

PCR EVALUATION NOTE FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS

1. BASIC INFORMATION

a. Basic project data			
Project title: Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Program II			
Project code: P-TZ-EA0-010	Instrument number(s): 2100150022943 and 5800155000551		
Project type: ADF Loan, RWSSI Trust Fund	Sector: Water Supply and Sanitation		
Country: Tanzania	Environmental categorization (1-3) : 2		
Processing Milestones	Key Events	Disbursement and Closing date	
Date approved: 15 Sept 2010	Cancelled amount:	Original disbursement deadline: 31 Dec 2015	
Date signed: 11 Mar 2011	Supplementary financing:	Original closing date: 31 Dec 2015	
Date of entry into force : 24 Oct 2011	Restructuring:	Revised disbursement deadline:	
Date effective for 1st disbursement: 31 Jul 2011	Extensions (specify dates):	Revised closing date:	
Date of actual 1st : 24 Nov 2011			
b. Financing sources			
Financing source/ instrument (MUA)	Approved amount (MUA) :	Disbursed amount (MUA) :	Percentage disbursed (%) :
ADF Loan	59,000,000.00	59,000,000.00	100
RWSSI Trust Fund	6,000,000.00	6,000,000.00	100
Government contribution	15,000,000.00	15,000,000.00	100
Other (ex. Co-financiers):			
IDA Loan	50,000,000.00	50,000,000.00	100
DFID Grant	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	100
Other Development Partners (DPs) (Loans/Grants)	15,000,000.00	15,000,000.00	100
Beneficiaries contribution	5,000,000.00	5,000,000.00	100
TOTAL :	200,000,000.00	200,000,000.00	100
Co-financiers and other external partners: International Development Association (IDA), department for International Development (DFID), Government OF Tanzania (GoT), Other Development Partners (DPs), Beneficiaries			
Execution and implementation agencies: Ministry of Water and Irrigation (MOWI), Ministry of Health and Social Welfare (MOHSW), President's Office - Regional Administration and Local Government (PO-RALG) - Executing Agencies (EAs). Local Government Authorities (LGAs) - Implementing Agencies (IAs)			

c. Responsible Bank staff		
Position	At approval	At completion
Regional Director	Ms. Diaretou GAYE	Mr. Gabriel NEGATU
Country Manager	Mr. Prajesh BHAKTA	Ms. Tonia KANDIERO
Sector Director	Mr. Ali KIES	Mr. EL Azizi MOHAMED
Sector Manager	Mr. Sering B. JALLOW	Mr. Oswald M. CHANDA
Task Manager	Mr. Paul DZIMIRI	Mr. Sabas MARANDU
Alternate Task Manager	Mr. Sabas MARANDU	
PCR Team Leader		Ms. Nancy A.A. OGAL (OWAS.2)
PCR Team Members		Mr. Hamisi S. SIMBA (TZFO) Mr. Alex GOMANI (OWAS.2)
d. Report data		
PCR Date : 24 Jun 2016		
PCR Mission Date:	From: 13 Jun 2016	To: 24 Jun 2016
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.

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.

Rational

The rational for the project as stated in the appraisal report is that

- Almost one out of every two rural Tanzanians do not have access to improved water supply and sanitation,
- The ongoing Rural water Supply and Sanitation project (RWSSPP) Phase I has to date been successfully implemented, and
- Investments (logistics, rehabilitation/new district water offices, equipment, training) have been made which created a good program foundation for additional investments.

The level of investment in Phase I fell far short of the demand. Phase II investment is expected to increase coverage for both water and sanitation by taking advantage of the momentum built from Phase I. This additional investment will also help the country meet its Millennium Development Goals (MDGs.)

Expected impacts

The expected impact is improved health and socio-economic well being of the rural population.

Intended Beneficiaries

The intended beneficiaries are the rural population of Tanzania.

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.

The Program objectives from the logical framework in the Appraisal Report are:

- **To improve district level capacity to implement demand-based Rural Water and Sanitation (RWSS) programs.**
- **To improve access of rural communities to water and sanitation services operated and maintained by capable persons.**
- **To improve health & hygiene practices.**

The expected Outcomes, from the logical framework in the Appraisal Report are:

- **District Water and Sanitation Teams (DWSTs) capacity to appraise community sub project**
- **DWSTs capacity to secure funds for and implement community subprojects**
- **DWSTs monitoring & supporting communities in RWSS O&M, promotion of good sanitation, health and hygienic practices.**
- **Increased number of rural communities with adequate management, operation and maintenance capabilities.**
- **Improved knowledge, attitudes and practices in relation of health and hygiene and sanitation including increased use of latrines.**

The expected beneficiaries, from the appraisal report are:

- **All rural districts in the country**
- **Prime Minister's Office Regional Administration and Local Government (PMO-RALG) and Ministry of Water and Industry (MOWI) Staff involved in National Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Programs (NRWSSP)**
- **Rural Tanzanians**

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 from the Appraisal Report logical framework are:

1. **Districts and Regional staff have access to information and data for Management Information Systems (MIS).**
2. **Up to date operational field information available to all stakeholders**
3. **Based upon the DWSP and using agreed criteria, Communities, with the support of District Councils, identify suitable sub-projects for implementation**
4. **Water points constructed**
5. **Capacity to repair and spare parts available near/in the village**
6. **Demand created for household & school facilities**

7. Capacity developed in MOWI to mainstreaming gender issues

d. Principal activities/Components:

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

From the Appraisal Report's logical framework, the principal activities are:

- 1. Install an MIS for the NRWSSP in all districts/regions**
- 2. Establish and operationalize a water point mapping system**
- 3. Formulate District Water and Sanitation Plans including priority criteria for projects**
- 4. Procure contractors/consultants and implement RWSS sub-projects**
- 5. Establish a hand pump supply chain and train community technicians**
- 6. National Sanitation Campaign & School WASH established**
- 7. Strengthen MoWI to mainstream gender in RWSS National Program**

3. PROJECT PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

The assessment of project performance is based mostly on the PCR, the Aide Memoire of the PCR mission, and on the appraisal report. The IPR was done at the time of the PCR mission. In most cases where an assessment is called for in the IPR the IPR says to refer to the PCR for details. Also, no supervision reports were provided to the PCREN team, except for the aide memoire.

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 development objectives of the RWSSP Phase II are highly relevant. The project is part of the National Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Program (NRWSSP), which according to the appraisal report, is the Government's long-term plan for the development of the sub-sector to meet the MDG targets and beyond.

The program is also in line with the Bank Group vision and strategic plan and the Millennium Development Goals. It falls within the objectives stated in the Country Strategy Paper 2006-2010

(Cluster II, Improvement in the quality of life and social well-being), concerning support for development of basic infrastructure in the rural areas, including water supply and sanitation. It also falls within the PRSP objective for the water supply and sanitation sector. The Bank has developed the Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Initiative (RWSSI) to address the rural situation in the water sector, which is much worse compared with the urban situation. The RWSSP Phase I and Phase II are the results of the RWSSI support to Tanzania and have resulted in a large program supported by several District Programs, who are part of the ongoing Phase I and will take part in Phase II as well.

The development objectives and outcomes are clearly stated and since the project is a follow-on to the RWSSP Phase I, it is based on experience in Tanzania.

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.

The program was jointly prepared and appraised with the World Bank, AFD, KfW, WSP and other DPs and officials of the Government of Tanzania (GOT), who included the Ministry of Finance & Economic Affairs (MOFEA), Ministry of Water and Irrigation (MOWI), Ministry of Health and Social Welfare (MOHSW) and PMO-RALG. This assured the widest possible assessment of design challenges.

The design took advantage of lessons learned in Phase I, especially with regard to institutional issues for sanitation, where the sanitation component has been moved to the MOHSW, except for construction of School Latrines.

In Phase I, a number of water points were constructed without proper community involvement. This resulted in lack of ownership of the schemes with limited understanding of how to run the schemes. In Phase II, community involvement at all stages of program implementation will be strictly followed.

According to the PCR, design issues that arose during implementation included: i) water quality (fluoride levels beyond the acceptable threshold in some areas), ii) Seasonal fluctuations in water supply at some of the identified sources, and iii) Inadequate faecal sludge management of sanitation facilities.

These point to possible quality at entry and quality of implementation issues.

- Water quality should have been addressed with early testing prior to the installation of water points during implementation.
- Assessing the seasonal fluctuations in water availability should have been identified as a necessary part of implementation so that corrective measures could be taken at an early stage.
- Management of sanitation facilities should normally be agreed with communities at appraisal.

To this could be added the lack of tariff studies in the project activities, lack of a plan to support

the financial sustainability of the community organizations charged with operating the water systems and the lack of data the MIS on financial status of the operating institutions.

Rating = 3

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 IPR provided to the PCREN team is an annex to the PCR. That Annex says that the IPR was updated during the PCR mission in July 2016. However, wherever the IPR form called for a non-numerical assessment, the reader was referred to the PCR for further details. There was no independent assessment in the IPR. Also, there were no supervision reports provided to the PCREN team, except for the aide memoire of the Joint supervision and Implementation Completion and Result (ICR) Mission, of the Water Sector Development Program (WSDP). Therefore this PCREN had to rely almost exclusively on data from the PCR.

The outputs shown in the table below are the outputs listed in the log-frame of the Appraisal Report. The PCR uses a different list. The PCR uses the list of target indicators for outputs in the logframe rather than the list of outputs itself. Some outputs, i.e. numbers 4 and 5 in the table below are not discussed at all in the PCR.

Outputs from logical framework in appraisal report	Targets met according to PCR	PCREN Comment
1. Districts and Regional staff have access to information and data for Management Information Systems (MIS).	168 LGUs with MIS systems vs target of 132	Target exceeded. However, later sections of the PCR indicate that there were shortcomings in data collection and disaggregation by gender.
2. Up to date operational field information available to all stakeholders	131 LGUs vs target of 132 have district level operational plans	Target met
3. Based upon the DWSP and using agreed criteria, Communities, with the support of District Councils, identify suitable sub-projects for implementation	This output, is not directly reported on by the PCR. The target indicator for this output was an additional 4.6 million people supplied with water. The achievement was 7.1 million supplied with water.	There is no information in the PCR about whether communities themselves identified sub-projects with the district council's support. The target for beneficiaries supplied with water was substantially exceeded
4. Water points constructed	Not reported in PCR	No information in PCR on numbers of water points constructed, but the number of beneficiaries clearly indicate that the number of water points constructed must have exceeded the target.
5. Capacity to repair and spare parts available near/in the village	Not reported in this section of the PCR	No information, but the PCR in section 4 d on the lessons learned on

		sustainability indicates that this is a problem.
6. Demand created for household & school facilities	Demand is not directly discussed in PCR but PCR says 1.4 million household latrines were constructed vs a target of 1.5 million. It also says that 1419 school Water and Sanitation projects were implemented vs the target of 264 schools.	Target exceeded.
7. Capacity developed in MOWI to mainstreaming gender issues	Target was 50% of water utilities have women in decision making positions	No records were maintained concerning this indicator. Nevertheless, the PCR says that this output can be viewed as met given the mandatory requirement to include 50% of women in the management committees of community groups. Unfortunately the PCR does not indicate whether it was able to verify that this requirement was being met.

While it is easier for the PCR to assess results based on quantifiable indicators of outputs rather than on the outputs themselves, there should be a discussion of the outputs themselves, especially when the indicators diverge from the outputs.

In fact, some outputs are not discussed at all in this section. For example, the capacity to repair and spare parts (#5) is a particularly important output that section 4 d on the lessons learned on sustainability indicates may be a problem. This should have been discussed here.

The Project far exceeded targets for the number of additional people supplied with water. However, because of the lack of focus during implementation on the capacity to repair and on spare parts, the rating is less than 4.

Rating = 3

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 PCR discusses the outcome indicators rather than the outcomes themselves.

List of outcomes from the appraisal report logical framework	Achievements	PCREN Comments
1. District Water and Sanitation Teams (DWSTs) capacity to appraise community sub project	The capacity of DWSTs to appraise is not discussed in the PCR	The PCR reports on the percentage of rural communities with access to water. The achievement of this indicator was 75% of the appraisal target. Another methodology by the BRN Lab (not explained in the PCR) give a more favourable achievement of

		94%
2. DWSTs capacity to secure funds for and implement community subprojects	The ability to secure funds was not discussed in the PCR	The PCR reports on the indicator of percentage of rural communities with access to improved sanitation. The PCR says the achievement of this indicator was 75% of the appraisal target. However, this is on the basis of counting all latrines, both improved and unimproved rather than just improved.
3. DWSTs monitoring & supporting communities in RWSS O&M, promotion of good sanitation, health and hygienic practices.	This was not discussed in the PCR	
4. Increased number of rural communities with adequate management, operation and maintenance capabilities.	This was not discussed in the PCR	
5. Improved knowledge, attitudes and practices in relation of health and hygiene and sanitation including increased use of latrines.	This was not discussed in the PCR	The PCR reports on increase in the percent of communities with gender balance in membership of rural water committees. This increased by 250% of target.

A discussion of the outcome indicators in the PCR is not sufficient. The indicators are not the same as the expected outcomes. There should also be some discussion of the expected outcomes themselves.

Given the deficiencies and omissions in the discussion of the outcomes as listed in the logical framework of the appraisal report, Rating = 2

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).

The ratings for outcomes and output were combined to assess the progress that the project made towards realizing its development objectives.

The Rating = 2

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.

Actual (A) According to PCR	Planned (B) From Logical framework	Progress towards target (% realized) (A/B)	% of women	Comment by PCREN
168 beneficiary LGAs with MIS	132 LGAs	128.2%	n/a	n/a
131 beneficiary	132 LGAs	100.7%	n/a	n/a

LGAs with RWSS plans				
7,121,533 additional people in rural areas with access to water supply	4,600,000 people	154.8%	-	PCR says that data as reported by the WP-MIS of MOWI was not disaggregated by gender and therefore the gender categories of beneficiaries can not be specified.
1419 schools with improved latrines	264 schools	537.5%	n/a	1,139 out of the 1419 schools attained the student to latrine ratio (1:50 boys, 1:40 girls per facility) stipulated by guidelines.
1,386,210 households with latrines	2 million additional latrines	69%	-	The PCR shows a target of 1,520,000 additional latrines instead of a target of 2 million in the Appraisal Report. The PCR also says the data as reported by Health-MIS of MOHSW was not disaggregated by gender and therefore the gender of beneficiaries cannot be specified.

Note that with respect to the number of additional latrines constructed, the PCR says that the target in the PAR was 2 million. However, the PCR uses a lower target of 1,520,000 latrines. It offers no explanation as to why this lower target was used. Later under the section “lessons learned” the PCR says that the reason was that there were insufficient funds to construct the original planned number of latrines and the BRN-lab decided to reduce the target. However, for purposes of evaluation, unless the Bank formally agrees to the reduced target as part of a project restructuring, the original target remains valid.

The data on the number of additional people in rural areas with access to water supply is given as 7,121,533. This number gives a false sense of precision. The Aide Memoire of the PCR mission indicates that the number of beneficiaries is obtained by multiplying the number of water points constructed by the number of beneficiaries per water point. Because the number of beneficiaries per water point is an estimated national average, the number of beneficiaries should be rounded. More importantly, the PCR should provide a brief explanation of the methodology used to obtain the numbers of actual beneficiaries, given the importance of this number.

Despite the issue with the reporting of numbers and targets, the actual accomplishment of serving beneficiaries appears significant.

Rating = 4

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 Additional Outcomes from the PCR	Type	Positive or negative	Comments of PCREN
Reduction in family conflicts previously attributable to prolonged absence of females members of households in search for water.	Social	Positive	Agree
Appreciation in land value in areas with reliable water supply.	Economic	Positive	Land value increases from improved infrastructure should have been anticipated
Migration of nomadic communities back to areas that were previously deserted.	Social	Positive	Agree
Direct and indirect job creation at the construction stage of WSS facilities and at the post commissioning phase of water supply systems.	Economic	Positive	This is not an unanticipated benefit unless the level is significantly higher than normal.

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.

Planned period of implementation: 5 years.

Actual period of implementation: from 31/07 2011 (time of effectiveness for 1st disbursement) to 31/12/2015 four years and five months.

Rating = 4

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).

The PCR sets the median % physical implementation of RLF outputs financed by all financiers (A) at 127.3.

It sets the % commitment rate (B) at 100.

$A/B = 1.27$ Rating = 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 main text of the appraisal report provides almost no information on the methodology used in the cost benefit analysis, and says that the details are contained in Annex B7. Unfortunately, this annex is not part of the appraisal report that is available to the PCREN team. Because the Annex with details is not available, the PCREN cannot comment on the data or methodology used at appraisal.

Appendix IV of the PCR does contain a table that shows the calculations that underlie the cost benefit analysis as recalculated at completion.

The methodology used in the PCR is apparently different from that used in the appraisal report, because the appraisal report indicates that non-revenue water is a factor, whereas the PCR does not rely on revenues to the water providers for the estimate of benefits. The benefits in the PCR are: the monetary value of convenience time saved, productive time saved and health treatment times saved. From the table given in the PCR, the methodology seems mostly reasonable, but there is not enough of an explanation of the benefits in three areas of the analysis

First, the PCR discussion of the cost benefit analysis says that the lower number of latrines actually built (1.386 million vs 2.0 million forecast at appraisal) did not affect the benefits of the project. However, in the table in the annex, only the number of beneficiaries of improved water is used. The number of beneficiaries from the construction of latrines is not used in the table. So arithmetically there is no way the cost benefit ratio computed in the PCR would be changed by construction of fewer latrines. Even 0 latrines would result in the same cost benefit result. The PCR does not explain why the cost benefit analysis, does not include benefits from latrines.

Second, the source of the estimates for monetary value of convenience time saved, productive time saved and health treatment times saved per beneficiary are not given.

Third, the Appendix says that “*an additional beneficiary population of 7.1 million is used, based on a programmed population of 31 million in 2016.*” It is not clear what this means. However, the Aide Memoire of the PCR mission indicates that the number of beneficiaries is determined by multiplying the number of water-points times the national average of beneficiaries per water point. Using a national parameter instead of the number of beneficiaries per water point based on direct observation after completion is rarely appropriate. Conditions differ far too much in different localities for a national parameter to be appropriate. The monitoring and evaluation should have focused on developing area specific parameters in the project area. Related to this is the question of how the number of water points was determined, given that many rural communities opted for piped systems that served larger geographical areas, rather than individual boreholes.

The computed IRR at completion is 22%; The computed IRR at appraisal is 17%.

Given the apparent different methodology used in the appraisal report and in the PCR, and the lack of explanation of the sources of data used for benefits in the PCR computation,

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).

According to the PCR:

Compliance with covenants: All conditions were fulfilled.

Environmental and Social (E&S) Safeguards: At appraisal, an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) was prepared and was incorporated in contract documents at implementation. Based on findings from the PCR mission field visits, the plans were periodically assessed on a project-by-project basis. The PCR further found that the assessments were not done sufficiently and presented significant challenges at implementation.

Program systems and procedures: satisfactory

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Framework: M&E modalities proved to be important improvements for the sector. Nevertheless there were shortcomings in data collection and disaggregation by gender.

Program execution and financing: Bank and co-financier financing was fully disbursed before the closing date. However, a major problem was the delayed flow of funds from the treasury, which severely affected program implementation.

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.

The PCR does not provide data on the financial condition of the Community Owner Water Supply Operators (COWSOs). Nevertheless the PCR notes that high operation and maintenance (O&M) costs, especially for diesel engine generators and high electricity bills are affecting the sustainability of water operations in the project areas. The only exceptions are areas that have renewable energy sources such as solar powered systems which have lower O&M costs.. This is compounded by lack of meters in some of the water supply systems, which limits the ability of the COWSOs to gauge actual consumption and levy commensurate fees. The PCR says that behavioural malpractices such as continuous running taps are very common because of lack of

meters, and as a result the non-revenue water is likely to be high. There is also the problem of limited technical and administrative capacities of COWSOs. In the “lessons learned” section, the PCR says that, “The majority of the COWSOs are reportedly unable to generate sufficient revenue to cover operational costs.” And that “rationalized tariff regimes have not been put in place by most COWSOs.”

Rating = 2

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.

According to the PCR, the program has made contributions to strengthening institutional capacities especially those of the LGAs by installation of the WP-MIS system and development of RWSS plans, and of COWSOs for which a capacity building package was defined. The shortfall, however, is that not all the COWSOs were trained,

In terms of staffing, the PCR says that there is evidence of skill existing within the MOWI and the LGAs. The PCR mission team observed that the program might have played a more significant role had a comprehensive institutional assessment taken place at appraisal and corresponding action plan for capacity building been developed.

Rating = 3

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.

Ownership: A series of participatory meetings and discussions were conducted by all stakeholders including beneficiaries during project design, which subsequent led to the formation and subsequent registration of COWSOs. Stakeholder consultation at implementation stage resulted in community groups applying for funding for water supply projects

Sustainability of Partnerships: In the case of sanitation and hygiene, coordination teams both at national and sub national (PO-RALG) level according to the PCR may not be fully staffed and the few staff available may not have all necessary resources and authority to perform the needed program coordination functions. At local level it was found that council planning and budgeting as well as coordination need further strengthening. In some LGAs, Sanitation and Hygiene stakeholder activities are not included in the Water and Sanitation Plans as required under WSDP Programme Implementation Manual. The PCR anticipates that the regulator would address key

O&M challenges with bearing of sustainability in the sub-sector.

Rating = 3

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 PCR makes two conflicting statements: It says that, "as part of the program design, systematic and comprehensive E&S management, monitoring, and reporting mechanisms were established." It also says that "However, progress on the ESMP at the project level could not be assessed by the mission given there was no systematic monitoring and periodic reporting on the status of the ESMP". The PCR provides some data for compliance with environmental signoffs for the national program as a whole, i.e. the entire WSDP including the water resources management, RWSS and the urban water supply and sewerage components. However, disaggregated data for the RWSS component was not available.

Because the data is not available, Rating = 2

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.

The Borrower stated that overall performance of the Bank was commendable.

The PCR notes that the Bank supervised the program regularly, maintained regular dialogue with the authorities and provided necessary solutions where required. It was also noted that the time taken by the Bank to grant no objection to program documents and to react to various requests from the borrower was generally satisfactory. The Bank's Field office in Tanzania maintained regular communication and follow-up with the MOWI and the MOHSW

The PCR mission is however of the opinion that during supervision missions and at the mid-term review, the Bank did not seek to establish concrete measures to ensure data collection as part of the M&E framework. The mission also noted that the supervision missions did not wholly benefit from a multidisciplinary skills mix (social/ gender and environmental experts) in order to adequately support the program by reviewing and processing of safeguards documents for the projects.

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 there are a number of areas in which the Borrower performed well.

- It coordinated project identification among donors ensured avoidance of duplication of projects and helped to build partnerships between Government and the DPs.
- MOWI provided leadership at implementation ensuring adherence to guidelines and procedures as required by the various actors.
- Government was found to be responsive to the joint supervision mission findings and recommendations.
- The Borrower has also subjected the program operations to regular internal audits and concerns raised were expeditiously addressed.

However, the Borrower performed poorly in program execution and financing. There were delays in flow of funds to the IAs. The Borrower did not seek to establish concrete measures to ensure data collection as part of the M&E framework. The officials involved in data collection at the LGAs did not have adequate logistics to facilitate implementation of their roles. This should have been identified during appraisal. There was also low prioritization of the WASH component which resulted in partial fulfillment of planned outcome and output indicators.

Rating = 3

c. Performance of other stakeholders:

Provide observations on the objectivity of the PCR ratings, and if necessary, re-assess the other stakeholders' 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).

According to the PCR:

Co-financiers: There was adequate coordination between the development partners involved in the national program financing. In particular, joint supervision missions and meetings drawing participation from all stakeholders were periodically conducted and challenges that were encountered were openly discussed.

LGAs: The good working relationship between the Local Government Authorities (LGAs) impacted positively on implementation of program activities. The LGAs readily provided information whenever required by the DPs and Government and intervened on behalf of MOWI and MOHSW whenever issues arose on project implementation.

Contractors: In the section on *lessons learned related to effectiveness*, the PCR notes that the large number of projects implemented under the program led to a mushrooming of inexperienced contractors into the sector, which resulted in unsatisfactory workmanship in some cases.

Rating = 3

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.

Combining the 4 key components (Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Sustainability),
The overall 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 appraisal report does not contain a separate cost estimate of the M&E system. While the PCR says that such a system was installed, it also says that useful data on Environment and social issues was not maintained and was unavailable.

Rating = 2

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.

Lessons from PCR	PCREN comments
1. Leadership and effective coordination are crucial for rolling out complex projects.	Agree, but this is a fairly obvious lesson that has been learned in every complex project. Nothing is cited that is particular to this Bank intervention.
2. Multiplier effects accrued from the Sector Wide Approach to investment in the water and sanitation sector. The sector wide approach adopted under the program enabled leveraging and coordination of funding from several sources including from Development Partners, Government and beneficiaries.	Agree. Important point.
3. Project planning - Integrated and holistic approach is fundamental for development impact	An integrated and holistic approach is fundamental to program planning for the water sector as a whole. However <u>it is not always fundamental that each individual project include all aspects of water resources management</u> . This can over complicate a project to the point where individual important components do not get the attention they deserve. The examples given in the PCR lesson indicate poor planning of the components mentioned, not a lack of integrated planning.
4. Program execution – funds flow. Government should streamline procedures for project funds flow to ensure timeliness for effective program implementation in the future.	Agree. This is a continuing issue.
5. Results monitoring . Project level monitoring should be	

ensured even in SWAP s. Monitoring units need to be funded at a level that allows them to carry out responsibilities.	Agreed
---	--------

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.

Recommendations	PCREN Comments
Sustaining gains from the National Sanitation Campaign (NSC) Campaigns to target community groups that were not sensitized under the program should be continued. Appropriate M&E mechanisms should be instituted to ensure that the momentum is sustained in communities that have already been sensitized under the program	Agreed
Financial sustainability in the rural water supply and sanitation sector. Government should incorporate tariff studies at the formulation stages of future investments in the rural water sector. MOWI should also step up registration of all COWSOs and ensure training of sector actors including COWSOs on best practices in O&M including tariff setting to ensure financial sustainability of water supply operations. Government should also commit to implementing its plan to establish a regulatory body for the RWSS sub-sector to streamline operations.	Agreed
Supply chain management in the local construction and water sector O&M . There is need to develop, through training and experience building, a pool of competent construction firms at the local level. There is also need for Government support to existing structures to enable adequate supply chain management for spare parts and construction materials so that demand for maintenance services of COWSOs are met.	Agreed

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).

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	3	3.5	
Relevance of project development objective	3	4	The development objective is highly relevant and consistent with government and Bank policies and strategies.
Relevance of project design	3	3	
EFFECTIVENESS	4	3	
Development objective (DO)	4	2	Because of lack of focus during implementation on the capacity to repair and on spare parts, lack of discussion of outcomes
EFFICIENCY	3.75	3.75	
Timeliness	4	4	
Resource use efficiency	4	4	
Cost-benefit analysis	4	2	Questionable benefits that are not explained
Implementation progress (IP)	3	3	
SUSTAINABILITY	2.7	2.3	
Financial sustainability	2	2	
Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities	3	3	
Environmental and social sustainability	3	2	According to the PCR there was no systematic monitoring and periodic reporting on the status of the ESMP
OVERALL PROJECT COMPLETION RATING			
Bank performance:	3	3	
Borrower performance:	3	3	
Performance of other shareholders:	3	3	
Overall PCR quality:		3	

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	3	4	The development objective is highly relevant and consistent with government and Bank policies and strategies.
	Relevance of project design (from approval to completion)	3	3	
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	2	Lack of discussion and lack of data on key outcomes
	Beneficiaries			
	Beneficiary1	UTS	UTS	
	Beneficiary2	UTS	UTS	

Criteria	Sub-criteria	PCR work score	IDEV review	Reasons for deviation/comments
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)	UTS	UTS	
EFFECTIVENESS OVERALL SCORE				
EFFICIENCY	Timeliness (based on the initial closing date)	4	4	
	Resource used efficiency	4	4	
	Cost-benefit analysis	4	2	Lack of explanation of data and benefits
	Implementation progress (from the IPR)	3	3	
	Other (specify)	UTS	UTS	
OVERALL EFFICIENCY SCORE		4	3	Insufficient information about cost benefit analysis
SUSTAINABILITY	Financial sustainability	2	2	
	Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities	3	3	
	Ownership and sustainability of partnerships	3	3	
	Environmental and social sustainability	3	2	According to the PCR there was no systematic monitoring and periodic reporting on the status of the ESMP
<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	UTS	
	Promotion of stakeholder participation to strengthen ownership	UTS	UTS	
	Enforcement of safeguard and fiduciary requirements	UTS	UTS	
	Design and implementation of Monitoring & Evaluation system	UTS	2	According to the PCR there was no systematic monitoring and periodic reporting on the status of the ESMP
	Quality of Bank supervision (mix of skills in supervisory teams, etc)	UTS	UTS	
	Timeliness of responses to requests	UTS	UTS	
OVERALL BANK PERFORMANCE SCORE				
BORROWER PERFORMANCE	Quality of preparation and implementation	UTS	UTS	
	Compliance with covenants, agreements and safeguards	UTS	UTS	
	Provision of timely counterpart funding	UTS	UTS	
	Responsiveness to supervision recommendations	UTS	UTS	
	Measures taken to establish basis for project sustainability	UTS	UTS	
	Timeliness of preparing requests	UTS	UTS	
OVERALL BORROWER PERFORMANCE SCORE				
PERFORMANCE OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS	Timeliness of disbursements by co-financiers	UTS	UTS	
	Functioning of collaborative agreements	UTS	UTS	
	Quality of policy dialogue with co-financiers (for PBOs only)	UTS	UTS	
	Quality of work by service providers	UTS	UTS	
	Responsiveness to client demands	UTS	UTS	
OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF OTHER STAKEHOLDERS				
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, IMPLEMENTATION AND UTILIZATION OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION (M&E)

Criteria	Sub-criteria	IDEV Score	Comments
M&E DESIGN	M&E system is in place, clear, appropriate and realistic	2	According to the PCR there was no systematic monitoring and periodic reporting on the status of the ESMP. Sources of data on beneficiaries are unclear.
	Monitoring indicators and monitoring plan were duly approved	UTS	
	Existence of disaggregated gender indicator	2	According to the PCR the gender data was not disaggregated
	Baseline data were available or collected during the design	2	Insufficient baseline data
	Other, specify		
OVERALL M&E DESIGN SCORE		2	
M&E IMPLEMENTATION	The M&E function is adequately equipped and staffed	UTS	
OVERALL M&E IMPLEMENTATION SCORE		2	
M&E UTILIZATION	The borrower used the tracking information for decision	UTS	
OVERALL M&E UTILIZATION SCORE		2	
OVERALL M&E PERFORMANCE SCORE		2	

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	3	
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)	3	
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	3	
6. Extent of soundness of data generating and analysis process (including rates of returns) in support of PCR assessment	2	Sources of some data not explained
7. Overall adequacy of the accessible evidence (from PCR including annexure and other data provided)	3	
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	3	
Other (specify)		
PCR QUALITY SCORE	3	
PCR compliance with guidelines (PCR/OM ; IDEV)		
1. PCR Timeliness (On time = 4; Late= 1)	4	
2. Extent of participation of borrower, Co-financiers & field offices in PCR preparation	UTS	
3. Other aspect(s) (specify)		
PCR COMPLIANCE SCORE	4	
*** rated as Very Good (4), or Good (3), or Fair (2), or Poor (1)		

References

African Development Bank, Rural Water Supply and Rural Water and Sanitation Program II. *Country Tanzania : TANZANIA, Project Completion Report. June 2016*

African Development Bank, Rural Water Supply and Rural Water and Sanitation Program II. *Country Tanzania : TANZANIA, Project Appraisal Report. April 2010*

African Development Bank, Rural Water Supply and Rural Water and Sanitation Program II. *Country Tanzania : TANZANIA, Aide Memoire Project Completion Report mission, 24 June 2016*

Tanzania Ministry of Water, 15th Joint supervision and Implementation Completion and Result (ICR) Mission, Water Sector Development Program (WSDP) October 8-20, 2015 Aide Memoire