, The Gambia for English-speaking countries in West Africa in 2007 and 2008. The implementation of the conduct of IWRM Tools Training in Liberia and the set up of an IWRM Resource Information Center are essential.*

8. How and to what extent has so far capacity been built or increased among key water managers and decision makers on IWRM planning? What remains still to be done?

R: *The setup and support to the IWRM Secretariat is a major capacity building initiative. Financing the contracts of the national consultants in Liberia for the IWRM Plans formulation as embodied in the Project is*

also a contributing factor to increased capacity. The formulation of the IWRM Plans and implementation of the plans will eventually be required.

9. Question for Gambia Guinea Conakry, Guinea Bissau and Sierra Leone:

10. Question for Liberia, Togo and Côte d'Ivoire: How far has the work on the IWRM Plan progressed? What steps have so far been taken? What remains to be done? Are the IWRM protagonists and stakeholders committed to constructively collaborate to and agree on the IWRM Plan?

R: *The work on the IWRM Plans is in the initial stage with the roadmap being completed and consultants short listed for the awarding of the consultancy to formulate the plans. There is a high degree of commitment for constructive collaboration in drafting the IWRM Plans as exemplified at the June 2009 Multi-Stakeholders Dialogue in Gbarnga, Liberia during which over 40 persons participated.*

11. To what extent has the technical assistance and support that the collaborating national and regional teams and institutions have been provided with been appropriate and adequate to reach the goal?

R: *The technical assistance and support received as a result of the Project are for now appropriate but inadequate given the enormity of the tasks at hand to implement IWRM Plans in Liberia.*

12. Have the institutional arrangements for the national implementation of the project been appropriate and adequate? Have they ensured appropriate participation of key stakeholder groups?

R: *The institutional arrangements for the national implementation of the Project are for now appropriate and adequate but need to be improved with the changing time and realities. Appropriate participation of key stakeholders has been ensured through multi-stakeholders' activities, examples, the validation of the IWRM Policy and the WRIAM Dialogue in Liberia.*

To what extent has the following been enough effective and flexible:

- a) The organization: *Not enough effective but flexible.*
- b) The staffing: *Not enough effective and flexible.*
- c) The sharing of responsibilities: *Not enough but somehow flexible.*
- d) Coordination mechanism between the different actors: *Existed but needs improvement.*
- e) The support structure: *Not enough and flexible but could improve.*
- f) The relationship between different key partner institutions: *Enough effective and flexible*
- g) The cooperation with the Project Management Group? *Not enough but flexible.*

13. To what degree has the collaborative implementation of the activities under the project contributed to
- a) Strengthening regional and national institutions
 - b) The number of international agreements and arrangements
 - c) The exchange of information between key actors of project implementation
 - d) Creating regional, national and local ownership of the activities and outputs of this Action/project?

R: *The collaborative implementation of the activities under the Project contributed substantially to strengthen the support from WRCU of the ECOWAS regional body and the IWRM Secretariat in Liberia through participation in IWRM Training Seminars and Workshops in the region.*

14. To what extent and how has this Action/project forged appropriate and effective partnerships and linkages between different stakeholders (government departments, the private sector, development partners, UN agencies, civil society, NGOs etc.) for the implementation of the Action/project and its sustainable outcome?

R: *The Action/project has forged an appropriate and effective partnerships and linkages between different stakeholders through the creation of multi-stakeholders' participation and support to the IWRM processes in Liberia during the past years. Major stakeholders have been given financial support to the IWRM activities through financing major projects and awareness and sensitization for IWRM adaptation as sustainable way for the management of water resources by increasing the political will towards IWRM in Liberia.*

15. To what extent has this Action/project also leveraged funding from other sources? How?

R: *The Project has highly leveraged funding from other sources through co-financing of major IWRM activities throughout the formulation of the IWRM Policy and other sub-sectoral policies. For example, UNICEF co-financed the validation of the IWRM Policy while EU and UNICEF also co-financed the IWRM Secretariat and Water Supply and Sanitation Policy received financial contributions from WB, NGO Consortium which received funding the DFID at various levels.*

Country: ...LIBERIA.....

Submitted by (name and function): **Engr. Oliver B. Kulah, IWRM National Consultant**.....

Questions:

1. The over-all question concerns the progress that has been achieved today in the different countries, within the project and as a consequence of the project. Please, respond in some sentences to each of the questions "a" – "d"

- a) Which steps has been taken in your country towards a nationally negotiated IWRM roadmap, respective a nationally negotiated IWRM plan? Such steps could include multi-stakeholder consultation and their consequences etc.

R: *Significant progress has been made in the following:*

- *Preparation of a draft 'National Integrated Water Resources Management Policy' (January 2006 to April 2007)*
- *Technical Review of the Draft IWRM Policy (Stage 1: 23 – 25 May, 2007 in Monrovia)*
- *Preparation of the Liberia's Roadmap leading to the adoption IWRM principles (December 2006 to April 2007)*
- *Technical Review of the Roadmap: May 31, 2007 (Monrovia, Liberia)*
- *Further steps towards drafting the IWRM Roadmap, (multi-stakeholders workshop) June 11-12 2009, Gbanga, Bong County, Liberia.*

- b) To what extent is the outcomes of the project so far integrated in current planning, including concerning water resources? What kind of concrete examples are there? Please, describe whether these examples also demonstrate any clear value added related to climate change adaptation or mitigation!

R: Information on the important rivers and major river basins and their strategic locations has been collected for the planning purpose of water resources management in Liberia.

There are about 15 important rivers in Liberia; out of which 6 are major river basins. The largest and longest is the Cavalla River which is shared between Liberia and La Cote D'Ivoire (18,672 km in total with 8,400 km in Liberia). The St. Paul River is the second longest (13,536 km with 7,912 km in Liberia). This river feeds the Mt. Coffee hydro-electric plant (now damaged) and provides the major source of pipe-borne water supply for Monrovia. The other rivers are: Mano River, Lofa, Mafa, Du, Farmington, St. John, Timbo, Cestos, Sinoe, Dugbe, Grand Cess and Makona Rivers.

The challenges of climate change are the extensive impacts on the water resources in Liberia. These impacts are the result of increasing and intensive rain and flood in some areas, food insecurity, and deterioration in human and animal health, disruptions to water supply and major or extensive coastal erosion throughout the country. However, IWRM is widely recognized as one of the appropriate responses to the challenges faced this climate change.

- c) Are there any concrete examples of that IWRM principles and guidelines are being integrated in sector strategies or PRSP reports?

R: The Government is committed to working towards achieving the aims and objectives of the Millennium Development Goals. Liberia's post-war Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) strongly supports 'providing water and sanitation'.

The strategy overall objective 'is to increase safe drinking water and improve sanitation (healthy environment) for all in urban and rural areas' (PRS, 2006). Furthermore, the Government has endorsed the general objectives of the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade (IDWSSD) since its inception in 1980.

Water sector reforms study which started in February 2009 and will end in December 2009. This study is to be carryout in support of the water sector reforms.

The 2007 Liberia Demographic and Health Survey (LDHS) data show that mortality levels in rural areas tend to be higher than in urban areas. For example, under-five mortality in rural areas is 146 per 1,000 live births, compared with 131 for urban areas. Likewise, the diarrhea prevalence among under-five children two weeks preceding the LDHS survey is 20.2% in rural areas and 18.8% in urban areas.

In general, the high infant mortality rates and incidence of diseases in the rural areas are attributed to the consumption of unsafe drinking water, improper disposal of human and animals excreta in rivers, and poor sanitation. LDHS 2007, Table 8.2, p. 105 and Riparian (shared) rivers

- d) To what extent can any positive result reported under a-c be regarded as a result of this project? What would have happened anyway?

R: As a result of the project, further steps have been taken to include the last multi-stakeholder workshop held in Gbanga, Central Liberia, leading to the drafting the IWRM Road for Liberia.

This progress would not have been made possible without financial and technical support from the project.

2. What are the primary results of the project's work in your country/region so far? What is still remaining to be done?

R: *The primary result of the project's work is the knowledge and awareness disseminated among the Liberian People about Integrated Water Resources Management. Furthermore, the existing draft Integrated Water Resources Management Policy, the draft Situation Analysis and the draft Roadmap document.*

What remains to be done includes:

- *Legislation/Policies*
- *Political Will*
- *Provision of financial resources*
- *Capacity building*
- *Awareness in changing our attitudes and minds toward the management of our water resources and integrated approach toward managing water resources.*

Also, to finalize these documents and continue the project until a national IWRM Action Plan for Liberia is produced or made.

3. How has the work under the project helped to further IWRM in your country/region so far? What remains to be done?

R:

- i) *The work under the project has helped to further IWRM in Liberia through some meetings and some training workshops involving stakeholders at the national and local levels (urban and rural areas), to include the development of IWRM policy*
- ii) *Development of draft Water Supply and Sanitation (WSS) policy*
- iii) *Framing of key water deliverables by Liberia Poverty Reduction Strategy*
- iv) *Improved donor-NGO coordination and the prevention of major cholera outbreaks in recent time.*

At present there is scarcity of data covering water quantity and quality. However, as IWRM develops in the Country it is expected that monitoring and assessment of quality and quantity will become continuous activities

Furthermore, the project has helped to achieve:

The holistic approach of all relevant water sectors in Liberia, thus making it possible for all those responsible for the water resource to feel been part of the process.

B. The closure of some substandard water processing companies in Liberia which was posing serious health problems for the consumers.

c. The networking amongst ministries /agencies and stakeholders that have the oversight responsibilities for the water resource management in Liberia.

d. Liberia partnership with regional and international integrated water resource management organizations such as :African Development Bank (ADB,) United Nations Development Program (UNDP,) United Nations Children Education Fund (UNICEF) etc.

e. The consistent hosting of stakeholder meetings to derive at a policy document.

What needs to be done is to

continue these meetings and training workshops until the entire country can receive the same level of information and knowledge about Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM).

4. What have so far been the main strengths of the project's IWRM work in your region?

R: *The main strength of the project is that there are now many opportunities the water sector in Liberia can benefit from amongst which are the international community willingness to assist Liberia in its post-war water sector development and growth.*

The major donors in the Water Sector are the UNEP/UCC-Water, along with the European Commission and the World Bank. Currently UNEP/UCC-Water is engaged in data collection, Water Policy drafting and capacity building (training), while the European Commission and the World Bank are involved with the planning and implementation of the Monrovia Water Supply and Sanitation rehabilitation systems.

5. What have been the main shortcomings and/or weaknesses of the project's IWRM work so far in your country? How these shortcomings could be addressed, will the project continue?

R:

- *Lack of funding and logistics to effectively monitor activities along the river basins.*
- *population growth In Urban Areas*
- *Inadequacy of Human Resource Capacities*
- *uncontrolled disposal of waste*
- *Water activities fragmented amongst ministries and institutions*
- *Low level of Development of Water Resources for various activities (Agricultural, mining, logging, aquaculture and activities in other economic sectors).*
- *Human encroachment on ecosystems of coastal lagoons, estuaries, deltas and mangroves*
- *Lack of regional and International cooperation to properly manage the River Basins.*
- *Lack of regional and international cooperation to properly manage the shared River Basins.*

These shortcomings can be addressed when the appropriate financial resources and technical support are provided to continue the project to a successful completion.

Yes in deed, the project will continue ...

6. To what extent has the project to date resulted in increased awareness on importance of environmental approaches and considerations, including such related to ecosystem services, in IWRM? Please, give examples! What remains to be done?

R: *The project has provided increased awareness pertaining to the following issues:*

Poor quality of our Rivers due to Mining and natural conditions (etc.). Gold and diamond mining in Liberia consists largely of alluvial and small-scale operations, with estimates of over 100,000 artisanal miners in Liberia.

The sector faces major challenges with unrecorded production, poor working conditions, and a variety of environmental and social problems.

Erosion caused by deforestation, floods and intensive rains

Disposal of Sewage by use of vacuum trucks and wastage into the Mesurrado River, the Atlantic Ocean, lagoons and other water sources.

Additional awareness are contained in The Draft IWRM Policy Document on :

- *Water abstraction regulation*
- *Waste discharge regulation*
- *Clearance to undertake water resources management*
- *Enforcement*
- *Conflict prevention and resolution*

What remains to be done are:

- *Efficient and proper disposal of wastes*
 - *Proper Coordination River Basin Management*
 - *Development and enhancement of human resources*
 - *Development of International River Basin Managements*
7. To what extent has the project so far resulted in increased access to relevant IWRM information and tools? Please, give examples? What remains to be done?

R: To prioritize and make rational planning decisions, certain tools are crucial to include:

- *An information system, within which information on the quantity, quality, utilization and environmental condition of water resources can be collected, analyzed and disseminated, and*
 - *Water resources assessments, which evaluate the impact of proposed interventions, such as water abstractions or waste discharges on the hydrological regime and water quality.*
 - *What remains to be done is to continue the data collection from around the country and to create a Management Information System (MIS) with modern computers, along with a high speed internet service that will serve as a research centre for water resources management in Liberia*
 - *At present there is scarcity of data covering water quantity and quality. However, as IWRM develops in the Country it is expected that monitoring and assessment of quality and quantity will become continuous activities.*
8. How and to what extent has so far capacity been built or increased among key water managers and decision makers on IWRM planning? What remains still to be done?

R: To a minimum level, some capacities have been built to handle water resources management issues at:

- *National level*
- *County level*
- *District level and Municipalities*
- *Clan Level*
- *Community level*
- *River basin level*
- *International Level*

Some level of capacity has also been built in the following areas:

- *Institutional reform to improve the efficiency of personnel in relevant Government Ministries and Agencies, partners-in-progress and communities*
 - *Development of institutional framework which brings water utilities, partners-in-progress, the private sector, and community groups to exchange views, contribute skills and take decisions on water supply and sanitation projects.*
 - *Supportive of inter-sectoral planning at administrative levels*
 - *Protection against depletion and degradation of water resources*
 - *Empowering local Community-Based Organizations (CBOs)*
 - *Resource mobilization*
9. Question for Gambia, Guinea Conakry, Guinea Bissau and Sierra Leone: Is there any IWRM roadmap published for your country? What steps have been taken to reach this goal? What remains to be done? Are the IWRM protagonists and stakeholders committed to constructively collaborate to and agree on the roadmap?
10. Question for Liberia, Togo and Côte d'Ivoire: How far has the work on the IWRM Plan progressed? What steps have so far been taken? What remains to be done? Are the IWRM protagonists and stakeholders committed to constructively collaborate to and agree on the IWRM Plan?

R:

- *The work on the IWRM Plan has progressed from the Preparation of a draft 'National Integrated Water Resources Management Policy' (January 2006 to April 2007)*
- *Technical Review of the Draft IWRM Policy (Stage 1: 23 – 25 May, 2007 in Monrovia)*
- *Preparation of the Liberia's Roadmap leading to the adoption IWRM principles (December 2006 to April 2007)*
- *Technical Review of the Roadmap: May 31, 2007 (Monrovia, Liberia)*
- *Further steps towards drafting the IWRM Roadmap, (multi-stakeholders workshop) June 11-12 2009, Gbanga, Bong County, Liberia.*

“It is the vision of the People of Liberia that by 2015 the country's water resources will be developed integrally with land and other natural resources, and managed in an efficient, environmentally sound, equitable and responsible manner, with due consideration to all varied and competing uses, in order to satisfy present societal needs and demands for water and water related goods and services, and to preserve the ecological functions of water resources, without compromising the ability of future generations to satisfy those same needs.”

11. To what extent has the technical assistance and support that the collaborating national and regional teams and institutions have been provided with been appropriate and adequate to reach the goal?

R: *The technical assistance and support to some level have been appropriate towards reaching the goal of the project with the following activities:*

- *Establishment of coordinating mechanisms and bodies*
- *Management functions to the lowest appropriate level*
- *Involvement of the private sector to an appropriate level*
- *Increase rural gender balanced participation in decision making in water resources management*
- *Development of water resources management capacities and capabilities at some levels*

12. Have the institutional arrangements for the national implementation of the project been appropriate and adequate? Have they ensured appropriate participation of key stakeholder groups? To what extent has the following been enough effective and flexible:
- The organization
 - The staffing
 - The sharing of responsibilities
 - Coordinating mechanism between the different actors
 - The support structure
 - The relationship between different key partner institutions
 - The cooperation with the Project Management Group?

R: *Yes, the institutional arrangements for the national implementation of the project are appropriate but not adequate enough to include all stakeholders in Liberia. However, key stakeholder groups have ensured appropriate participation and they have demonstrated this by their full participation in meeting and workshops.*

13. To what degree has the collaborative implementation of the activities under the project contributed to
- Strengthening regional and national institutions
 - The number of international agreements and arrangements
 - The exchange of information between key actors of project implementation
 - Creating regional, national and local ownership of the activities and outputs of this Action/project?

R: *The Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy is in charge of water resources management in Liberia, working in collaboration with the:*

- Ministry of Health and Social Welfare (MOH), Ministry of Rural Development (MRD), Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs (MPEA), Ministry of Agriculture (MOA), Ministry of Public Works (MPW), Environmental Protection Agency of Liberia (EPA) and Liberia Water and Sewer Corporation (LWSC)*
- and with Support from:*
- UNEP-UUC Water, UNICEF – Liberia and UNDP – Liberia, African Development Bank and the World Bank.*

14. To what extent and how has this Action/project forged appropriate and effective partnerships and linkages between different stakeholders (government departments, the private sector, development partners, UN agencies, civil society, NGOs etc.) for the implementation of the Action/project and its sustainable outcome?

R: *The UNDP and UNICEF are active in rural areas. Other NGOs involved in water supply and sanitation are Oxfam, Concern, Tear Fund; most are engaged in Rural Water Supply and Sanitation. In general, Donors and NGOs seem to be fairly active in the water sector, but actual commitment and implementation is short of expectations.*

The existing institutional structure and management arrangements are not adequate to address the water resources issues in the country given its trans-boundary nature, the demand on the resources for development activities, the increasing pollution threats and the need for decentralization and devolution of powers to lower levels of Government.

15. To what extent has this Action/project also leveraged funding from other sources? How?

R: At present, Liberian Government Budget is very limited, Compounded with low bill collection. This has made it very difficult to operate the system efficiently and build capability for management.

The low level of implementation under donor commitment (as a result of Donors' own lengthy procedures and process for approval, disbursement and procurement) has created unnecessary delays in project execution. The situation is exacerbated by the low Government capacity of implementation, and lack of coordination to utilize common implementation instruments. This is visibly affecting the progress in water resources management and the much needed rehabilitation of Water Supply and Sanitation systems in both rural and urban areas.

Country: Sierra Leone

Submitted by (name and function): Francis Moijue (National Consultant)

Questions:

1. The over-all question concerns the progress that has been achieved today in the different countries, within the project and as a consequence of the project. Please, respond in some sentences to each of the questions “a” – “d”
 - a) Which steps has been taken in your country towards a nationally negotiated IWRM roadmap, respective a nationally negotiated IWRM plan? Such steps could include multi-stakeholder consultation and their consequences etc.

R: *A multi-stakeholder consultation was held on 12th June 2009 in which a road map was agreed upon by representatives various from parts of the country.*

- b) To what extent is the outcomes of the project so far integrated in current planning, including concerning water resources? What kind of concrete examples are there? Please, describe whether these examples also demonstrate any clear value added related to climate change adaptation or mitigation!

R: *The outcome is integrated into current Government plans for the sector*

- c) Are there any concrete examples of that IWRM principles and guidelines are being integrated in sector strategies or PRSP reports?

R: *The PRSP clearly spelt out the need for the integration of IWRM principles and practices in the water sector and economic development in the country.*

- d) To what extent can any positive result reported under a-c be regarded as a result of this project? What would have happened anyway?

R: *As a result of the project, there has been an increased awareness of IWRM principles amongst various stakeholders; and*

Capacity was also increase amongst various stakeholders more especially government staff

2. What are the primary results of the project’s work in your country/region so far? What is still remaining to be done?

- *Capacity building*
- *Awareness raising*
- *Consultations towards the development of an IWRM Road map*

3. How has the work under the project helped to further IWRM in your country/region so far? What remains to be done?
- *It has built capacity*
 - *It has created some awareness*

What remains to be done?

- *Further awareness raising is necessary*
- *Development of an IWRM Plan*

4. What have so far been the main strengths of the project's IWRM work in your region?

- *The country's sectoral policy for water and sanitation incorporates IWRM principles*
- *Pursuing IWRM concepts broad principles is a key element of the country's PRSP*

5. What have been the main shortcomings and/or weaknesses of the project's IWRM work so far in your country? How could these shortcomings be addressed, will the project continue?

- *There is no Country Water Partnership to support the country's IWRM agenda
Support the establishment of a CWP in the country*
- *Limited awareness of IWRM amongst Politicians and or other Policy makers
Targeted awareness raising of these people*

6. To what extent has the project to date resulted in increased awareness on importance of environmental approaches and considerations, including such related to ecosystem services, in IWRM? Please, give examples! What remains to be done?

7. To what extent has the project so far resulted in increased access to relevant IWRM information and tools? Please, give examples? What remains to be done?

R: *Capacity building resulted in increased capacities in*

- *the GWP ToolBox*
- *An Introduction to WRIAM (Water Resources Assessment Method)*

8. How and to what extent has so far capacity been built or increased among key water managers and decision makers on IWRM planning? What remains still to be done?

R: *Capacity building among some key water managers and decision makers was undertaken in*

- *The principles of IWRM*
- *The IWRM Planning cycle*
- *GWP Toolbox*
- *WRIAM*
- *Development of an IWRM Road , etc*

9. Question for Gambia, Guinea Conakry, Guinea Bissau and Sierra Leone: Is there any IWRM roadmap published for your country? What steps have been taken to reach this goal? What remains to be done? Are the IWRM protagonists and stakeholders committed to constructively collaborate to and agree on the roadmap?

R: *Stakeholders from diverse socio-cultural background were involved the validation of the roadmap for IWRM in June 2009. Some of the activities in the IWRM Road like the establishment of a CWP and the Formation of a Steering Committee to oversee the IWRM process are yet to be undertaken.*

10. Question for Liberia, Togo and Côte d'Ivoire: How far has the work on the IWRM Plan progressed? What steps have so far been taken? What remains to be done? Are the IWRM protagonists and stakeholders committed to constructively collaborate to and agree on the IWRM Plan?

11. To what extent has the technical assistance and support that the collaborating national and regional teams and institutions have been provided with been appropriate and adequate to reach the goal?

R: *This has been timely and appropriate*

12. Have the institutional arrangements for the national implementation of the project been appropriate and adequate? Have they ensured appropriate participation of key stakeholder groups? To what extent has the following been enough effective and flexible:

- a) The organization *Appropriate*
- b) The staffing *Has been adequate*
- c) The sharing of responsibilities *This has been okay*
- d) Cording mechanism between the different actors *This has been okay*
- e) The support structure *Has been adequate*
- f) The relationship between different key partner institutions *This has been okay*
- g) The cooperation with the Project Management Group? *This has been okay*

13. To what degree has the collaborative implementation of the activities under the project contributed to

- a) Strengthening regional and national institutions
- b) The number of international agreements and arrangements
- c) The exchange of information between key actors of project implementation
- d) Creating regional, national and local ownership of the activities and outputs of this Action/project?

14. To what extent and how has this Action/project forged appropriate and effective partnerships and linkages between different stakeholders (government departments, the private sector, development partners, UN agencies, civil society, NGOs etc.) for the implementation of the Action/project and its sustainable outcome?

R:

- *Since the start of the project, stronger partnerships have been developed between the Govt. Departments of Water, Agriculture, Environment, Finance and economic Development, Health Ministries.*
- *Development partners like AfDB, DFID, FAO, etc have also showed active interest in IWRM activities in the country and an Agency like FAO has linked some future support to the its programs in Sierra Leone to our commitment to IWRM practices.*
- *Also INGOs like Action Contre la Faim have shown interest in the implementation of Sierra Leone IWRM Roadmap.*

15. To what extent has this Action/project also leveraged funding from other sources? How?

R:

- *AfDB has indicated interest in supporting some IWRM activities as detailed in the IWRM Road map for Sierra Leone*
- *UNICEF is considering some awareness raising activities*
- *DFID say they might consider some activities in the IWRM roadmap at a later stage*
- *etc*

PAYS: TOGO

Soumis par (nom et fonction): TOZO Abla ; Coordonnateur du projet ACP-UE

Questions:

1. La question générale concerne les progrès qui ont été réalisés à ce jour dans les différents pays, au sein du projet et par suite du projet. Prière de répondre par quelques phrases à chacune des questions "a" - "d"
 - a) Quelles mesures ont été prises dans votre pays vers une feuille de route de GIRE négociée au niveau national et un plan de GIRE négocié au niveau national, respectivement? De telles mesures pourraient comprendre des consultations de multiples parties-prenantes, une évaluation des conséquences, etc.

R : *Une esquisse de feuille de route a été faite avec l'appui de l'expert du Centre PNUE-DHI mais il n'existe pas un document de feuille de route validée pour le Togo. En décembre 2008, l'une des principales activités programmées par de l'équipe de mise en œuvre du projet ACP-UE était la finalisation de cette feuille de route.*

En ce qui concerne le Plan GIRE, un consultant national a été recruté par l'Equipe de Mise en Œuvre(EMO) et le Comité Interministériel de Pilotage de la Politique et stratégies pour la gestion intégrée des ressources en eau (CIP/GIRE) pour élaborer le Plan d'actions GIRE du Togo. Ce recrutement a été effectué avec l'appui technique de l'expert du Centre PNUE-DHI et du consultant régional chargés du Togo. L'EMO et le CIP-GIRE suivent toutes le processus d'élaboration de ce document qui devra s'achever en Février 2010 selon le chronogramme établi.

Le CIP-GIRE regroupe les principaux acteurs intervenant dans le secteur de l'eau.

- b) Dans quelle mesure est-ce que les résultats du projet ont été intégrés jusqu'ici dans la planification actuelle, y compris ce qui concerne les ressources en eau? Est-ce que vous avez des exemples concrets? Prière d'indiquer si ces exemples démontrent également une valeur ajoutée évidente en matière d'adaptation ou d'atténuation du changement climatique!

R : *Le projet a pris un de retard au Togo à cause de son démarrage un peu tardif et à cause de l'état de santé de l'expert de Centre PNUE-DHI qui était initialement chargé d'appuyer le Togo dans la mise en œuvre du projet.*

Aucun résultat concret pouvant être intégré dans la planification n'est encore disponible. En l'état actuel du projet, seule l'élaboration d'une proposition de Politique Nationale de l'Eau est achevée en novembre 2010.

- c) Existe-t-il des exemples concrets de ce que les principes et les directives de GIRE ont été intégrés dans les stratégies sectorielles ou les rapports DSRP (PRSP)?

R : *Le troisième pilier du document DSRP dans son objectif stratégique 1 du domaine 4 met un accent particulier sur l'amélioration du système de gestion des ressources en eau par l'approche de Gestion Intégrée des Ressources en Eau(GIRE).*

Le Togo a élaboré en 2005 avec l'appui technique et financier du PNUD, de l'ONU/DAES et de la FAO un document de référence GIRE pour le Togo en trois volumes :

- *le premier volume porte sur l'état des lieux du secteur de l'eau au Togo,*
- *le second volume porte sur les propositions de politique et de stratégies de gestion intégrée des ressources en eau et le plan d'action,*
- *le troisième est avant projet de loi portant Code de l'Eau qui a été adopté par le gouvernement en octobre 2009.*

Un autre document de Synthèse GIRE- OMD-AEPA a été élaboré et adopté et constitue désormais un programme national sectoriel eau-assainissement.

- d) Dans quelle mesure est-il possible de considérer des résultats positifs éventuels décrits en point "a" - "c" comme des résultats provenant de ce projet? Quels résultats auraient été obtenus de toute façon?

R : *L'existence du projet a permis de relancer les activités du processus GIRE au Togo par la reprise des réunions du CIP-GIRE, le recrutement des consultants nationaux et régional pour appuyer le Togo dans la poursuite de ce processus*

2. Quels sont les principaux résultats des travaux du projet dans votre pays/région jusqu'ici? Que reste-t-il encore à faire?

R : *Des résultats du projet sont attendus dans les semaines à venir, notamment le document validé de politique de l'eau au Togo et le PAGIRE Togo. Mais comme résultats intermédiaires nous avons :*

- *la relance des activités du processus GIRE au Togo par la reprise des réunions du CIP-GIRE,*
- *la formation sur MERQURE des représentants des structures intervenants dans le secteur de l'eau ;*
- *Le rapport dénommé « état des lieux des progrès accomplis en la matière de GIRE depuis juillet 2007 et propositions pour la suite du processus de planification de GIRE » sur financement du projet ACP-UE a permis de dégager les points forts et faibles de notre processus et proposer les actions à entreprendre pour la suite. Cette même étude a identifié les 25 parties prenantes (groupe des 25) qui seront invitées par le projet ACP-UE au « dialogue multi parties prenantes du Togo ». ;*
- *un plan de travail actualisé pour le Togo a été élaboré*
- *documents de Politique Nationale de l'Eau et PAGIRE en cours d'élaboration ;*
- *Mise à la disposition des projets d'appui à la GIRE un cadre équipé;*

Les activités qui restent à faire sont :

- *Mobiliser les parties prenantes (groupe des 25) pour participer au processus GIRE. Le Ministère en charge de l'eau est entrain de formaliser ce groupe de 25 pour le permettre d'animer le « Dialogue Multi-parties prenantes » prévu par le projet ACP-UE.*
- *Organiser un atelier de formation à la GIRE des membres du G25.*
- *Recruter un Consultant international pour la revue des activités du Partenariat National de l'Eau ;*
- *Recruter un consultant pour finalisation de la feuille de route GIRE ;*
- *Finaliser le Plan d'Action National de GIRE du Togo (validation multiplication publication...);*

- *Plaidoyer pour la GIRE, information, éducation, communication à destination des acteurs du secteur de l'eau et de la population dans son ensemble ;*
- *Organiser une table ronde des bailleurs de fonds pour la GIRE et les OMD ;*
- *Recruter un consultant pour l'élaboration des décrets d'application du code de l'eau*
- *Le Ministère en charge de l'eau est entrain de formaliser ce groupe de 25 pour le permettre d'animer le « Dialogue Multi-parties prenantes » prévu par le projet ACP-UE*

3. Dans le cadre du projet, comment est-ce que le travail a contribué à développer davantage la GIRE dans votre pays/région jusqu'ici? Que reste-t-il à faire?

R : *Le projet a permis de relancer le processus GIRE à travers un appui technique et financier (recrutement des consultants...)*

Reste à faire :

Le Togo a besoins d'un soutien technique et financier supplémentaires pour poursuivre son processus ; ce qui permettra au Togo de rattraper le retard accusé par rapport aux autres pays de la sous région.

4. Quels ont été jusqu'ici les principaux points forts du travail de GIRE du projet dans votre région?

R : *Le projet a permis aux membres du CIP-GIRE d'avoir le même niveau de compréhension sur la GIRE. La Formation sur le logiciel MERQURE a contribué à apprécier les divers problèmes des ressources en eau dans les trois bassins du pays.*

5. Quels ont été les principaux défauts et/ou faiblesses du travail de GIRE du projet dans votre pays jusqu'ici? Comment peut-on aborder ces défauts; est-ce qu'il est prévu de continuer le projet?

R : *Il faut mentionner le retard et la lenteur des affaires administratives dû à la mauvaise santé de l'expert initialement affecté pour la mise en œuvre du projet (Gérard Cougny).*

Le recrutement d'un consultant régional chargé de seconder l'expert international dans l'appui au pays est un atout considérable pour accélérer la mise en œuvre du projet au Togo.

Le projet devra continuer jusqu'à l'obtention de tous les résultats (voir résultats restant au point 2).

6. Dans quelle mesure est-ce que le projet a résulté jusqu'ici en une sensibilisation augmentée à l'importance des approches et des considérations environnementales dans le cadre de la GIRE, y-compris celles liées à l'écosystème? Prière de donner des exemples! Que reste-t-il à faire?

R : *Aucune action n'est encore menée en matière de sensibilisation à l'importance des approches et des considérations environnementales dans la GIRE ; les Parties prenantes ne sont pas encore mobilisées pour participer aux processus GIRE.*

7. Dans quelle mesure est-ce que le projet a abouti jusqu'à présent à un accès accru à des informations et à des outils de GIRE pertinents? Prière de donner des exemples? Que reste-t-il à faire?

R : La formation MERQURE organisée au bénéfice des membres du CIP-GIRE élargi à d'autres personnes ressources du secteur de l'eau a permis de renforcer les capacités de ces derniers dans l'appréciation et d'hierarchisation des divers problèmes des ressources en eau dans les bassins du pays.

Reste à faire :

Formation des ingénieurs et techniciens de la DGEA au SIG Eau ;

Documentation sur les bonnes pratiques, études de cas et documents guides.

8. Comment et dans quelle mesure est-ce qu'il a été créé ou augmenté jusqu'à présent la capacité parmi les gestionnaires principaux de l'eau et les décideurs clés de la planification de GIRE? Que reste-t-il encore à faire?

R : Tous les membres du CIP-GIRE et certains universitaires et ONGs intervenant dans le secteur de l'eau de l'eau ont bénéficié la formation sur la MERQURE.

Il reste à poursuivre la formation et le renforcement des capacités des acteurs en GIRE et si possible organiser des missions d'immersion dans les pays avancés dans la mise en œuvre de la GIRE (Burkina Faso ou Bénin) pour partager les expériences sur le processus GIRE

9. Question pour la Gambie, la Guinée Conakry, la Guinée Bissau et la Sierra Leone: Est-ce qu'une feuille de route de GIRE a été publiée pour votre pays? Quelles mesures ont été prises pour atteindre cet objectif? Que reste-t-il encore à faire? Les protagonistes et les parties prenantes de GIRE, sont-ils engagés à collaborer de manière constructive et à se mettre d'accord sur la feuille de route?
10. Question pour le Liberia, le Togo et la Côte d'Ivoire: Le travail sur le plan de GIRE, dans quelle mesure a-t-il progressé? Quelles mesures ont été prises jusqu'à présent? Que reste-t-il à faire? Les protagonistes et les parties prenantes de GIRE, sont-ils engagés à collaborer de manière constructive et à se mettre d'accord sur le plan de GIRE?

R : Le consultant national recruté pour l'élaboration du plan GIRE a présenté son rapport à mi-terme le 9 novembre 2009 et le 20 novembre 2009 les résultats hiérarchisés de MERQURE ont été validés pour leur exploitation dans le plan GIRE.

Il reste à finaliser le document et à préparer les fiches projets.

Les membres du CIP/GIRE et l'EMO examinent périodiquement les drafts du document (examen à mi-terme). Une validation du PAGIRE par les protagonistes et les parties prenantes de GIRE.

11. Dans quelle mesure est-ce que l'assistance et le soutien techniques reçus par les équipes et les institutions de collaboration nationales et régionales ont été appropriés et adéquates pour atteindre le but?

R : L'assistance et le soutien techniques apportés au projet sont pour le moment appropriés dans la mesure où les besoins en consultants exprimés par la partie togolaise pour atteindre les résultats du projet sont jusqu'ici mis à disposition (recrutement des consultants nationaux pour l'élaboration de la politique de l'eau et PAGIRE).

12. Est-ce que les arrangements institutionnels pour la mise en œuvre nationale du projet ont été appropriés et adéquats? Ont-ils assuré une participation appropriée des groupes de parties prenantes principales? Dans quelle mesure est-ce que vous avez trouvé les point ci-dessous suffisamment efficaces et souples:

a) L'organisation

R : *Le schéma d'ancrage institutionnel mis en place par le CIPGIRE respecte les dispositions institutionnelles du Togo et celles du document de projet ACP-UE. Il est composé de l'EMO et du groupe de 25.*

La composition de l'EMO est adéquate car elle assure efficacement la mise en œuvre de ce projet.

Le Groupe des 25 parties prenantes est composé de 9 membres du CIP-GIRE + 16 représentants d'autres structures étatiques, ONGs, secteur privée et de la société civile. Ce groupe de parties prenantes n'est pas encore opérationnel. La composition du G25 devra faire l'objet d'un arrêté ministérielle (Ministère en charge de l'Eau) avant de pouvoir inviter les institutions concernées à désigner leurs représentants pour animer le « Dialogue Multi-parties prenantes » prévu par le projet ACP-UE.

b) Le personnel

R : *Les membres de l'EMO et du CIP-GIRE, les cadres de la DGEA participent activement à la mise en œuvre du projet.*

c) Le partage des responsabilités

R : *L'EMO assure la coordination et la mise en œuvre des activités du projet alors que le CIP-GIRE assure le suivi-évaluation des activités du projet ;*

d) Le mécanisme Cording entre les différents acteurs

e) La structure de soutien

R : *La structure est efficace et souple*

f) Les relations entre les différentes institutions de partenaires principaux

R : *Le projet n'est pas encore étendu aux institutions de partenaires. La participation de ces dernières sera effective avec la mise en route des activités des parties prenantes pour le dialogue multi-parties prenantes prévu par le projet ACP-UE.*

g) La coopération avec le groupe de gestion du projet

R : *Bonne coopération*

13. Dans quelle mesure est-ce que la mise en œuvre des activités dans le cadre du projet a contribué

a) A renforcer les institutions régionales et nationales

R : *Le projet a permis de renforcer les activités du CIP/GIRE qui est comité national chargé du suivi de la mise en œuvre du processus GIRE.*

b) Au nombre de conventions et d'arrangements internationaux

R : *Aucune convention ou arrangements internationaux signés dans le cadre de ce projet.*

c) A l'échange d'informations entre les acteurs principaux de la mise en œuvre du projet

R : *Le projet a beaucoup contribué à l'échange d'informations entre les différents acteurs (EMO, CIP/GIRE) à travers des réunions sur l'état d'avancement des activités du projet, sur le suivi et évaluation des activités du projet et des ateliers de formation.*

d) A encourager l'appropriation régionale, nationale et locale des activités et des résultats de cet action/ce projet

R : *Ce résultat est attendu avec la suite des activités du projet.*

14. Dans quelle mesure et comment est-ce que cette action/ce projet a établi des partenariats et des liens appropriés et efficaces entre différentes parties prenantes (départements gouvernementaux, le secteur privé, partenaires au développement, des agences de l'ONU, la société civile, les ONG, etc.) en vue de la mise en œuvre de l'action/du projet et son résultat durable?

R : *Ce projet a permis de redynamiser le CIP-GIRE et de proposer un Groupe de 25 composé des membres de CIP-GIRE, le secteur privé, la société civile et les ONGs pour assurer le Dialogue des multi-parties prenantes.*

15. Dans quelle mesure est-ce que cette action/ce projet a contribué à obtenir du financement d'autres sources également? Comment?

R : *Le projet n'a pas encore contribué à obtenir d'autres sources de financement.*

Annex VII

CURRICULUM VITAE

Ms. Gunilla Björklund, PhD

Personal: *Birth date:* 16 June 1945 in Örebro, SWEDEN
 Contact: Marmorv 16 A,
 SE-752 44 Uppsala, Sweden, phone: +46-18-51 65 22
 e-mail:gunilla.bjorklund@telia.com
 Status: Unmarried, no children
 Languages: Swedish (mother tongue), English (fluent), French
 (elementary), German (elementary)

Education:

- ◆ PhD. 1984 in Physical Geography at Uppsala University, Sweden.

Appointments:

- ◆ Jan 1998 - Director, GeWa Consulting, Marmorv 16A, S-752 44 Uppsala, SWEDEN. Work as consultant on sustainable development policy issues such as water related issues, mainly international water policy issues, land degradation issues, climate related issues etc.
- ◆ Oct. 1998 - May 2001 Senior researcher (20%), division of Hydraulic Engineering, Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden. Main duty to act as supervisor for PhD-students in Integrated Water Resources Management.
- ◆ Oct.1994 - December 1997 Commissioned by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs as Executive Secretary for the Comprehensive Freshwater Assessment Programme, conducted by Stockholm Environment Institute and the UN Agencies of the UN ACC for Water Resources, based at SEI.
- ◆ Sept.1992 - Oct 1994 Special Adviser, Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Development Assistance Division, responsible for environmental issues in multilateral assistance, including GEF, UNFCCC- and UNCCD-negotiations.
- ◆ Oct.1990 - August 1992 Scientific Advisor, Swedish UNCED Secretariat, Ministry of the Environment, with responsibilities for *inter alia* freshwater issues, research, education and awareness issues.
- ◆ Feb.1990 - Sept.1990 Project Leader for an Environmental Project at Swedish Television.
- ◆ Sept.1988 - Feb.1990 Programme Officer, International Secretariat of the IGBP, Global Change, Stockholm.
- ◆ 1986 - Sept.1988 Assistant Professor in Physical Geography and Environmental Science, Karlstad University.
- ◆ 1971-1985 Researcher/Student Counsellor in Geosciences/Assistant Professor, Department of Physical Geography, Uppsala.

Short summary of experiences:

I have as consultant with GeWa Consulting been representing Sweden at UN-meetings on freshwater and also as Swedish representative participated in EU-coordinations. I was the team leader for the SIWI/European Parliament study on Water and Development delivered 2000, when I also presented the study to the European Parliament. I was also the team leader and lead author for a SIWI/Sida financed study that was used as an EC Communication to the European Parliament and Council on

Water and Development in 2001. In this work I did closely cooperate with EC DG Development and to some extent EC DG Environment.

I have been engaged by Sida/SAREC for the assessment of the Swedish climate expertise and its applicability within Swedish Development Assistance and made during early 2003 a study resulting in a proposal for a sustainable research policy in the climate sector that is adopted by Sida/SAREC. I have together with Professor Michael Chadwick, York, been evaluating the Sida/SAREC-supported Asian Regional Research Programme on Energy, Environment and Climate, ARRPEEC. I have been reviewing their new project proposal, Asian Climate Change Research Programme, to be expanded into an 'energy and environment and climate change for sustainable development'-programme and am still involved as advisor on this to Sida/SAREC. In November-December 2005 I undertook a study for Sida on Sida supported projects under the framework of EU Action on Climate Change in the Context of Development Cooperation. In early 2007 I have as Sida-consultant been developing a framework-initiative for Climate-related Sida activities in Partner Countries, and in its further development where it is to be implemented as part of a Swedish Environmental Development Support initiated in 2007. I did in October 2007 also assess for funding an ICIMOD project on adaptation to climate change in the Hindu Kush-Himalaya region for Sida. Currently I am doing an analysis of the linkages between strategies in UNFCCC National Adaptation Programmes for Action and National Freshwater Strategies for some LDCs for UNDP Water Governance Facility/SIWI and am contracted as writer for the World Water Development Report 3 including on some climate change-related issues.

I have also been consulted as expert on Freshwater with an emphasis on Integrated Water Resources Management by the UN Secretariat, UNEP, UNDP, UNESCO, the World Bank, GEF, the Swedish government, Sida and GWP. I was Swedish governmental water expert at an intergovernmental meeting over Ganges in Dhaka in presence of the Bangladesh primeminister in March 1998. I was also the water expert of the UNIFEM Aral Sea team on a mission in Uzbekistan. I have for the GWP participated at expert-meetings in the ESCWA-region. I have also participated in the work on the UNCHS/UNEP Programme Water for African Cities. I was a Swedish consultant for the GEF/UNEP Global International Waters Assessment with an emphasis on freshwater. I have also been consultant for the World Water Vision; Framework for Action under HR Wallingford, UK and am consultant to UNESCO/World Water Assessment Programme as writer for World Water Development Report 3, to be published 2009. I have also been consulted both by GEF/UNDP, GEF/UNEP and by GEF/World Bank to do GEF STAP reviews of International Waters' projects and did in 1997 a review of the GEF/UNDP Tumen River SAP project, in early 2001 of the first phase of the GEF/UNDP project to strengthening implementation capacities for nutrient reduction and transboundary cooperation in the Danube River Basin, in September 2001 the review of the GEF/World Bank Senegal River project, in early 2003 the initial and the final technical STAP review of the GEF/UNDP Niger project and the final technical STAP review of the GEF/UNDP Danube project, both presented for the GEF Council in May 2003. In August 2003 I made the review of the GEF/World Bank Hai Basin project. I did during first part of 2005 the GEF/STAP review of a project in Fouta Djallon, West Africa for GEF/UNEP and in 2006 a project in Kagera River Basin, part of the Nile River Basin for GEF/UNEP. I was in 2006 engaged by GEF/UNEP as consultant on a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis for the Amur River basin in Russia/ China/ Mongolia, a project that should be reshaped and restarted late 2007.

I was during 2002 engaged by UNDP and UN/DESA to investigate possibilities for a UN Funding Structure for Water. During 2004 I was the team-leader of the World Bank/GEF project to prepare a methodology for assessing (economic) costs of land degradation and the benefits of Sustainable Land Management in affected African countries. A second phase of that study, with implementation in

Ethiopia and Ghana was initiated in the fall of 2005 and reported as a draft GEF/MSP to the World Bank in October 2006. The project now sorts under the TerrAfrica-initiative.

I was during the period May – October 2006 a member of the team to evaluate the Sida/SAREC support to international and regional thematic research work, where I was responsible for support to the environment sector. The study was one of five, aiming at defining the strengths and weaknesses and the areas for improvement of the research development activities.

I have been lecturing at the universities in Uppsala, Lund, Stockholm, Linköping, Karlstad, Falun, Södertörn and Örebro as well as at the Technical Universities in Gothenburg and Stockholm and the Agricultural University, Ultuna, in Uppsala. I have acted as supervisor for some PhD-student on Integrated Water Management issues at the Royal Technical University in Stockholm. I have also been engaged to review as opponent for a land degradation Master-thesis at the Royal Technical University, Stockholm, as chairperson of the examining committee for a PhD-thesis at the same university in 2002 and as chairperson on another such committee at the same university in February 2005 and at yet another one in December 2006 and in 2007 I have so far been on the examining committee for one land degradation- PhD-thesis at Stockholm University and will in June 2007 be on one PhD-thesis on groundwater at the same university. In May 2005 I was the opponent on a licentiate thesis at Stockholm University. For 2003-04 I was engaged in the examining committee at the “Centrum för Miljö- och Utvecklingsstudier” (Centre for studies in Environment and Development), Uppsala University.

During 1994 – 97 I was the executive secretary for the UN/SEI programme Comprehensive Assessment of the Freshwater Resources of the World. I did coordinate, together with the secretary for the UN ACC Subcommittee on Water who was the chairman, the work conducted by 8 different UN agencies (FAO, UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO, WMO, WHO, UNESCO and the World Bank) and experts under SEI and was the head of the secretariat. The main report resulting from the work was presented to UN CSD and to UN General Assembly Special Session, resulting in Freshwater being on top of the Intergovernmental agenda and the main topic at CSD 1998. As a consequence of that work I was also asked by EC-DGVIII to contribute in the EC Guidelines for Water Resources Development Cooperation, carried out by a team of experts under the chairmanship of HR Wallingford, UK.

During 1992 – 94, as special advisor at the Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs I was responsible for all environmental issues within the multilateral development assistance. I also acted as advisor for a Swedish position on environmental aspects on World Bank Projects. I was during the period also the Swedish chief negotiator to the UN Convention to Combat Desertification, and had the Swedish responsibility for the financial negotiations on the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. In dealing with convention negotiations, although not being an expert in international law, I of course had to familiarise with that. I participated as negotiator at OECD/DAC environment committee, in forestry negotiations, in negotiations on the Biodiversity Convention, in Habitat issues etc. I was also a member of the negotiating team for the GEF Instrument and participated at the CSD meetings. And as part of this was the period when Sweden was preparing to join the EU I also participated for Sweden at EU-coordination meetings.

1990 – 92 I worked as expert at the Swedish secretariat to United Nations Conference for Environment and Development, UNCED, based at the Swedish Ministry of the Environment. During that time I did negotiate a large part of Agenda 21, including the chapters on Freshwater, Desertification, Science and Education (where I was the international chairperson) for Sweden as well

as the complete part on Major Groups. I did during that period also contribute to the Agenda 21 chapter on Desertification at the International UNCED secretariat in Geneva.

During 1988 – 90, as programme officer at the International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme under the International Council for the Scientific Unions (ICSU) I had a responsibility for the programmes on "Past Global Changes", a programme dealing with the background to today's climate changes and their effects, and "Land Ocean Interactions in the Coastal Zone" and was one of the initiators to the last one.

I have a 16-year academic experience including research work in physical geography, including hydrology, academic teaching and administrative work, such as planning and administrating PhD-level courses. The topic for my PhD Thesis dealt with developing different models for Environmental Impact Assessments including working with different international models, particularly in river environments. Working with county councils etc. I also had to familiarise with biology and environmental law. I was during 10 years of that time also student counsellor for Geosciences which includes all geological subjects, geohydrology, hydrology, climatology, physical geography etc. and am still teaching on some classes in these subjects at different universities.

Specific appointments:

- ◆ Reviewer for the Global Environmental Outlook 4, published by UNEP in 2007.
- ◆ Reviewer for the Millenium Ecosystem Assessment, supported by The CBD, CCD, Ramsar, UNEP, FAO, UNDP, UNESCO, WHO, GEF, UNF, World Bank, ICSU, UN/FCCC, IUCN.
- ◆ Member of the reference group for freshwater related issues to the Swedish government in preparing for the Johannesburg Summit, 2002.
- ◆ Reviewer of scientific articles for Water International, published by International Water Resources Association, for Ambio published by the Swedish Royal Academy of Sciences, and for Lakes and Reservoirs published by International Lake Environment Committee.
- ◆ Consultant to UN/DESA in preparations for Expert meeting on Freshwater issues in Harare Jan 1998, preparatory meeting for meeting with UN/Commission for Sustainable Development 1998.
- ◆ Consultative GEF/STAP expert to UNDP for reviewing UNDP/GEF projects on International Waters, to the World Bank for reviewing World Bank/GEF projects on International Waters and to UNEP for reviewing UNEP/GEF projects on International Waters and Land degradation.
- ◆ Ad hoc member of the Global Environment Facility Scientific Technical Advisory Committee (GEF/STAP) (1995-97) and at their Roster of Experts as freshwater expert (1995- 2003). My membership on the Roster of Experts has been renewed from November 2004.
- ◆ Member of the Steering Committee for planning of the GEF/UNEP Global International Waters Assessment Project.
- ◆ Swedish Water Expert to the Swedish Delegations to Global Environmental Facility and to the Commission for Sustainable Development.
- ◆ Member of the World Bank Advisory Committee for International Waters Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines (World Bank GEF-projects).

Membership of organisations

- ◆ Member of the Board of the International Water Resources Association, appointed October 2006.
- ◆ Member of the Board of the Swedish Aral Sea Society, 2002 and currently. Vice chairman from 2007.
- ◆ Member of the Board of Governors to the World Water Council. (1996- 1997) and of the WWC Founding Committee 1994-96.

Selected Publications:

- *A Geomorphological Evaluation of the Dalälven Area with an Assessment of Different Evaluation Models.* Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Abstracts of Uppsala Dissertation from the Faculty of Science 789, 1984 (Part of my PhD-thesis).
- *United Nations Conference on Environment and Development.* AMBIO, Vol. 21, No. 1, 1992.
- In cooperation with representatives for UN/DPCSD, FAO, UNIDO, UNDP, UNEP, UNESCO, WHO, WMO and the World Bank I was responsible for the preparation of "A *Comprehensive Assessment of the Freshwater Resources of the World*" presented as a secretary-general's report to the UN/CSD 1997 (E/CN.17/1997/9).
- *Water Resources. Challenges for development under different predicaments.* In Mar del Plata. 20 year Anniversary Seminar. Water for the next 30 years. Averting the looming water crisis. SIWI Proceedings. Report 1. 1997. Together with M. Falkenmark.
- *Assessing the world's freshwater resources.* Published in Nature and Resources, the UNESCO quarterly journal on environment and natural resources research. Volume 34. No 1 January-March 1998. With A. Szöllosi-Nagy and P. Najlis.
- *Protecting Our Planet, Securing Our Future.* Ed: Watson, Dixon, Hamburg, Janetos, and Moss. UNEP-US/NASA-the World Bank. 1998. I was the author for freshwater parts.
- *Aral Sea - water resources, use and misuse.* In Proceedings from the Aral Sea Symposium arranged by UNIFEM and Royal Swedish Academy, April 1998. Published March 1999.
- *Water and Development in the Developing Countries.* 2000. (together with Ulf Ehlin, Malin Falkenmark, Jan Lundqvist, Ashok Swain, Johan Rockström and Anna Brismar). European Parliament, Directorate General for Research, Development Series, Deve 100 EN. 8-2000.
- *Water Management in Developing Countries: Policy and Priorities for EU Development Cooperation. Background document for an EC Communication on Water and Development.* Published by SIWI October 2001.
- *People, Environment and Water Security in the Aral Sea Area.* Published 2005 by the Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul in the documentary volume from the seminar "Prospects for Democracy in Central Asia, June, 2003".
- *Methods for Assessing the Impacts and Costs of Land Degradation and the Net Benefits of Prevention and Mitigation Measures.* Together with A. Brismar et al. Paper commissioned by the World Bank. 2004.
- *The Asian Regional Research Programme in Energy, Environment and Climate – ARRPEEC.* Together with Michael Chadwick. Sida Evaluation 04/16.
- *Klimatvariationer och sårbarhet – behov av anpassningsstrategier för människor och natur.* (Climate variations and vulnerability – environmental and human need for adaptation strategies). Ymer, Stockholm, 2004.
- *Securing food production under climate variability – exploring the options.* Workshop report from the 13th Stockholm Water Symposium, 2003, together with A. Rahman. Water Science and Technology, vol 49. No 07 2004.
- *A decision framework for accounting costs and benefits of land degradation and sustainable land management.* Together with D. Vadjnal and J. Rudengren. Paper Commissioned by the World Bank under its Africa SLM Product Line. 2004.
- *SAREC Support to International and Regional Thematic Research Programs, 2000-2005.* Together with Amitav Rath (team leader), Mary Ann Lansang, Oliver Sassa and Francisco Sagasti. Sida Evaluation 06/40 and 06/40:1. Sida Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit. 2006.