

PCR EVALUATION NOTE FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

1. BASIC INFORMATION

a. Basic project data			
Project title: Rwanda National Rural Drinking Water Supply And Sanitation Programme (PNEAR) (Phase II: Second Sub-Programme 2009-2012)			
Project code: P-RW-E00-005	Instrument number(s): ADF 2100155015717 & RWSSI 5800155000301		
Project type: Infrastructure	Sector: Water and Sanitation		
Country: Rwanda	Environmental categorization (1-3) : 2		
Processing Milestones	Key Events	Disbursement and Closing date	
Date approved: 01 Jul 2009	Cancelled amount: 39,176.85 (ADF Grant); 5 UA (6.26 Euros) (RWSSI Grant)	Original disbursement deadline: 31 Dec 2013	
Date signed: 10 Sept 2009	Supplementary financing:	Original closing date: 31 Dec 2013	
Date of entry into force : 10 Sept 2009	Restructuring:	Revised disbursement deadline: 30 Jun 2015	
Date effective for 1st disbursement: 12 Mar 2010	Extensions (specify dates): ADF Grant Extension 1: 03 Jan 2014 Extension 2: 10 Nov 2014	Revised closing date: ADF Grant Extension 1: 31 Dec 2014 Extension 2: 30 Jun 2015	
Date of actual 1st : 09 Apr 2010 (ADF Grant); 15 Sept 2010 (RWSSI Grant)			
b. Financing sources			
Financing source/ instrument (MUA)	Approved amount (MUA) :	Disbursed amount (MUA) :	Percentage disbursed (%) :
ADF Grant:	9,960,823.15	9,955,959.76	99.56
RWSSI Grant:	5,999,995.00	5,999,995.00	100
Government:	6,801,051.00	6,801,051.00	209
Beneficiaries:	1,011,000.00	1,011,000.00	100
TOTAL :	23,772,869.15	23,768,005.76	127.14
Co-financiers and other external partners:			
Execution and implementation agencies: Water and Sanitation Cooperation (WASAC)			
Implementing Agent: Project Implementation Unit - of WASAC			
c. Responsible Bank staff			
Position	At approval		At completion
Regional Director	A ORDU		Gabriel NEGATU
Country Manager	Jacob MUKETE		Makonnen NEGATU
Sector Director	A Rakotobe		Mohamed EL AZIZI
Sector Manager	Sering JALLOW		Osward M. CHANDA
Task Manager	El A. Hadji MBAYE		Ephrem RUTABOBA

Alternate Task Manager		
PCR Team Leader		Ephrem RUTABOBA
PCR Team Members		Alex GOMANI
d. Report data		
PCR Date : 08 Dec 2015		
PCR Mission Date:	From: 23 Nov 2015	To: 28 Nov 2015
PCR-EN Date:		
Evaluator/consultant :	Peer Reviewer/Task Manager:	

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Summary from Appraisal Report including addendum/corrigendum or loan agreement, and taking into account any modification that occurred during the implementation phase.

This Rural Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation (RWSS) Sub-program covers 15 districts in three Rwandan provinces (North, West and South) out of the four in the country. The main outputs expected at the end of the scheduled 30 months of implementation are: (i) 16,000 new individual latrines for the most vulnerable families; (ii) 130 new multi-compartment latrines and 100 storm water harvesting reservoirs constructed in village public infrastructures (schools, health centres and other public places); (iii) 500 masons trained in latrine construction techniques; (iv) 250 female outreach workers and 100 school teachers trained in hygiene and prevention in villages; (v) a large drinking water supply network over 150 km; (vi) ten (10) medium DWS schemes totaling 275 km of networks constructed; (vii) 1000 drinking water supply sources developed and fitted with laundry tubs; (viii) 200 district borehole drillers trained in the maintenance of water facilities put in place; (ix) 10 private operators supported and trained in the operation and maintenance of complex water supply systems; and (x) training, outreach and sensitization campaigns conducted in 216 localities of the three provinces of the sub-program.

The construction of structures and implementation of activities of the sub-program will help to meet the water and sanitation infrastructure needs of about 792,000 persons throughout the three provinces, including nearly 642,000 individuals directly concerned with drinking water supply, and 150,000 with household and public sanitation.

a. Rationale and expected impacts:

Provide a brief and precise description on the project/programme rationale (concerns/questions raised), expected impacts and the intended beneficiaries (directly or indirectly impacted by the project/programme). Highlight any change that occurred during the execution phase.

According to the appraisal report, at the time of appraisal, the rate of access by the communities in the project area to clean drinking water

averaged 47% in the provinces. Moreover, as a result of under-equipment, about 20% of the populations of the three provinces still resort to vulnerable water sources of dubious quality for their supply.

To address these deficiencies, the project will: (i) improve the availability and quality of drinking water; (ii) reduce water fetching chores, particularly for women; (iii) reduce water costs; (iv) reduce water-borne diseases; and (v) promote water-related income-generating activities.

Furthermore, the approach recommended for community development on drinking water supply sources and construction of household latrines is intended to enable the beneficiary population to fully participate in the construction.

In addition to the improvement of drinking water supply to the targeted populations, the project also addresses a major concern relating to the fact that the vast majority of the country's rural localities do not yet have appropriate systems for the collection and evacuation of wastewater, excreta and solid waste.

The beneficiaries are the populations of 15 districts⁵ of the three provinces of the North, West and South, representing a total of 5.05 million inhabitants out of the 9.7 million in the country.

b. Objectives/Expected Outcomes:

Provide a clear and concise description of the project objectives, expected outcomes, and intended beneficiaries. In so doing, highlight any revision/amendment.

According to the logical framework in the appraisal report, the project objectives are to:

- Improve drinking water supply services in 216 rural localities of 3 provinces (North, West and South) ;**
- Improve the supply of household sanitation services in 216 rural localities, and community sanitation services in 15 districts of 3 provinces.**

The expected outcomes By 2012 are:

- 1) Increase in rate of access to drinking water for the population targeted by the project;**
- 2) Increase in rate of sanitation coverage in the three provinces;**
- 3) Reduction in average rate of prevalence of water-borne diseases and faecal peril in 3 provinces.**

As noted above, the expected beneficiaries are the populations of 15 districts⁵ of the three provinces of the North, West and South, representing a total of 5.05 million inhabitants out of the 9.7 million in the country.

c. Outputs and intended beneficiaries:

Provide a clear and concise description the expected outputs and intended beneficiaries. In so doing, highlight any revision/amendment.

The expected outputs listed in the logical framework of the appraisal report are:

- 1) Construction of a large water pumping system to supply about 112,000 persons
- 2) Construction of 10 new gravity pipe water systems to supply 280,000 people
- 3) Development of 1000 water sources to supply water for 250,000 people.
- 4) Recruit and train 1011 WUAs and WUA managers
- 5) 16,000 individual, household sanitation facilities constructed
- 6) 130 public latrines constructed
- 7) 500 masons and 100 school teachers trained; 250 female hygiene outreach workers recruited.

The expected beneficiaries are rural populations directly or collectively served in the three provinces:

- (i) 642000 persons directly supplied with drinking water;
- (ii) 150000 people directly equipped for household sanitation; and
- (iii) 5.05 million people collectively concerned with IEC campaigns.
- Contractors, Consultancy firms, NGO, etc. - Village public infrastructure Structures concerned DEA, ANEPAR and PNEAR)

d. Principal activities/Components:

Provide a clear and concise description of the principal activities/components. In so doing, highlight any revision/amendment.

Basic Infrastructure Development

- Household Sanitation Works
- Public Sanitation Works
- Development Works for 1000 drinking water sources
- 10 Medium DWS Works
- Large WS Works
- Studies, Supervision and Control of Works
- Outreach and Sensitization Campaigns for DWS Structures
- IEC Campaigns for Sanitation Structures

Support for Intervention Structures of the project

- Support for Fifteen Districts
- Support for training of stand-pipe repairers for maintenance of facilities
- Capacity building for central structures

Project management

- Project Coordination
- Annual auditing of PCU and project accounts

3. PROJECT PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

RELEVANCE

a. Relevance of the project development objective:

Evaluation of the relevance ex-ante and ex-post (including during the implementation phase). The relevance of the project objective (during the evaluation ex-ante and the post-evaluation) in terms of alignment with country's development priorities and strategies, the beneficiary needs (including any changes that may have occurred during the implementation), applicable Bank sector strategies, the Bank country/regional strategy, and general strategic priorities of the Bank. This criterion equally assesses the extent to which the project's development objective was clearly stated and focused on outcomes and the realism of the intended outcomes in the project setting.

The appraisal report notes that in addition to being an integral part of the national program (PNEAR), the project is also aligned with: (i) Rwanda's Vision for 2020 which, seeks to enable total access to drinking water for the rural populations by 2020; (ii) the new orientations of the Government's sector policy that seeks optimal use of water resources and adequate access to water and sanitation services for all; and (iii) the (then) current economic development and poverty reduction strategy – EDPRS (2008 – 2012), some of whose key pillars give priority to access to adequate services and sanitation for the population, as well as the use of water to promote income-generating activities to alleviate poverty.

The appraisal report also notes that apart from being in line with the EDPRS, the project is also in harmony with the Bank's Vision, particularly its Strategic Plan. Consequently, its primary objective is to provide support to the Government in the fight against poverty, under the following two pillars: (I) Pillar I: development of infrastructure, including those for adequate access to drinking water and sanitation services. This is fully consistent with the Bank's Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Initiative (RWSSI). (II) Pillar II: promotion of competitiveness and development of enterprises so as to enhance their productivity and, subsequently, improve the standard of living of the populations and reduce poverty. This sub-programme is therefore in keeping with the country's priorities, particularly as outlined in Pillar I. Furthermore, the satisfactory implementation of Phase I of PNEAR is a further indication of the relevance of the project development objective.

Rating = 4

b. Relevance of project design (from approval to completion):

The evaluator should provide an assessment of the relevance of the project design regardless of the one provided in the PCR. The evaluator will also comment on the PCR conclusion for this section, and will provide an evaluation of the relevance of the project design. The latter assesses the soundness and the timing of eventual adjustments, or technical solutions to ensure the achievement of the intended results (outcomes and outputs), the adequacy of the risk assessment, environmental and social protection measures, as well as the implementation arrangements. For Programme Based Operations (PBO), an assessment will be made on the relevance of the prior actions, the policy dialogue and the extent to which the operation could have been more pro-poor in its design.

According to the PCR, the participatory approach adopted by the Government, through effective involvement of communities in the design and implementation of the national program, enhanced the community sense of ownership. This also enabled them to participate in: (i) validation of the location of DWS structures; (ii) determination of the beneficiaries of household sanitation facilities (exclusively reserved for economically weak households); (iii) supply of local labor and materials for works; and (iv) selection of management method for the infrastructures. Lastly, field visits undertaken during the appraisal mission provided an opportunity to interact with the communities and observe the anchoring of this approach at their level.

In addition, lessons learnt from Phase 1 of PNEAR, have contributed to better project design including, effective management of DWSS systems by private operators and public/private partnership in rural areas. This is evidenced by the rapid growth and entrenchment of this type of water supply management systems in rural areas.. In addition the use of the Common Development Fund (CDF6) as a financing bridge at district level has contributed to buttressing the Government's decentralization policy and also

fostered the participation of beneficiary communities. The model adopted thereby promotes sustainability of the servicing of the facilities.

In addition, one of sanitation alternatives relevant in the project design was Ecosan toilet technology for sustainable sanitation, which had improved the sustainability (Water conservation and low wastewater generation) and the project benefits.

Rating = 4

EFFECTIVENESS

c. Effectiveness in delivering outputs:

Evaluation of the extent to which the project achieved its stated results (obtained from the logical framework) based on the last Implementation Progress and Results Report (IPR) and by considering accurate reporting of direct or indirect evidence on intended and unanticipated outputs. In the absence of sufficient data (as direct evidence), indirect evidence (such as project outcomes and other pertinent processes/elements of the causal chain) should be used particularly in the evaluation of the extent to which the project is expected to achieve its stated results/ objectives. The absence of sufficient data to assess the effectiveness should be indicated (and clearly detailed in the PCR quality evaluation section). The PCR score should equally be indicated in this section.

The outputs in the table below are taken from the appraisal logical framework

Output	Progress toward target	PCREN Comment
1) Construction of a large water pumping system to supply about 112,000 persons	100% according to PCR	According to the PCR, at the end of the project 4 systems with a total length of 161 km and with 194 public water taps and 58 private connections supplying a population of more than 144 000 people have been constructed. The PCR does not explain how 194 public water taps and 58 private connections can supply 112,000 people.
2) Construction of 10 new gravity piped water systems to supply 280,000 people	98%*	According to the PCR, at the end of the project 12 systems with 319 public water taps and 97 private connections supplying a population of 275,000 people have been constructed. The PCR does not explain how 275,000 people can be served with only 319 public water taps and 97 private connections. * The PCR suggests that the target was to supply 263,210 people. However, the appraisal target was in fact, 280,000.
3) Development of 1000 water sources to supply water for 250,000 people.	887 water sources of 1,000 planned or 88.7%	The PCR says, “Construction of one water supply system in place of the remaining sources. Beneficiaries that were to benefit from the remaining undeveloped water springs are now benefiting from piped water systems following their request to be provided with a piped water system”. Presumably this means that in place of individual water sources, each of which would serve small groups of people, a larger group asked for a piped system. <i>Unfortunately the PCR does not mention the number of people sharing this piped system and does not discuss what that means for</i>

		<i>achieving the original target of 250,000 people served.</i>
4) Recruit and train 1011 WUAs and WUA managers		No discussion in the PCR
5) 16,000 individual, household sanitation facilities constructed	106%	The PCR says, that the construction of household latrines focused mainly on vulnerable families while better-equipped families constructed latrines for themselves. Construction of additional household sanitation facilities were due to the savings;
6) 130 public latrines constructed	100%	The PCR says, many of these latrines were at health centres, at schools and at public institutions. Gender segregation was emphasized. Decomposed waste from these latrines is being used for fertilization of crops for both the institutions and neighboring individual families.
7) 500 masons and 100 school teachers trained; 250 female hygiene outreach workers recruited	100%	Both the masons and the female outreach workers were trained.

Narrative: This discussion is based on a review of the outputs as recorded in the appraisal report's logical framework.

In the discussion of Output 1, the PCR does not explain how 194 public water taps and 58 private connections can supply 112,000 people. This seems implausible. It is possible that there are a large number of families in areas where pipes have been laid, but connections to houses not yet made. Section 2c above under beneficiaries is clear that the logical framework target applied to beneficiaries with direct connections. If there were a change in the project targets, this would need to be explained in the PCR

In the discussion of Output 2, the PCR does not explain how 275,000 people can be served with only 319 public water taps and 97 private connections. This also seems implausible. As noted above, it is possible that there are a large number of families in areas where pipes have been laid, but connections to houses not yet made. Section 2c above under beneficiaries is clear that the logical framework target applied to beneficiaries with direct connections. If there were a change in the project targets, this would need to be explained in the PCR

The PCR comment on Output 3 in the above table is not complete. The appraisal report says that 1,000 water sources were to be developed to serve 250,000 people. It says that 887 water sources were constructed. The PCR says, "Construction of one water supply system in place of the remaining sources. Beneficiaries that were to benefit from the remaining undeveloped water springs are now benefiting from piped water systems following their request to be provided with a piped water system". Presumably this means that the residents of the areas that were to have been covered by the 113 water sources not built under the project, requested a piped system instead of 113 individual water sources. *Unfortunately the PCR does not mention the number of people sharing this piped system and does not discuss how many people are served by the 887 individual water sources and the one piped system. It should have compared the actual total number served the 887 individual sources and the one piped system with the logical framework target of 250,000.*

The PCR does not discuss output number 4 in the table above, "Recruit and train 1011 WUAs and WUA managers" The PCR does discuss what it considers another output, "Private operators supported and trained in the operation and maintenance of complex water supply systems" This support to private operators, seems similar to the training of WUAs, but the PCR does not provide an explanation. The PCR says that 24 of the private operators were trained out of a target of 10. The discrepancy in the description

of the outputs and the target indicators is not discussed in the PCR. There is no discussion in the PCR that indicates that there was a change in outputs.

Because of the lack of any discussion of the output related to WUAs (output 4 in the table) and the fact that no mention is made of the number of beneficiaries for output 3, and because the data for beneficiaries in Outputs 1 and 2 seem implausible, the rating is 2.

d. Effectiveness in delivering outcomes:

Evaluation of the extent to which the project achieved its intended set of outcomes (including for Program Based Operations (PBOs) where complementary measures are necessary for their implementation, namely public awareness, policy dialogue and institutional arrangements for instance). The evaluator should make an assessment based on the results of the last project Implementation Progress and Results (IPR). The evaluator shall indicate the degree to which project outcomes (intended and unanticipated) as well as reasons for any eventual gap were discussed in the PCR.

The intended set of outcomes listed in the table below come from the appraisal report’s logical framework.

Intended Outcomes	Progress towards target	Comment
1) Increase in rate of access to drinking water for the population targeted by the project;	133%	According to the PCR, the current rate of access: is (78.2) Northern, 71% Western and 74.9% in the Southern Province. The target was 61% in Northern province and 60% in the Southern and Western provinces The target was exceeded by about 33% In addition, the average of water consumed has increased from 5 litres per day to 20 litres per day and at lower cost. A 20 litre bucket used to cost 200 francs. The cost now is pegged at 20 . The PCR also reports on a reduction in the time to fetch water, which was an outcome indicator, but not an outcome itself.
2) Increase in rate of sanitation coverage in he three provinces;	The appraisal report called for an increase in the rate of sanitation coverage from 10 to16% in the 3 provinces	The PCR does not report on the rate of sanitation coverage in the 3 provinces at project completion. The PCR does say that over 155,000 people are benefiting from improved sanitation facilities following the construction of 17,001 household latrines and 130 public latrines. The M&E system should have been designed to estimate the rate of sanitation coverage.
3) Reduction in average rate of prevalence of water-borne diseases and faecal peril in 3 provinces	The appraisal report called for a reduction in water borne disease from 34% to 26%. (The logical framework does not indicate 34% of what. Per thousand population?)	The M&E System should have reported on the extent of disease reduction from the project.

The PCR reports 5 outcomes, rather than the 3 in the logical framework of the appraisal report that are discussed above. However, the two additional “outcomes” of the PCR are listed in the appraisal logical

framework as additional indicators of outcome number 1. They are not independent outcomes.

The table above indicates substantial achievements in the first two outcomes. However, for the second outcome (increasing the rate of sanitation coverage) the PCR gives a number for sanitation beneficiaries, but does not discuss the increase in coverage or the progress in achieving the target, despite the specific targets for increased coverage given in the logical framework.

The PCR also does not give an indication of progress in achieving the target for the 3rd anticipated outcome, health, despite the importance of health to the project's justification. It is puzzling that the cost benefit analysis in the PCR does use a monetary value of the reduction in waterborne disease in the calculation of the economic rate of return at project completion, but the PCR discussion on effectiveness in delivering outcomes has no estimate for the reduction in waterborne disease.

Despite the deficiencies in the PCR assessment of outcomes, because of the substantial achievements in the first two outcomes, rating =3

e. Project development outcome:

The ratings derived for outcomes and output are combined to assess the progress the project has made towards realizing its development objectives, based on the rating methodology recommended in the Staff Guidance Note on project completion reporting and rating (see IPR Guidance Note for further instruction on development objective rating).

Combining the ratings for outcomes and output, and giving more weight to outcomes, the Project Development Outcome is rated 3.

f. Beneficiaries:

Using evidence, the evaluator should provide an assessment of the relevance of the total number of beneficiaries by categories and disaggregated by sex.

As noted above, In the discussion of Outputs 1 and 2 the PCR the estimate of numbers of beneficiaries is implausible.

For the second outcome (increasing the rate of sanitation coverage) the PCR gives a number for sanitation beneficiaries, but does not discuss the increase in coverage or the progress in achieving the target, despite the specific targets for increased coverage given in the logical framework.

Unfortunately the PCR does not discuss how many people are served by the 887 individual water sources and the one piped system. It should have compared the actual total number served by the 887 individual sources and the one piped system with the logical framework target of 250,000.

Rating =2

g. Unanticipated additional outcomes (positive or negative, not taken into consideration in the project logical framework):

This includes gender, climate change, as well as social and socio-economic- related issues. Provide an assessment of the extent to which intended or unanticipated additional and important outcomes have been taken into consideration by the PCR. The assessment should also look at the manner the PCR accounted for these outcomes.

Unanticipated or additional outcomes	PCREN Comments
Some clinics are using human	

waste as fertilizer, which is used for farming activities for the surrounding inhabitants as well as the clinic using the same for fertilizing grass, which is fed to milk cattle. The milk is in turn fed to undernourished children.	Agree. This is a positive unanticipated outcome. It was adequately taken into account in the PCR
Utilization of savings for Compact Mobile Water Treatment plants has benefited an additional 69,950 people thereby contributing to the wellbeing of the people living in the two districts	Agree. This is a positive additional outcome It was adequately taken into account in the PCR
Improved household health and hygiene knowledge. At the household level, the support was provided through hygiene education and sanitation improvement promotion activities aimed at averting Open Defecation Free (ODF) communities accompanied by gender responsive sanitation marketing encouraging households to construct improved sanitation facilities.	Disagree. This outcome is a direct consequence of Output number 7 in the table of outputs above, i.e. 250 female hygiene outreach workers recruited. This should have been anticipated.
Encouragement of entrepreneurship through the PPP arrangements as well as providing employment through the same model.	This outcome should be better explained. The “lessons” section explains that this refers to management of water points by private individuals or cooperatives. This appears to be a positive outcome, but it should have been anticipated since private management of the WUAs was part of the project design.

EFFICIENCY

h. Timeliness:

The timeliness of project implementation is based on a comparison between the planned and actual period of implementation from the date of effectiveness for first disbursement. For Programme Based Operations (PBOs), the timely release of the tranche(s) are assessed through this same criterion.

The following information is from the PCR.

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

4.25 years from 2009 to 2013	5.75 years from 2009 to 2015	1.35	2.96
------------------------------	------------------------------	------	------

Rating = 3

i. Resource use efficiency:

Provide and assessment of physical implementation (based on outputs delivered) against resources used (based on cumulative commitments) at completion for all contributors to the project (the Bank, Government, and others). This criterion would normally not apply to PBOs, as there is often no direct link between the outputs and the amount of contribution (in which case the rater would indicate N/A).

Median % physical implementation of RLF outputs financed by all financiers (A) (see II.B.3)	Commitment rate (%) (B) (See table 1.C – Total commitment rate of all financiers)	Ratio of the median percentage physical implementation and commitment rate (A/B)	Rating
100	99.9	1	4

j. Cost-benefit analysis:

Provide an assessment of the timeliness of the development outputs, and the extent to which costs of the costs have been effective and have been provided in the most efficient manner. The PCR rating should be discussed. The evaluator should verify whether the benefits of the project (achieved or expected) exceed its actual costs. To achieve this, evidences will mainly be based on a comparison between Economic Rates of Return (ERR) calculated at appraisal, the mid-term review and completion. When commenting PCR ratings, the degree of utilization of valid sources for evidence justifying the rating assigned should be taken into consideration. The evaluator should ensure of the validity of assumptions and that the same model was used for the calculation of others ERRs. For PBOs for which this calculation model does not apply, an assessment could be done with regards to the contribution of policy reforms to economic growth. In the absence of sufficient evidence, an appropriate rating should be assigned.

The economic rate of return at appraisal was calculated at 24 % and the updated economic rate of return at completion was calculated in the PCR at 23%.

The narrative discussion of cost benefit analysis lists many benefits accruing from the project. However, it does not explain the quantitative benefits included in the analysis. The table of the costs and benefits and the explanatory notes in the “progress report” that is attached to the PCR provide some additional information, but this also suffers from lack of details. The ERR is calculated by using as benefits both the financial revenues from payments made by users, and time benefits and health benefits. The explanation does not give details about how health benefits were calculated, e.g. amounts assumed for medical expenses saved, and levels of reduction in disease. More importunately, the cost benefit analysis uses both the amount that users pay for water, as well as the monetary value of time saved and of health costs saved by the reduction in disease. This is double counting since the amount that consumers are willing to pay for water includes the health benefits and saving in time.

One of the three outcomes of the project from the appraisal report logical framework is “Reduction in average rate of prevalence of water-borne diseases and faecal peril in 3 provinces” The appraisal report target for this outcome, was a reduction from 34% to 24%. However, in the discussion of outputs, (see above) no quantification of disease has been provided. In the cost benefit analysis, some assumption about reduction in disease was embedded in the calculation, but the actual reduction assumed in the benefits table is not provided.

The appraisal report says that the details of the cost benefit analysis are included in an annex to the appraisal report, but this annex was not part of the appraisal report. The narrative discussion in the text of

the appraisal report does not provide sufficient information to comment on the analysis done at appraisal. It is therefore not possible to comment on the cost benefit analysis conducted at appraisal.

Rating = 2

k. Implementation progress:

The assessment of the Implementation Progress (IP) on the PCR is derived from the updated IPR and takes into account the all applicable IP criteria assessed under the three categories : i) Compliance with covenants (project covenants, environmental and social safeguards and audit compliance), ii) project systems and procedures (procurement, financial management and monitoring and evaluation), and iii) project execution and financing (disbursement, budget commitments, counterpart funding and co-financing).

No formal IPR was provided to the PCREN team.

The PCR says that there were a few “hitches” during implementation and these had to do with heavy rains which rendered access to project sites impossible; lack of materials including sand and quarry in certain project areas which resulted in contractors having to ferry the materials from other regions; and the question of electrification one of the pumping stations. However these hiccups did not affect the implementation timeline for the project.

Also the PCR says that the boundaries of a new road to be constructed cover some of the newly constructed piped water supply infrastructure along the way – especially in Miyove. This means that the water supply infrastructure will need to be relocated if the people are to continue benefitting from the systems. The PCR says that this ought to have been foreseen at the design time of either the water systems or the surveying of the possible location of the road. Both the Bank and GoR should have foreseen this.

The PCR also says there were defects identified during implementation including: Failure of some pipes among the transmission and distribution networks; failure of some of the valves which continue to leak, leakages of some of the reservoirs and that some of the pumping equipment was defective and needed to be replaced

On the whole the implementation went smoothly and was satisfactory according to the PCR. There was neither procurement nor disbursement issues.

Rating = 3

SUSTAINABILITY

l. Financial sustainability:

Provide an assessment of the extent to which funding mechanisms and modalities (eg. Tariffs, user fees, maintenance fees, budgetary allocations, other stakeholder contributions, aid flows, etc.) have been put in place to ensure the continued flow of benefits after completion, with particular emphasis on financial sustainability. For PBOs, the assessment should focus on financial sustainability of reforms, as well as the Bank’s policy dialogue to promote financial sustainability of the reforms.

According to the PCR, the model employed of engaging the private sector to run the water points is a key factor in sustainability of the systems as the operator depends on the amounts collected hence encouraging efficient and sustainable operation of the systems and the utilization of these systems by the beneficiaries. The water charges have been set at 20 Fr per 20 litres. This figure is set by the Rwanda Utility Regulatory authority. The water tariffs are based on affordability but also operations and maintenance and the cost of electricity are factored in.

It is suggested that a detailed financial analysis of a few representative private operators who are managing water points would be very helpful to substantiate the project achievements and also provide lessons for scaling up and adaptation in other member countries.

There were cases whereby some private sector operators started incurring losses due to high power tariff until the district council decided to absorb the additional cost by allowing a higher cut for the operator.

Rating = 3

m. Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities:

Provide an assessment of the extent to which the project has contributed to the strengthening of institutional capacities – including for instance through the use of country systems – that will continue to facilitate the continued flow of benefits associated with the project. An appreciation should be made with regards to whether or not improved governance practices or improved skills, procedures, incentives, structures, or institutional mechanisms came into effect as a result of the operation. For PBOs, this should include an assessment on the contributions made to building the capacity to lead and manage the policy reform process; the extent to which the political economy of decision making was conducive to reform; the Government's commitment to reform; and how the design reinforced national ownership.

The PCR notes that staff retention at WASAC (the national water and sanitation company) has been a strong factor in successful implementation. It says that the implementation of the project has been smooth and with neither disbursement nor procurement issues. As such there were savings, in implementation, which the PCR says led to additional benefits from those estimated at appraisal. The PCR says that the staff at WASAC is supporting the activities of the private in sector running the water points and they are running some of the water points not run by the private sector. As the private sector involvement takes root, the PCR suggests that WASAC may wish to divest this role in favor of the private sector.

Rating = 4

n. Ownership and sustainability of partnerships:

Provide an assessment of whether the project has effectively involved relevant stakeholders, promoted a sense of ownership amongst the beneficiaries (both men and women) and put in place effective partnerships with relevant stakeholders (eg. local authorities, civil society organizations, private sector, donors) as required for the continued maintenance of the project outputs. For PBOs, the assessment should measure the extent to which the Government's capacity to conduct consultations during policy dialogue and the extent to which the Bank supported the Government in deepening the consultation processes.

Consultation with communities about their needs in order to determine project priorities was an element of project design intended to foster ownership and sustainability. The PCR says that animators were used to identify vulnerable groups to benefit from latrines.

The PCR says that the project has supported training of in excess of 840,000 people to sensitize them in water supply and sanitation. It says that 100% of the animators met by the mission met indicated that they would continue with the sensitization activities despite the project coming to an end.

The PCR also says that the model employed of engaging the private sector to run the water points fosters institutional sustainability of the systems as the benefits of the operator depends on the amounts collected hence encouraging efficient and sustainable operation of the systems and the utilization of these systems by the beneficiaries.

Rating = 4

o. Environmental and social sustainability:

Provide an assessment of the objectivity of the PCR rating on the project's implementation of environmental and social mitigation/enhancement measures with regard to the Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP), the capacity of country institutions and systems, as well as the availability of funding to ensure the environmental and social sustainability of the operation. This criterion would normally only apply to Environmental Category I and II projects.

The project is classified as Environmental and Social Category II. In accordance with the Bank's guidelines and policies, an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) was to be prepared and implemented concurrently with the implementation. The PCR does not mention the ESMP and does not comment on its implementation. There is no indication in the PCR of any environmental problem.

The PCR says that the project led to a cleaner environment first with the construction of sanitation facilities and second through the training and engagement of female hygiene outreach workers. Communities have also been sensitized on the benefits of protection of their water sources through protection of the landscape and the vegetation around the sources. In fact those not covered by the water supply schemes are also made aware of the benefits of consuming potable water by among other approaches – the boiling of the water for consumption.

Rating = 3

4. PERFORMANCE OF STAKEHOLDERS

a. Bank performance:

(Preparation/approval, ensure of Quality at Entry (QAE) : quality of the supervision, completion) : Provide observations on the objectivity of the PCR ratings and feedback provided by the Borrower, and if necessary, re-assess the Bank's performance throughout the project cycle (design, implementation, completion) by focusing on evidence from the PCR in relation to 7 criteria defined in the PCR Guidance Note.

Quality at entry. There are three points related to quality at entry:

- A key factor in smooth project implementation was the fact that this is a follow-on project which itself is part of a larger multi-donor coordinated program to make progress on an important national issue.
- Cost benefit analysis: The appraisal report did not contain the annex cited in the narrative with detailed information about the cost benefit analysis. However, the narrative mentions both financial and health benefits and suggests that these are additive. However, if the cost benefit analysis included the value of payments for water and savings due to reductions in disease it would be double counting, since willingness to pay for clean water, is in part because of the health benefits. The cost benefit analysis is problematic.
- The siting of some of the water supply infrastructure should have foreseen that there would be a road upgrade, which road would affect the water infrastructure built on the right of way of the road. The PCR also says it will be costly to move the water facility.

During implementation: The PCR mentions 3 points:

- The use of animators has resulted in considerable gains in hygiene education and popularizing the construction of individual household pit latrines.

- The model supported by the Bank to support a PPP approach in water supply management has also led to creation of employment
- The bank showed flexibility in handling the requests by the Government for utilization of unspent funds which facilitated the construction of the Compact Mobile Water Treatment Plants which are now benefiting an additional 69,950 people.

No supervision reports were provided to the PCREN team. Therefore no comment can be made on the quality of supervision.

Rating = 3

b. Borrower performance:

Provide observations on the objectivity of the PCR ratings, and if necessary, re-assess the Borrower's performance throughout the project cycle (design, implementation, completion) by focusing on evidence from the PCR in relation to questions defined in the PCR Guidance Note.

The PCR says that the performance of the Government of Rwanda through Ministry of Infrastructure (MININFRA) and Water and Sanitation Corporation (WASAC) has been satisfactory in ensuring overall project implementation and achievement of the resultants indicated in this report. The Government has performed very well in the disbursement (ADF fund 99.6 %, RWSSI Trust Fund 100 % and exceeding their counterpart funding commitment 159 %). The PCR also says the Government is to be commended for ensuring staff continuity at WASAC, which after learning from the mistakes in phase I of PNEAR, led to smooth implementation of the program – PNEAR II - both in terms of procurement and disbursements and follow up of works.

The PCR notes the “glitch” in the location of water supply infrastructure on the borders of the road which is to be upgraded (see above)

Rating = 3

c. Performance of other stakeholders:

Provide observations on the objectivity of the PCR ratings, and if necessary, re-assess the other shareholders' performance throughout the project cycle (design, implementation, completion) by focusing on evidence from the PCR in relation to relevant questions specific to each stakeholder (co-financiers, NGO, contractors and service providers).

Co-financiers: The PCR does not comment on Co-financiers.

NGO: The PCR does not comment on NGOs

Contractors: The PCR says that contracting went smoothly, but does not otherwise comment.

Service providers: The PCR says that WASAC, as an independent company, has to make profits and has managed systems well. The PCR also says that the involvement of animators has led the project to deliver maximum benefits in terms of sanitation and hygiene at minimum cost. This has led to a cleaner environment and is saving peoples' lives.

Rating = 4

5. SUMMARY OF OVERALL PROJECT PERFORMANCE

a. Overall assessment:

Provide a summary of the project/programme's overall performance based on the PCR 4 key components (Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Sustainability). Any difference with the PCR and the reasons that have resulted in them should be mentioned. For cases with insufficient evidence (from the PCR and other documents) available, the evaluator should assign a partly satisfactory rating (to be revised) until a post project performance evaluation (e.g. PPER, PER or PRA) is complete.

Relevance, = 3.5
Effectiveness = 2.5
Efficiency = 3
Sustainability = 3.7

Rating = 3

b. Design, implementation and utilization of the M&E (appreciation of the evaluator):

Provide an assessment of planned and actual cost of the design, implementation and utilization of the M&E system. Design : To which extent the project M&E system was explicit, adequate and realistic to generate and analyse relevant data ; Implementation : To which extent relevant data was collected – Elements of M&E implementation and effectiveness in the PCR ; Utilization : degree of utilization of data generated for decision-making and resource allocation – elements of M&E utilization in the PCR.

The PCR does not discuss M&E. Because no supporting documentation except the PCR was provided to the PCREN team, there is no other information available on M&E. Rating = 1

6. EVALUATION OF KEY LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

a. Lessons learned:

Provide a brief description of any agreement/disagreement with all or part of the lessons learned from the PCR after analysis of the project performance with regards to each of the key components of the evaluation (Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Sustainability). List the PCR main new and/or reformulated pertinent (and generic) lessons learned for each of these components here. It is recommended that no more than five lessons learned are discussed. Key questions and targeted audience must also be specified for each lesson learned.

Lesson from PCR	PCREN comment
Decentralisation of ownership of systems – especially the medium water supply systems – to the Districts increases ownership and facilitates sustainability. Districts sign management contracts with Private operators and also WASAC.	Agree
Big Rural water supply systems are also owned by the different Districts but are managed by WASAC (due to its capacity). WASAC as an independent company has to make profits	Agree, but this lesson is phrased in a manner specific to WASAC

hence has to manage the systems well.	
The model adopted of involving the private sector in water provision has expanded the project benefits through employment provision and the development of entrepreneurship. It also assures proper maintenance which will result in sustainability of the project	Agree, but this is not just a matter of involving the private sector. It also depends on having a capable, professional regulator.
The involvement of animators has led the project to deliver maximum benefits in terms of sanitation and hygiene at minimum cost. This has led to a cleaner environment and is saving peoples' lives.	Many projects have involved animators that were much less successful. The PCR does not explain what the lesson was that led to these animators being successful
The Bank's flexible approach wherever necessary has resulted in an additional 69,950 people benefiting from the project. Also GoR's commitment to scale up funding for the project has assisted those people accessing water	The PCR does not explain what the "Bank's flexible approach" means. This is not a properly defined lesson.

b. Recommendations:

Provide a brief description of any agreement/ disagreement with all or part of the recommendations from the PCR. List the PCR main new and/or reformulated recommendations (requiring more actions by the Borrower and/or the Bank) here.

Recommendation from PCR	Comment of PCREN
WASAC and the different Districts should continuously train and equip their teams to facilitate better management. The Private Operators need to be better supervised.	Agree
Government oversight is important especially in the location of the infrastructure including water tanks. This will avoid the duplication of effort and disruption to the provision of water services. There should also be better coordination between the various ministries to ensure proper location of water infrastructure	Agree, but the PCR should specify what government level and department has responsibility
A clear understanding of Bank procedures on procurement and disbursement is very important for smooth implementation of projects. The staff continuity has mattered in this project. The Bank and Government should always discuss more on the National Procurement and disbursement procedures and agree on the final Document to facilitate Enhanced National Procurement and disbursement practices where there are capacity deficiencies.	Agree
While the Implementation Period of the project was reasonable, the start of the project delayed and this delay in future would be better managed.	The PCR does not explain how the delay was managed in this project, and how it could be better managed in future.
PNEAR III was planned for and studies were completed and documents are available. To facilitate increased Rural Water supply and improved sanitation, the sub-program needs to be implemented	Agree

7. COMMENTS ON PCR QUALITY AND TIMELINESS

The overall PCR rating is based on all or part of the criteria presented in the annexe and other:

The quality of the PCR is rated as highly satisfactory (4), satisfactory (3), unsatisfactory (2), and highly unsatisfactory (1). The timeliness of the PCR is rated as on time (4) or late (1). The participation of the Borrower, co-financier, and the bank's external office(s) are rated as follows: Very Good (4), Good (3), Fair (2), Poor (1).

The PCR has a number of important deficiencies.

- The cost benefit analysis was incorrectly done.
- The discussion of outputs and outcomes was not based on the actual outputs and outcomes in the appraisal report logical framework. The discrepancy was not discussed.
- There were discrepancies in number of beneficiaries that was not explained.

Rating = 2

8. SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION

This is a summary of both the PCR and IDEV ratings with justification for deviations/comments. Appropriate section of the PCR Evaluation should be indicated in the last column in order to avoid detailed comments. The evaluator must provide a reasonable explanation for each criterion the PCR rating is not validated by IDEV. Consequently, the overall rating of the project could be "equally satisfactory".

Criteria	PCR	PCREN	Reason for disagreement/ Comments
RELEVANCE	4	4	
Relevance of project development objective	4	4	
Relevance of project design	4	4	
EFFECTIVENESS	4	3	
Development objective (DO)	4	3	PCR makes no mention of the number of beneficiaries for output 3, and the data for Output 2 seem implausible
EFFICIENCY	3.44	3	
Timeliness	2.96	3	
Resource use efficiency	4	4	
Cost-benefit analysis	3.8	2	Neither appraisal or PCR cost benefit analysis was done correctly
Implementation progress (IP)	3	3	
SUSTAINABILITY	3	3.7	
Financial sustainability	3	3	
Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities	3	4	The institutions seem to be performing very well.
Environmental and social sustainability	3	3	
OVERALL PROJECT COMPLETION RATING	3.78	3.3	
Bank performance:	3.5	3	
Borrower performance:	3.5	3	

Performance of other shareholders:	4	4	
Overall PCR quality:		2	

9. PRIORITY FOR FUTURE EVALUATIVE WORK: PROJECT FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT, IMPACT EVALUATION, COUNTRY/SECTOR REVIEWS OR THEMATIC EVALUATION STUDIES:

- Project is part of a series and suitable for cluster evaluation
- Project is a success story
- High priority for impact evaluation
- Performance evaluation is required to sector/country review
- High priority for thematic or special evaluation studies (Country)
- PPER is required because of incomplete validation rating

Major areas of focus for future evaluation work:

- a) Performance evaluation is required for sector/ country review
- b) Cluster evaluation (institutional support)
- c) Sector evaluation (budgetary support or public finance management reforms)

Follow up action by IDEV:

Identify same cluster or sector operations; organize appropriate work or consultation mission to facilitate a), b) and/or c).

Division Manager clearance

Director signing off

Data source for validation:

- Task Manager/ Responsible bank staff interviewed/contacted (in person, by telephone or email)
- Documents/ Database reports

Attachment:

- PCR evaluation note validation sheet of performance ratings
- List of references

PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT EVALUATION NOTE

Validation of PCR performance ratings

PCR rating scale:

Score	Description
4	Very Good – Fully achieved with no shortcomings
3	Good – Mostly achieved despite a few shortcomings
2	Fair – Partially achieved. Shortcomings and achievements are roughly balanced
1	Poor – very limited achievement with extensive shortcomings
UTS	Unable to score/rate
NA	Non Applicable

Criteria	Sub-criteria	PCR work score	IDEV review	Reasons for deviation/comments
RELEVANCE	Relevance of the project development objective (DO) during implementation	4	4	
	Relevance of project design (from approval to completion)	4	4	
OVERALL RELEVANCE SCORE				
EFFECTIVENESS*	Effectiveness in delivering outcomes			
	Outcome1	UTS	UTS	
	Outcome2	UTS	UTS	
	Effectiveness in delivering output			
	Output1	UTS	UTS	
	Output2	UTS	UTS	
	Development objective (DO)			
	Development objective rating	4	3	PCR makes no mention of the number of beneficiaries for output 3, and the data for Output 2 seem implausible
	Beneficiaries			
	Beneficiary1	UTS	2	

Criteria	Sub-criteria	PCR work score	IDEV review	Reasons for deviation/comments
	Beneficiary2	UTS	2	
	Unanticipated outcomes (positive or negative not considered in the project logical framework) and their level of impact on the project (high, moderate, low)			
	Institutional development	UTS	UTS	
	Gender	UTS	UTS	
	Environment & climate change	UTS	UTS	
	Poverty reduction	UTS	UTS	
	Private sector development	UTS	UTS	
	Regional integration	UTS	UTS	
	Other (specify)			
EFFECTIVENESS OVERALL SCORE				
EFFICIENCY	Timeliness (based on the initial closing date)	2.96	3	
	Resource used efficiency	4	4	
	Cost-benefit analysis	3.8	2	Cost benefit analysis incorrectly double counted benefits
	Implementation progress (from the IPR)	3	3	
	Other (specify)			
OVERALL EFFICIENCY SCORE				
SUSTAINABILITY	Financial sustainability	3	3	
	Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities	3	4	Institutions are on sustainable basis.
	Ownership and sustainability of partnerships	3	3	
	Environmental and social sustainability	3	3	
<p>*The rating of the effectiveness component is obtained from the development objective (DO) rating in the latest IPR of the project (see Guidance Note on the IPR).</p> <p>The ratings for outputs and outcomes are determined based on the project's progress towards realizing its targets, and the overall development objective of the project (DO) is obtained by combining the ratings obtained for outputs and outcomes following the method defined in the IPR Guidance Note. The following method is applied: Highly satisfactory (4), Satisfactory (3), Unsatisfactory (2) and Highly unsatisfactory (1).</p>				

Criteria	Sub-criteria	PCR Work score	IDEV review	Reasons for deviation/comments
BANK PERFORMANCE	Proactive identification and resolution of problems at different stage of the project cycle	UTS	UTS	
	Use of previous lessons learned from previous operations during design and implementation	UTS	4	
	Promotion of stakeholder participation to strengthen ownership	UTS	4	
	Enforcement of safeguard and fiduciary requirements	UTS	UTS	
	Design and implementation of Monitoring & Evaluation system	UTS	1	
	Quality of Bank supervision (mix of skills in supervisory teams, etc)	UTS	UTS	
	Timeliness of responses to requests	UTS	UTS	
OVERALL BANK PERFORMANCE SCORE		4	3	
BORROWER PERFORMANCE	Quality of preparation and implementation	UTS	4	
	Compliance with covenants, agreements and safeguards	UTS	UTS	
	Provision of timely counterpart funding	UTS	4	
	Responsiveness to supervision recommendations	UTS	UTS	
	Measures taken to establish basis for project sustainability	UTS	4	
	Timeliness of preparing requests	UTS	UTS	
OVERALL BORROWER PERFORMANCE SCORE		3.5	4	
PERFORMANCE OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS	Timeliness of disbursements by co-financiers	UTS	UTS	
	Functioning of collaborative agreements	UTS	4	
	Quality of policy dialogue with co-financiers (for PBOs only)	UTS	UTS	
	Quality of work by service providers	UTS	4	
	Responsiveness to client demands	UTS	UTS	
OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS		4	4	
The overall rating is given: Very Good, Good, Fair and Poor.				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Very Good (HS) : 4 (ii) Good (H) : 3 (iii) Fair (US) : 2 (iv) Poor (HUS): 1 				

**DESIGN, IMPLEMENTAION AND UTILIZATION OF MONITIRING AND
EVALUATION (M&E)**

Criteria	Sub-criteria	IDEV Score	Comments
M&E DESIGN	M&E system is in place, clear, appropriate and realistic	1	
	Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan were duly approved	1	
	Existence of disaggregated gender indicator	1	
	Baseline data were available or collected during the design	1	
	Other, specify		
OVERALL M&E DESIGN SCORE			
M&E IMPLEMENTATION	The M&E function is adequately equipped and staffed	1	
OVERALL M&E IMPLEMENTATION SCORE			
M&E UTILIZATION	The borrower used the tracking information for decision	1	
OVERALL M&E UTILIZATION SCORE			
OVERALL M&E PERFORMANCE SCORE		1	

PCR QUALITY EVALUATION

Criteria	PCR-EVN (1-4)	Comments
QUALITY OF PCR		
1. Extent of quality and completeness of the PCR evidence and analysis to substantiate the ratings of the various sections	2	
2. Extent of objectivity of PCR assessment score	3	
3. Extent of internal consistency of PCR assessment ratings; inaccuracies; inconsistencies; (in various sections; between text and ratings; consistency of overall rating with individual component ratings)	2	
4. Extent of identification and assessment of key factors (internal and exogenous) and unintended effects (positive or negative) affecting design and implementation	3	
5. Adequacy of treatment of safeguards, fiduciary issues, and alignment and harmonization	2	
6. Extent of soundness of data generating and analysis process (including rates of returns) in support of PCR assessment	2	
7. Overall adequacy of the accessible evidence (from PCR including annexure and other data provided)	2	
8. Extent to which lessons learned (and recommendations) are clear and based on the PCR assessment (evidence & analysis)	3	
9. Extent of overall clarity and completeness of the PCR	2	
Other (specify)		
PCR QUALITY SCORE	2	
PCR compliance with guidelines (PCR/OM ; IDEV)		
1. PCR Timeliness (On time = 4; Late= 1)	3	
2. Extent of participation of borrower, Co-financiers & field offices in PCR preparation	UTS	
3. Other aspect(s) (specify)		
PCR COMPLIANCE SCORE	3	
*** rated as Very Good (4), or Good (3), or Fair (2), or Poor (1)		

References

African Development Bank Group, Rwanda National Rural Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Programme (PNEAR) (Phase II: Second Sub-Programme- 2009-2012), Appraisal Report, February 2009

African Development Bank Group, Rwanda National Rural Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Programme (PNEAR) (Phase II: Second Sub-Programme- 2009-2012) Project Completion Report. ,December 2015

African Development Bank Group, Rwanda National Rural Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Programme (PNEAR) (Phase II: Second Sub-Programme- 2009-2012) Matrix of Comments. Undated