

---

# PROGRAM EVALUATION OF PARTNERSHIP FOR AFRICA'S WATER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (PAWD)

## -GLOBAL WATER PARTNERSHIP-

### FINAL REPORT



**Prepared For:**  
**Canada Fund for Africa**  
**Canadian International Development Agency**  
**July 7<sup>th</sup>, 2008**

Plan:Net Limited – [www.plannet.ca](http://www.plannet.ca) and  
Mosaic International – [www.mosaic-net-intl.ca](http://www.mosaic-net-intl.ca)

## List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

AfDB	African Development Bank
AMCOW	African Ministers' Council on Water
AU	African Union
AWPs	Area Water Partnerships
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CSD	Commission on Sustainable Development
CSD	Commission on Sustainable Development
CWPs	Country Water Partnerships
DGPRES	Directorate for Management and Planning of Water Resources
DNH	Direction Nationale de l'Hydraulique
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FNDP	Five Year National Development Plan
GTZ	Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit
GWA	Gender and Water Alliance
GWP	Global Water Partnership
GWP-EnA	Global Water Partnership – East Africa
GWP-SA	Global Water Partnership – Southern Africa
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
IWRM	Integrated Water Resource Management
KWP	Kenya Water Partnership
LFA	Logical Framework Analysis
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MEWD	Ministry of Environment and Water Development
MEWD	Ministry of Energy and Water Development
MGDS	Malawi Growth and Development Strategy
MOFP	Ministry of Finance and Planning
MoiWD	Ministry of Irrigation and Water Development
MWP	Malawi Water Partnership
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGOs	Non Governmental Organization
NWPs	National Water Partnerships
OAU	Organization of African Unity

OM	Outcomes Mapping
PAWD	Partnership for Africa's Water Development
PNAEP	National Plan for Access to Potable Water
PRSPs	Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
RBM	Results Based Management
RISDP	Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan
RWPs	Regional Water Partnerships
SADC	The Southern African Development Community
SATAC	Southern Africa Technical Advisory Committee
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
TORs	Terms of References
UN	United Nations
UNCED	United Nations Council on Economic Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNECA	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
WATAC	West Africa Technical Advisory Committee
WAWP	West Africa Water Partnership
WAWP	West Africa Water Partnership
WE	Water Efficiency
WCW	World Commission on Water
WHO	World Health Organization
WRAP	Water Resources Action Program
WRCU	Water Resources Conservation Unit
WRMA	Water Resources Management Authority
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development
WWC	World Water Council
ZAWA	Zambia Wildlife Authority
ZWP	Zambia Water Partnership

## Evaluation Abstract

The \$10 million Partnership for Africa's Water Development (PAWD) was implemented by the Global Water Partnership and managed by the Canada Fund for Africa at CIDA. PAWD is one of four water initiatives in Africa funded through the \$500 million Fund set up after the 2002 G8 Summit as a gesture of Canada's support to the G8 Africa Action Plan.

PAWD was to support five African countries (Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Senegal and Zambia) to manage their water resources in a sustainable manner in order to contribute to poverty reduction, human well-being and the protection of natural resources.

At the country level, PAWD focused on three components, which are directly related to the project's outcomes/longer-term results:

- Support to National Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) Frameworks;
- Support to the institutional development of existing, new and emerging multi-stakeholder national and regional water partnerships;
- Support towards the integration of water into Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRSPs) or their equivalent.

By and large, the evaluation concludes that PAWD is a success, delivering substantially on four of its six program outcomes. The program fit well with the IWRM needs and aspirations of the five participating countries, and, over four and a half years, has helped them move their IWRM agendas forward. In turn, their experiences have helped other country water partnerships pass through a similar process.

It is clear from the literature, and from conversations held during the evaluation that the philosophy and methodology of IWRM is integral to the larger, longer-term water sector reforms underway. This bodes well for many of the gains made in PAWD. It seems very likely that implementation of the IWRM plans will occur as part of these continuing reform initiatives. Having struggled with roles and accountabilities for half the program, there now appears to be a level of comfort that government is driving the IWRM process with a disposition honouring interdependency and seeking complementarity. By all accounts, the philosophy and approaches of IWRM will help equip stakeholders to learn about, mitigate and/or adapt to the effects of climate change.

Well supported by GWP, the nascent Country Water Partnerships have demonstrated the value of multi-stakeholder participation in policy and planning. While PAWD is leaving some of them with important financial, legal and organizational questions to resolve, there are good reasons to believe that they all have a future. They enjoy a higher public profile and continue to be connected to a well spring of water sector/IWRM expertise. They are roundly appreciated for a basic but profound role that is so necessary given the inter-disciplinary, multi-sectoral and multi-scaled nature of IWRM – that is to share and exchange information, and to coordinate action.

## **Acknowledgements**

We greatly value the opportunity we have had to work with the GWP at the country and regional levels and with members of their PAWD team in Stockholm. In all instances we encountered tremendous openness and co-operation. Thanks, in particular, to the PAWD country managers who hosted us. Our arrival came during those busy closing weeks of the program, nevertheless they each took the time to sit with us. Thanks, indeed, to the individuals who came on board to help us document the evaluation workshops. With your write-ups we were so much better able to capture the reflections of the participants. Thanks also to the more than eighty representatives of government and non-governmental organizations across the five participating countries who shared their time and insights with us. The country partnerships that hosted the evaluation team clearly embraced this exercise as an opportunity to reflect on the past four and a half years and to consider options for the future. We hope this document does justice to this generous investment of time.

Philip Cox

Helen Patterson

## Table of Contents

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Evaluation Background and Methodology</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1	Purpose.....	1
1.2	Evaluation Issues and Key Questions.....	1
1.3	Evaluation Management and Key Audiences .....	2
1.4	Evaluation Approach and Methodology .....	2
1.5	Schedule .....	3
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Background</b> .....	<b>5</b>
2.1	Overview of the Global Water Crisis.....	5
2.2	Overview of IWRM Development in African Context.....	10
2.3	GWP – Profile .....	15
2.4	PAWD – Project Description.....	16
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Assessment of PAWD’s Relevance</b> .....	<b>19</b>
3.1	PAWD’s Relevance to the Country Contexts.....	20
3.2	Internal Consistency of the PAWD’s Results Logic.....	21
3.3	PAWD Alignment with CIDA’s Gender Policy and GWP Gender Equality Objectives.....	24
3.4	PAWD’s Contribution to CIDA’s Goals of Poverty Reduction and Sustainable Development ...	25
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Assessment of PAWD Results</b> .....	<b>27</b>
4.1	Progress Against Stated Outcomes .....	29
4.2	PAWD Handling of Factors Enabling and Constraining Success .....	41
4.3	Progress Against PAWD’s stated Capacity Building Intentions.....	44
4.4	Progress Against PAWD’s stated Gender Equality Intentions .....	45
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Assessment of PAWD Management</b> .....	<b>48</b>
5.1	Workplanning and Management Aspects .....	50
5.2	Performance Measurement and Reporting Aspects .....	53
5.2.1	<i>Progress in Implementing Outcomes Mapping</i> .....	54
5.3	Knowledge Management.....	57
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Assessment of Prospects for Sustainability</b> .....	<b>59</b>
6.1	IWRM concepts in partner countries .....	60
6.1.1	<i>Perceptions of IWRM in the Face of Climate Change</i> .....	63
6.2	Country Water Partnerships .....	64
6.3	Compendium of Lessons Learned.....	66
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Conclusions</b> .....	<b>69</b>

## **Appendices**

**Appendix I – PAWD Evaluation Terms of Reference**

**Appendix II – PAWD Evaluation Matrix**

**Appendix III – List of Key Informants**

**Appendix IV – PAWD Evaluation Workshop Outline**

**Appendix V - Country Evaluation Reports – PAWD Evaluation**

**Appendix VI – List of Key Documents**

# Executive Summary

## Background

CIDA's Canada Fund for Africa contracted Philip Cox of Plan:Net Limited and Helen Patterson of Mosaic International to carry out a final evaluation of the Partnership for Africa's Water Development (PAWD) program. The Global Water Partnership (GWP) is the executing agency for this program.

PAWD traces its origins to the G8 Summit in Kananaskis, Canada in July 2002. At the Summit, then Prime Minister Jean Chretien announced the \$500 million Canada Fund for Africa and a bundle of regional socio-economic, governance, environment, health and education related initiatives to support Africa's development. Included in his list of priorities was water management. A contribution agreement was signed between CIDA and GWP on December 30, 2003 for \$10 million over four years<sup>1</sup>.

By design, PAWD was to support five African countries (Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Senegal and Zambia) to manage their water resources in a sustainable manner in order to contribute to poverty reduction, human well-being and the protection of natural resources. At the country level, PAWD focuses on three components, which are directly related to the project's outcomes/longer-term results:

- Support to National IWRM Frameworks;
- Support to the institutional development of existing, new and emerging multi-stakeholder national and regional water partnerships;
- Support towards the integration of water into Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRSPs) or their equivalent.

## Main Observations

1. The Country Water Partnerships in all countries have played a decisive role in creating IWRM plans that are well anchored to relevant enabling policy and to multi-lateral commitments.
2. Prior to 2003, IWRM was mainly 'concept and theory' with varying levels of readiness to apply it across the five countries. Now there is a shared language and experience of IWRM planning within each country, at least among managers of water related ministries and agencies and leaders of water related non-governmental organizations. PAWD is widely credited with operationalizing and accelerating IWRM – and specifically the participatory process behind it.
3. IWRM plans have been produced with substantial consultation and media assisted communication. This has yielded new IWRM awareness. This awareness is centred within ministries with mandates linked to water, among a collection of NGOs, relevant parts of academia and, to a lesser extent, within the private sector. So far a cursory awareness has filtered to district and catchment levels in all countries, and particularly to so-called 'hot spots' where IWRM approaches to catchment management are deemed high priority due to scarcity and conflict among water users. That noted, there remains a substantial communications and capacity building challenge at these levels.
4. It is clear from the literature, and from conversations held during the evaluation that the philosophy and methodology of IWRM is integral to the larger, longer-term water sector reforms underway. This bodes well for many of the gains made in PAWD. It seems very likely that implementation of the IWRM plans will occur as part of these continuing reform initiatives.

---

<sup>1</sup> During 2006, Ministerial approval was given for a one-year no-cost extension to March 31, 2008.

5. It is also clear that IWRM as a philosophy and approach sets up countries to address the challenges imposed by climate change. As described to the evaluators, the impacts of climate change – extreme flood and drought conditions – demand inter-disciplinary responses, from the level of the water user to the policy maker. IWRM, by its very nature, provides for that.
6. Across the five PAWD countries, the leading edge of IWRM planning and management is shifting from the national to the catchment level – this is particularly true in Kenya, Senegal and along some trans-boundary water courses in the other countries. At ground level, IWRM philosophy and methods stand to be tested by specific water scarcity scenarios and water user conflicts. The transition occurring now from planning mode to implementation, and from national to catchment level programming creates many new challenges for the country partnerships.
7. Looking specifically at the partnerships; their evolutionary process has been conditioned, more than anything, by the newness of the idea that government and non-government stakeholders can collaborate, particularly on a subject as strategically sensitive as water. In all countries, it has taken longer to move through the formative stages of creating multi-stakeholder platforms than was envisaged at the outset. In at least three countries, the process of finding the mutually agreeable formula for working together has been quite ‘stormy’, particularly during the first half of the program. Nevertheless, at the close of PAWD, all five countries have functional platforms each edified by their work in co-creating IWRM planning documents. Trust relationships are building and there are, at the very least, glimpses of what is to be gained by government and non-government stakeholders working in concert with each other.
8. In all five countries, the country partnerships are entering a delicate period where, in the face of a shift from IWRM planning to implementation and a potentially large forward role to play in this, they have no assured core funding, as yet uncertain legal status, and are searching for their programming niche.
9. In all five PAWD countries, there is significant appreciation for the support of the larger GWP network; specifically for IWRM training provided, technical advice and for the opportunities to share experiences across countries. The “IWRM Tool Box” including the IWRM introductory training manual created with PAWD support, is considered foundational. That said, GWP’s own capacity building aspirations for PAWD have not been fully met. PAWD’s ambitious, regionally centred, capacity building program took longer than expected to put into action. Training events, while usually evaluated positively, were often hurried and out of sync with CWP programs of work. In the end, with the rush to get the IWRM plans completed, RWPs and CWPs were not able to follow up with participants to help them practice their new skills and/or pass those skills along to others.
10. It seems that gender equality considerations were an afterthought in the program design. The program began without engaging the PAWD teams and their close associates in a detailed analysis of the relationship of gender equality to IWRM. When the theme was addressed a year into PAWD, it was arguably too late to start ‘ground floor’ thinking on the subject. Recommendations to engage the Gender Water Alliance as a partner that could engage stakeholders in gender analysis work did not pan out, at least to the extent envisaged. Regionally organized training that was done was by all accounts useful, but not sufficient to initiate a serious treatment of gender mainstreaming in the context of IWRM planning.
11. Using PAWD resources, among other sources, it appears that GWP/RWPs have played an increasing role in creating an enabling policy environment for IWRM through regional bodies such as the African Ministerial Council on Water (AMCOW), Southern Africa Development Council (SADC) and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). The niche that GWP appears to be occupying here includes: facilitating multi-stakeholder involvement in high level dialogue and planning *vis a vis* regional and basin initiatives, engaging the international donor community in discussions around financing IWRM initiatives, and providing insight on progress *vis a vis* regional/Pan African and global commitments and targets. These larger commitments have become standards for countries ‘to live up to’ – and, as such, they can be used to leverage progress in a manner similar to the way policy commitments, ministry strategic plans and legal frameworks within countries give impetus for desirable outcomes (e.g. IWRM plans, stakeholder participation).
12. The evaluators feel they understand the reason for using PAWD resources to assist with this high level interaction - and they have heard from several individuals who indicate that it is paying dividends. That said, they remain a little unsure of the actual cost-benefit of this strategy. Some cautionary remarks made to the evaluators were that the distance between those attending high level fora and those at the

epicentre of IWRM planning and implementation at the country level may be too great for there to be much leverage value. At the same, it seems clear that GWP is trying to increase the fidelity of the relationship between these vastly different scales of IWRM activity, and thereby increase the possibilities for leverage and accountability. Part of the difficulty here when assessing PAWD, is that a wide range of brokering, facilitating, translating, and communicating activities, such as those used to foster the changes described above, were lumped under a component called Knowledge Management. This component has remained implicit in PAWD's strategic results framework, rather than explicit. It is not clear that PAWD managers, let alone the evaluators, have a fix on how 'enabling' these resources have been to the results sought by the program.

13. The evaluation observed some operational/management challenges, none of which have been insurmountable, but all of which offer insights for future practice. They include the following:
  - a. **Establishing 'enabling' relationships between country water partnerships and their host institutions** - In at least four countries (Kenya, Zambia, Senegal and Malawi), CWPs were constrained in being able to release funds for project activities and produce timely reporting of expenditures.
  - b. **Choosing program managers with the right combination of experience, technical and management skill, and comfort with ambiguity** – In two countries PAWD hired country managers lacking in one or more of these areas. This added to the difficulties of forging good working relationships at the beginning of PAWD thereby slowing the pace of work.
  - c. **Some ambiguity in the dialogue between RWPs/GWPO and CWPs on key points of strategy** – there has been ambivalence over the strategic questions of: a) whether CWP should strive for their own legal status, b) where 'facilitation' ends and 'implementation' begins (the latter being considered an undesirable role for a CWP as it potentially encroaches on the roles of others, including its members).
  - d. **Fledgling partnerships suddenly obtaining large project funding leading to, "the project "tail" wagging the partnership "dog"** - In at least three cases, nascent partnerships came into PAWD with lots of drive but few resources. PAWD came along with staff and access to a vast array of supports. As described by respondents in a couple of countries, PAWD and the partnership became synonomous, at least until the recognition that PAWD has a finite time line.

### PAWD – Summary of Achievements Against Outcomes

The following is a quick review of PAWD achievements as compared to planned Outcomes.

<p><b>1. National frameworks for sustainable WRM and service provision in place and/or well advanced for selected countries.</b></p>	<p>In all five countries national IWRM plans – that meet or exceed technical specifications - have been made ready for submission to government for approval. In every case, this has been achieved with a high level of attribution to PAWD.</p>
<p><b>2. Ownership of national frameworks and process developed by all stakeholders.</b></p>	<p>Across the five countries, CWPs have been built broad based support for the plans through: a) public consultations at national and district levels, and b) encouragement of inter-ministerial/agency participation in the drafting process. Across the five countries, the presence of a larger water sector reform agenda (policy, legal framework and/or ministerial strategic plans) has been instrumental to the extent that these higher level commitments state a commitment to inter-sectoral involvement and public participation. Equally important has been the 'buy in' of the strategically important ministries of finance and planning.</p>
<p><b>3. Improved water resource management and service delivery.</b></p>	<p>Some evidence of 'on the ground' changes in each country; innovations are 'early' and centred around specific water users or individuals in specific water catchment areas – those who have been directly engaged in IWRM activities by virtue of living in a so called "hot spot", or who have been exposed to IWRM concepts through awareness raising initiatives. Improvements are so far not systemic in nature, though Kenya is moving quickly to implement catchment level strategies. Level of attribution to PAWD is generally low across the five countries.</p>
<p><b>4. Stronger collaboration with potential</b></p>	<p>Financing for water sector has increased in all five countries (in most cases significantly); formulation of the IWRM plan and communication around it, has</p>

<p><b>financing institutions to support projects.</b></p>	<p>helped bring focus to the sector. PAWD supported multilateral discussions and commitments made through bodies such as AMCOW and SADC have provided impetus. Overall, the level of attribution to PAWD is generally lower than that of the first 2 outcomes, but greater than that for the third outcome.</p>
<p><b>5. Strengthened regional and country level partnerships in selected countries to ensure that they function as effective multi-stakeholder platforms</b></p>	<p>Functional multi-stakeholder platforms are in place in all five countries, and in all cases PAWD has been decisive – providing a significant infusion of financial and technical support. At the conclusion of PAWD, all platforms have established a sound governance arrangement in line with GWPs accreditation standards, have found a comfortable working relationship with their government mandated water authorities, and enjoy a higher public profiles than they had at the outset of PAWD. Getting to this point has not been easy in at least three countries. Progress has been constrained by uncertainties over the respective roles of the platforms, and of the lead water authorities in government on the other. While maturing, four partnerships remain in a delicate transitional state – without a base of financial support, with several possible programming niches to fill as the IWRM plan is implemented, and not fully resolved on the question of their future legal status.</p>
<p><b>6. Water issues are integrated into PRSPs for a selected number of African countries.</b></p>	<p>In at least four countries country partner efforts to highlight IWRM in national development plans have yielded high level government commitments. In four cases the commitments are general in nature, while in one, the core text of the IWRM plan has been adopted in the country's national development strategy.</p>

### Lessons Learned for PAWD

On the basis of the evaluation findings summarized above, the evaluators have formulated a series of lessons learned. These have been inspired through the reflections of those met during the field work and may be relevant to the design and delivery of future IWRM planning/implementation initiatives as well as other multi-stakeholder policy development initiatives beyond the water sector. They are set out below.

<p><b>On introducing funds to ‘grass roots’ entities...</b></p>	<p>Care is required when introducing a relatively large and generously funded project to a fledgling organization with lots of “chuptzpa” but little in the way of financial resources. While few would argue that the infusion of project resources opens up possibilities to realize the aspirations of the organization, several observe that some of the vital chemistry – in particular, the volunteer work ethic – may be compromised. Stakeholders may start placing demands on the secretariat that they would have otherwise resourced themselves, and they can lose sight of the fact that the level of resourcing that their organization enjoys is only temporary.</p>
<p><b>On finding the optimal working relationship between government and multi-stakeholder platforms...</b></p>	<p>The strategic positioning of water governance platforms is vital and is something that requires continuous and careful management. On the one hand, given water's strategic importance to the national interest, these platforms must remain well aligned with the mandates and priorities of water related ministries; on the other, they must show the ‘welcome mat’ to private sector and civil society through effective operations and demonstrated success fostering information sharing, coordination and collaboration. When operating well, stakeholders around the table have something to give to and to glean from each other. There also has to be a foundation of trust.</p> <p>One cannot underestimate the importance of convening properly mandated representatives at the beginning of a multi-stakeholder planning process like PAWD to agree in writing on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Which entity is driving the process, ultimately – the platform or the government</li> <li>○ Context specific objectives of the planning project (within the frame of the program objectives)</li> <li>○ Role delineation and the accountability structure that links the government's own water authority, the core team, the executive function of the partnership, the project team and key contacts within the host institution</li> <li>○ Communication and decision-making modalities</li> </ul> <p>That said, such an agreement cannot guarantee clarity of roles and common purpose in practice. The chemistry has to be right and a stable presence of champions is helpful.</p>
<p><b>On using RBM and Outcome Mapping</b></p>	<p>One of the merits of RBM and Outcomes Mapping is that these planning and management tools can help stakeholders clarify: a) which actors are implementing</p>

<p><b>concepts to sort out who is ‘implementing’ and who is ‘benefiting/changing’...</b></p>	<p>the program/project, b) what they DO and what they wish to CHANGE with the time and resources available; and c) what in that change process the program/project has control over (outputs), what it has direct influence over (outcomes), and what it can only contribute towards with its indirect influence (impact). In complex policy settings like PAWD, this kind of design rigour is essential.</p>
<p><b>On being ready to work in a larger institutional reform context</b></p>	<p>Understanding that IWRM is likely to be occurring within a context of sector or institutional reform, one must expect uncertainty and possibly upheaval inside participating institutions. In this context, the missionary zeal that many might feel when advocating for IWRM solutions, may not be shared by all occupying strategically important positions. Accordingly, it is important to...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Work with an understanding of the mindsets of people who may feel insecure in their current roles.</li> <li>○ Plan on losing champions along the way as they are re-assigned.</li> <li>○ And, as much as possible, nurture understanding/appreciation for IWRM (or whatever reform strategy contemplated) among those who may be in important decision making roles in the future.</li> </ul>
<p><b>On knowing whether the idea of a multi-stakeholder platform has ‘staying power’</b></p>	<p>One measure of the relevance of a multi-stakeholder platform is the extent to which it continues to function when there is no enabling environment to support it – e.g. a lack of consensus around the defining characteristics of the platform and/or faltering support from government,</p>
<p><b>On choosing a host institution</b></p>	<p>There may be compelling programmatic reasons for a new multi-stakeholder platform/partnership to choose a particular institute to be its host. Perhaps it is because key individuals in the partnership hold positions in those institutions, or that the mandates of those institutions are entirely relevant and potentially very helpful to the work. However, if a major function of the hosting relationship is to provide fiduciary services to the program/project, then the capacity of the candidate institution to provide those services must be carefully assessed.</p>
<p><b>On choosing the right staffing</b></p>	<p>The project manager/coordinator position in a multi-stakeholder process is critical to its success simply because the person in that position must navigate the sometimes divergent interests of all the actors. They must be technically competent in the subject matter, procedurally competent (i.e. with an intuitive sense of how to work with people), and should have about them the ‘social’ power to be able to relate well with people in senior roles. Because theirs is essentially an organizational change facilitation role, they must be comfortable working with ambiguity. They must be able to keep their eye on the overarching purpose of the work, despite the distractions and irritants.</p>
<p><b>On the changing character of IWRM as it is applied at the catchment level.</b></p>	<p>As IWRM planning and implementation works its way downward to the catchment/water users level, two important trends are evident: a) the likelihood of encountering divergent interests and conflict increases tremendously; and b) the demand for capacity building – broad awareness raising as well as technical (e.g. flow monitoring), procedural (e.g. conflict management) rises exponentially. These trends have important downstream implications for IWRM practitioners.</p>
<p><b>On (not) being too bent on formulas for success in IWRM programming</b></p>	<p>For a wide range of reasons including political and administrative tradition and cultural norms around citizen participation, there is no one formula to follow in setting up a stakeholder involvement process. Perhaps the best guides one can follow are those champions already embedded in that particular setting.</p>
<p><b>On engaging the private sector</b></p>	<p>The PAWD process has not been as successful engaging the private sector as it has other non-government entities. From this, one can postulate that the terms by which the private sector chooses to interact with multi-stakeholder platforms on IWRM is sufficiently distinct from the terms by which government, academia, the media, and NGOs choose to interact. This may warrant a highly tailored engagement strategy for the partnerships.</p> <p>Once engaged (assuming this happens), the partnerships may need to be ready to handle the power and influence that larger business entities – notably large-scale water dependent industries and agribusinesses - yield by virtue of their roles as employers, their relative financial means, and their political connectedness.</p> <p>As IWRM works its way toward planning and implementation at the catchment level, partnership readiness to facilitate interactions with private sector entities will be tested. This is the place where substantive water user grievances are likely to be aired; one can expect private sector presence and participation at this level.</p>
<p><b>On creating a gender mainstreaming agenda</b></p>	<p>Without explicit gender mainstreaming results and gender equality mainstreaming indicators, a program like PAWD has nothing to guide its gender approach.</p> <p>In a program like PAWD one might be looking at training focused on awareness,</p>

leading to applied analysis, leading to agreement on country specific strategies that can be monitored. All this though, must be predicated on a common conceptual understanding of how 'gender equality/ mainstreaming' and the core subject matter relate.

Gender analysis should properly begin at the design phase of a program when the thinking of how to integrate gender considerations can itself be integrated into the design logic of the program. As demonstrated in PAWD, it is very difficult to return to fundamental discussions on design once the program has started. That is not to say that gender strategies (and program logic models) cannot be revisited – they should, but for the purpose of refining, not (re)creating, them.

### **On the inclusion of knowledge management in institutional capacity building and policy development programs like PAWD**

The intent of knowledge management is to ensure an ample, smooth flow of explicit and tacit knowledge among those with a 'need to know' in order to help make the program successful. Any knowledge management system has to be flexible to emergent requirements. That said, it is a component that can use up an inordinate amount of valuable resources if left unchecked; there should be some management/reporting tool in place to help program/project teams track the merit and worth of individual knowledge management initiatives.

### **Recommendations Emerging from the Evaluation**

There are six recommendations emerging from this report. Two concern the sustainability of PAWD outcomes, one concerns the possibility of promoting climate change mitigation and adaptation through IWRM, and three carry forward insights gained about the application of RBM, Gender Mainstreaming and Knowledge Management into recommendations for future practice on projects/programs analogous to PAWD. The recommendations are set out below and are repeated at the beginning of relevant sections of the report.

**Recommendation 1:** That in the formulation of further IWRM planning/implementation initiatives, CIDA/GWP ensure that RBM/Outcomes Mapping is utilized to sort out in a participatory way who, precisely, is implementing the initiative and which stakeholder groups are experiencing a change or benefit at the output, outcome and impact levels. Further, that where the initiative involves multiple countries (or discrete programming areas), consideration be given to replicating the exercise at this smaller scale. **(Section 3.0)**

**Recommendation 2:** That in the formulation of further IWRM planning/implementation initiatives CIDA/GWP ensure that gender analysis is carried out with key partners in the design phase of the initiative with a view to having gender dimensions commonly understood and strategies agreed upon by the end of the inception phase. **(Section 3.0)**

**Recommendation 3:** That in the formulation of further IWRM planning/implementation initiatives, CIDA/GWP integrate Knowledge Management more fully into the program/project logic model in a way that helps managers discern and track priority uses for the resources. **(Section 5.0)**

**Recommendation 4:** That GWP undertake a rapid assessment of the country partnerships, post-PAWD, to determine a level of financial support required over the next six to twelve months to ensure a seamless IWRM launch and dissemination in each country, and to assist the partnerships to resolve their questions of legal standing, identify their programming niche and formulate and begin to implement a sustainability strategy. Further, that with this information in hand, GWP assist the CWPs access transitional funding support. **(Section 6.0)**

**Recommendation 5:** That the CIDA Pan Africa Program explore possible funding modalities (including Mission funds) that could be accessed to provide transitional support to identified CWPs according to specifications worked out in the implementation of Recommendation 4. **(Section 6.0)**

**Recommendation 6:** That if CIDA is to take up climate change as a programming priority, that it: a) consider IWRM as a pertinent philosophy and approach for identifying climate change issues and for formulating mitigation and adaptation policies and strategies, and b) look to GWP as an organization with the experience and presence to convert climate change concepts into actionable strategies at the country and, in some settings, catchment level. **(Section 6.0)**

### **Set up of Report**

The report is divided into seven sections. Section One provides an introduction to this evaluation assignment. Section Two examines the PAWD's operating context – the global water crisis and its manifestations in Africa, the evolution of IWRM as a philosophy and approach to address the crisis, and Global Water Partnership's role as a champion for IWRM. The section concludes with a program description. Section Three assesses PAWD's relevance to the situation outlined in Section Two as well as to relevant CIDA policy goals. Section Four is the most substantial section in the document. It looks at results achieved by PAWD between 2004 and 08, and its handling of program constraints and enablers. Section Five turns inward to examine PAWD management – work planning and management routines, and performance measurement and reporting aspects. Section Six looks forward from today to examine the sustainability of the IWRM processes initiated by PAWD and the resilience and relevance of the multi-stakeholder platforms. Section Seven winds up with an overarching statement of conclusion.

The reader should be aware that individual country findings reports are attached in Appendix V. These were written by the evaluators at the conclusion of each country visit and then submitted to the PAWD Country Manager for validation. The documents represent the evaluators attempt to synthesize the observations coming from their field work.

## 1.0 Evaluation Background and Methodology

This section sets out the rationale and design parameters for this Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) project evaluation of the Partnership for Africa's Water Development (PAWD).

### 1.1 Purpose

This is a routine evaluation, it has not been triggered by any particular concern about the design and/or delivery of PAWD. As noted in the PAWD evaluation Terms of Reference (please see Appendix I), CIDA's Performance Review Policy requests periodic independent evaluations of its policies, programs, projects and operations. Evaluation results contribute to more informed decision-making, help to foster an environment of learning-by-doing and promote greater accountability for performance.

The initiatives of the Canada Fund for Africa came to a close on March 31, 2008. The evaluation is being carried out in the interests of documenting final results, ensuring a smooth wrap-up and contributing to lessons that may inform future CIDA programming in integrated water resource management. The intention is that recommendations arising from the evaluation will offer an opportunity for CIDA, GWP and other major stakeholders to address any challenges and/or weaknesses associated with the IWRM approach.

### 1.2 Evaluation Issues and Key Questions

The Evaluation TORs set out the following key evaluation issues for the team to address:

- The **relevance** of the project to the priorities and policies of its primary partners – validity of the project to the current programming context, consistency of PAWD's results logic, consistency of PAWD delivery with CIDA's goals of poverty reduction and sustainable development, its policy of gender equality, and key CIDA aid effectiveness principles.
- PAWD's **progress** toward the attainment of its objectives and articulated results, primarily at the outcomes level (as evidenced by the achievement of the outputs).
- PAWD's **efficiency** in producing outputs with the agreed-upon resources – with specific reference to: cost effectiveness, efficacy of management, project learning and knowledge sharing arrangements and the extent to which it has been able to manage risk.
- Positive or negative **changes** the project has produced, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended, in the countries, institutions and beneficiaries targeted by the project.
- The **sustainability** of benefits produced by the project, pinpointing the major factors that have influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability. In particular, recommendations are sought on ways in which the project's overall impact and sustainability might have been enhanced and lessons that may inform future CIDA programming in integrated water resource management and in the relationship of IWRM to the broader field of climate change programming.

### **1.3 Evaluation Management and Key Audiences**

The evaluation has been carried out by consultants, Philip Cox of Plan:Net Limited and Helen Cox of Mosaic International. The team was guided by Jean-Stephane Couture, Senior Program Officer and Farah Chandani, Program Analyst, at the Canada Fund for Africa, CIDA.

CIDA is the primary client for and a key audience of the evaluation final report. The Agency is particularly interested in the evaluation results as a contribution to: a) more informed decision-making, b) accountability for project results and c) generation of substantive 'lessons learned' and success stories that can be fed into one of the knowledge sharing activities as part of the closing of the Canada Fund for Africa to be held sometime in 2008. More broadly within CIDA, the evaluation will be of interest to the CIDA's policy analysts and environment specialists as an input into future programming strategies related to water governance and climate change.

The Global Water Partnership (GWP) is a second key audience for the evaluation. GWP sees in PAWD a pilot methodology for accelerating and strengthening IWRM programming at the country level. As such, the evaluation is to provide 'grist' for their strategic and operational planning. They may have additional donors interested in the PAWD approach to IWRM who could be served by this report.

Regional and Country Water Partnerships represent a third key audience for this evaluation. The evaluation methodology – in particular, a one-day evaluation workshop held in each participating country - engaged stakeholders in a reflective process that was documented and left for the partnerships to use in their own strategic planning.

### **1.4 Evaluation Approach and Methodology**

The evaluation team and CIDA agreed that this exercise was to be more than simply a process of collecting data and making independent judgments of PAWD's merit (performance to expectations) and worth (value-added to development in participating countries). The approved work plan envisaged the team engaging stakeholders in a collaborative inquiry wherein there is knowledge sharing and learning. Specifically this meant that, in addition to holding individual interviews with stakeholders and then compiling a report for circulation, evaluators would involve stakeholders, together, in a 'reflective' process and generate locally relevant documentation. The evaluation matrix guiding the interviews and the workshop design are included in Appendix II.

As it turned out, the evaluation team visited all five CIDA funded PAWD countries over three weeks in March. Cox visited Zambia, Malawi and Kenya; Patterson visited Malawi, Mali and Senegal. They spent three to five working days per country<sup>2</sup>. At the end of her tour, March 26 – 28<sup>th</sup>, H. Patterson

---

<sup>2</sup> Due to poor weather conditions, H. Patterson was unable to join P. Cox in Zambia for the Zambia visit as planned. The intention was to test the evaluation workshop methodology in Zambia and Malawi before splitting up for the work in East and West Africa.

attended the Africa Water Week Conference in Tunis, using this occasion to meet with regional and network GWP representatives and other key IWRM stakeholders outside beyond the network.

Typically, the consultants held semi-structured interviews with upwards of ten informants in each country – partnership staff and steering committee members, officials of key water related ministries and agencies and representatives of NGOs and private sector organizations. All individuals met were involved in some manner with IWRM, but not necessarily as part of the country water partnerships. Indeed, with the assistance of CIDA, the team was able to make independent contact with resource persons operating independently of the country partnerships. A list of key informants is included in Appendix III.

As envisaged, the consultants facilitated one-day evaluation workshops with attendance ranging from 12 to 35 across the five countries. In these settings, stakeholders analyzed their experience and learning of the project following a structured agenda. The outline of this workshop is set out in Appendix IV.

Following each country visit, the consultants prepared a preliminary findings report. These have been submitted to each PAWD manager for review and validation and are included as country reports in Appendix V. These reports, along with separate workshop reports prepared by locally hired consultants, interview notes and other project documentation are the foundation for this report.

At CIDA, from GWP’s Stockholm headquarters and from the regional and country partnerships, the evaluators have collected project documentation – including design documents; contracts; planning documents; analytical pieces related to IWRM planning and implementation at the global, regional and national levels; and a sampling of correspondence from CIDA’s project files. A list of key documents is included in Appendix VI.

## 1.5 Schedule

Figure 1-1 sets out the sequence of evaluation activities and actual dates across three key phases: Evaluation Design, Workshop and Information Gathering, and Report Preparation.

**Figure 1-1: Schedule of PAWD Evaluation Activities**

Item	Timeline
<b>Phase I – Evaluation Design</b>	
Review project documents and hold preliminary interviews	January 5 <sup>th</sup> – February 5 <sup>th</sup>
Draft country stakeholder workshop outline -generative questions -workshop process	
Communicate workshop intent and preliminary content ideas; request assistance of GWP Secretariats in setting up workshops	
Finalize workshop methodology and draft interview protocols	February 5 <sup>th</sup> – 28th

Formulate work plan and submit for approval	
<b>Phase II – Workshop &amp; Information Gathering</b>	
Program level interviews -telephone, email	February 16 <sup>th</sup> – 28 <sup>th</sup> , April
Zambia (P. Cox) • Stakeholder Workshop • Key informant Interviews	March 6 <sup>h</sup> – 12 <sup>th</sup> Workshop March 11th
Malawi (P. Cox & H. Patterson) • Stakeholder Workshop • Key Informant Interviews	March 12 <sup>th</sup> – 15 <sup>th</sup> Workshop March 14th
Kenya (P. Cox) • Stakeholder Workshop • Key Informant Interviews	March 15 <sup>th</sup> – 20 <sup>th</sup> Workshop March 20 <sup>th</sup>
Mali (H. Patterson) • Stakeholder Workshop • Key Informant Interviews	March 16 <sup>th</sup> – 19 <sup>th</sup> Workshop March 19th
Senegal (H. Patterson) • Stakeholder Workshop • Key Informant Interviews	March 19 <sup>th</sup> – 25 <sup>th</sup> Workshop March 24th
Tunisia (H. Patterson) • Observe Africa Water Week Activities • Key Informant Interviews	March 26 <sup>th</sup> – 28 <sup>th</sup>
<b>Phase III – Report Preparation</b>	
Draft Evaluation Report	May 28 <sup>th</sup>
Final Evaluation Report	July 7 <sup>th</sup>

## 2.0 Background

This Section provides an overview of the global water crisis and the efforts of government and non-government stakeholders to come to grips with it. Most of the documentation reviewed for this section traces historical developments back to the 1970's. For a thumbnail sketch of key international events in the development of a water agenda, click on [UNESCO's World Water Assessment Program site](#).

### 2.1 Overview of the Global Water Crisis

The situation at a glance<sup>3</sup>...

- While the world's population tripled in the 20th century, the use of renewable water resources has grown six-fold.
- 1 billion people live without clean drinking water
- 2.6 billion people lack adequate sanitation (2002, UNICEF/WHO JMP 2004)
- 1.8 million people die every year from diarrhoeal diseases.
- 900 children die every day from water borne diseases (WHO 2004)
- Daily per capita use of water in residential areas:
  - 350 litres in North America and Japan
  - 200 litres in Europe
  - 10-20 litres in sub-Saharan Africa
- Over 260 river basins are shared by two or more countries, mostly without adequate legal or institutional arrangements.
- Quantity of water needed to produce 1 kg of:
  - wheat: 1 000 L
  - rice: 1 400 L
  - beef: 13 000 L

According to the first [UN World Water Development Report \(WWDR\)](#), produced by UNESCO as a compilation of data from 23 UN agencies, the first substantial expression of global concern for the state of the World's water was made in 1977 at the UN Conference on Water in Mar del Plata, Argentina. Delegates agreed to the basic principle that, "whatever the development stage and the socio-economic situation, people have the right to have access to drinking water whose quality and quantity are equal to their basic needs." They resolved to conduct a systemic assessment of water resources.

The UN subsequently made 1981 – 90 the International Drinking Water and Sanitation Decade with what was, in retrospect, the lofty goal to, "provide every person with access to water of safe quality and adequate quantity, along with basic sanitary facilities, by 1990. During this formative time, water advocates in government, the UN system and in civil society recognized that addressing water was much more complex, expensive and time consuming than originally conceived. Nevertheless, a global water agenda had been established to chip away at the historic, nearly universal perception that water is an infinite and free commodity, and that the challenge of meeting water needs centres on infrastructure and service delivery.

Two historic events in 1992 defined water sector development in the context of sustainable development. The first was the International Conference on Water and the Environment in Dublin. The

---

<sup>3</sup> This information is taken from the World Water Council Website, [www.worldwatercouncil.org/](http://www.worldwatercouncil.org/)

conference report from this preparatory meeting to the UNCED Earth Summit set out four principles and statements to guide action on local, national and international levels. These are set out in the box below.

**Box 1: The Dublin Principles**

Concerted action is needed to reverse the present trends of over consumption, pollution, and rising threats from drought and floods. The Conference Report sets out recommendations for action at local, national and international levels, based on four guiding principles.

**Principle No. 1 - Fresh water is a finite and vulnerable resource, essential to sustain life, development and the environment** Since water sustains life, effective management of water resources demands a holistic approach, linking social and economic development with protection of natural ecosystems. Effective management links land and water uses across the whole of a catchment area or groundwater aquifer.

**Principle No. 2 - Water development and management should be based on a participatory approach, involving users, planners and policy-makers at all levels** The participatory approach involves raising awareness of the importance of water among policy-makers and the general public. It means that decisions are taken at the lowest appropriate level, with full public consultation and involvement of users in the planning and implementation of water projects.

**Principle No. 3 - Women play a central part in the provision, management and safeguarding of water** This pivotal role of women as providers and users of water and guardians of the living environment has seldom been reflected in institutional arrangements for the development and management of water resources. Acceptance and implementation of this principle requires positive policies to address women's specific needs and to equip and empower women to participate at all levels in water resources programs, including decision-making and implementation, in ways defined by them.

**Principle No. 4 - Water has an economic value in all its competing uses and should be recognized as an economic good** Within this principle, it is vital to recognize first the basic right of all human beings to have access to clean water and sanitation at an affordable price. Past failure to recognize the economic value of water has led to wasteful and environmentally damaging uses of the resource. Managing water as an economic good is an important way of achieving efficient and equitable use, and of encouraging conservation and protection of water resources.

The inclusion of Principle No. 4, that water has an economic value, has stirred an enduring debate among water watchers in government, civil society, academia and the private sector. Some claim that adherence to this principle paves the way for private sector interests to take control of a resource that has hitherto been openly available – like the air we breath. Others counter with the view that water is a limited commodity and that by placing a value on it, society will foster protection and conservation.

The Dublin meeting is marked as the point of genesis for a network of international water agencies that includes: the [World Water Council](#) (WWC), the [World Commission on Water](#) (WCW) and the [Global Water Partnership](#) (GWP). This network brought non-governmental actors more fully into the global policy dialogue on water.

The second defining event in 1992 was the UNCED, Earth Summit, itself. From this gathering in Rio de Janeiro comes Chapter 18 of the [Agenda 21](#). Chapter 18 sets out a new direction for the development of water resources.

“The holistic management of freshwater as a finite and vulnerable resource, and the integration of sectoral water plans and programs within the framework of national

economic and social policy, are of paramount importance for action in the 1990s and beyond". (Article 18.6, Chapter 18 of Agenda 21).

It also introduces the notion of integrated water resource management. Articles 18.8 and 18.9 of the text (see Box 2, below) exemplifies this early adherence to IWRM.

**Box 2: IWRM as Introduced in Chapter 18 of Agenda 21**

18.8. Integrated water resources management is based on the perception of water as an integral part of the ecosystem, a natural resource and a social and economic good, whose quantity and quality determine the nature of its utilization. To this end, water resources have to be protected, taking into account the functioning of aquatic ecosystems and the perenniality of the resource, in order to satisfy and reconcile needs for water in human activities. In developing and using water resources, priority has to be given to the satisfaction of basic needs and the safeguarding of ecosystems. Beyond these requirements, however, water users should be charged appropriately.

18.9. Integrated water resources management, including the integration of land- and water-related aspects, should be carried out at the level of the catchment basin or sub-basin. Four principal objectives should be pursued, as follows:

- (a) To promote a dynamic, interactive, iterative and multisectoral approach to water resources management, including the identification and protection of potential sources of freshwater supply, that integrates technological, socio-economic, environmental and human health considerations;
- (b) To plan for the sustainable and rational utilization, protection, conservation and management of water resources based on community needs and priorities within the framework of national economic development policy;
- (c) To design, implement and evaluate projects and programs that are both economically efficient and socially appropriate within clearly defined strategies, based on an approach of full public participation, including that of women, youth, indigenous people and local communities in water management policy-making and decision-making;
- (d) To identify and strengthen or develop, as required, in particular in developing countries, the appropriate institutional, legal and financial mechanisms to ensure that water policy and its implementation are a catalyst for sustainable social progress and economic growth.

Following the Earth Summit, Key themes of Agenda 21 – including water and sanitation - are elaborated upon in several discreet though related venues:

- The United Nations Summit of 2000 – which set the [Millenium Development Goals](#) (MDGs). The MDG's are the most influential targets in the water and sanitation sector. None of the goal statements explicitly mention water and sanitation, though almost all are pertinent. Layered below each goal are specific target statements, including Target 7c under the goal, "Ensure environmental sustainability". It sets out a commitment to, "Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation". Target 7a sets out the commitment to, "Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programs and reverse the loss of environmental resources", and is aimed at stopping the unsustainable exploitation of water resources.

- The International Conference on Freshwater in Bonn (2001) – the [Ministerial Statement](#) (prepared by ministers with water related mandates in 46 countries) from this German supported preparatory conference for the 2002 Johannesburg Summit stated a commitment to reach the international targets set at the UN Millenium Development Summit (see above), and asserted that:
  - On water governance...
    - Primary responsibility for ensuring sustainable and equitable management of water rests with governments.
    - Private sector join with government and civil society to extend water and sanitation to the unserved.
    - Privately managed service delivery does not imply private ownership of water resources – that there should be effective regulation and monitoring.
  - On funding...
    - Available funds need to be spent more efficiently.
    - New sources need to be found from public investment budgets, capital markets, community based finance, user and polluter pay arrangements, increased international development financing.
    - Resources are also needed to assist countries mitigate the effects of natural disasters and adapt to the effects of climate change.

The statement also called for: greater emphasis on capacity building to support locally relevant technology and water resource management, and for participatory approaches in water resource management that ensure equal participation of men and women, and an equal sharing of benefits.

- The UN World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) (Rio +10) (2002) – Most pertinent to the subject of this report, Article 26 of the [Johannesburg Plan of Implementation](#) adopted by Governments at the WSSD calls for countries to, “develop Integrated Water Resource Management and Water Efficiency Plans by 2005”. The document also makes a commitment to “halve, by 2015, the proportion of people who do not have access to basic sanitation”.
- The [Commission on Sustainable Development \(CSD\)](#) - responsible for reviewing progress in the implementation of Agenda 21 and the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development. The CSD meets annually in New York, in two-year cycles, with each cycle focusing on clusters of specific thematic and cross-sectoral issues. CSD-12 of 2003 was the first substantive session following the World Summit on Sustainable Development (2002 Johannesburg), and its focus was Water, Sanitation and Human Settlements. As stated in the [Introductory Note](#) to this session by the Chair, “The decision of CSD-11 to focus its first Implementation Cycle on Water, Sanitation and Human Settlements bears testimony to the sense of urgency the international community ascribes to these issues”. In his note, Minister Børge Brende urges ministries responsible for water to, “join forces

with their cabinet counterparts for environment, finance, agriculture, science and technology, urban and rural development and others to generate ideas and action for integrated implementation". At this session, the Commission recognized that it would be difficult to meet the WSSD, IWRM target without concerted action.

- The World Water Forum (organized by the World Water Council) – 1997 in Marrakech, 2000 in the Hague, 2003 in Kyoto, and 2006 in Mexico. Notable developments include:
  - Agreement on a [World Water Vision](#) (2000) that provides direction on how to apply the Dublin Principles. Key messages include:
    - Involve all stakeholders in integrated management
    - Move to full-cost pricing of water services
    - Increase public funding for research and innovation
    - Increase cooperation in international water basins
    - Massively increase investments in water.
  - Compilation of [World Water Actions](#) (2003) – demonstrating tangible preventative and remedial initiatives of national or trans-boundary significance. These include applied research, projects (planning, preparation or actual implementation), awareness-raising campaigns, and legal/institutional reforms *vis a vis* topics such as water supply and sanitation, water-related diseases, irrigation, drainage, dams, river and lake basins, wetlands, groundwater, poverty, gender, capacity building, legislation, institutions, community participation.
  - Elaboration of local actions that can and are being taken to address water issues (2006).

Monitoring data suggest that the global push, outlined above, to secure access to safe drinking water is making progress. According to the 2006, WHO/UNICEF report, [Meeting the MDG Drinking Water and Sanitation Target – A Mid-Term Assessment of Progress](#), 1.1 billion people gained access to safe drinking water between 1990-2002. The greatest access gains were achieved in South Asia, where water access increased from 71 per cent in 1990 to 84 per cent in 2002. In sub-Saharan Africa, access grew minimally, from 49 percent in 1990 to 58 per cent in 2002.

We are now in the opening years of UN [International Decade for Action, "Water for Life"](#). Its goals is "to promote efforts to fulfill international commitments made on water and water-related issues by 2015". Integrated Water Resource Management is listed as one of a dozen key themes for the campaign along with: scarcity, access to sanitation and health, water and gender, capacity-building, financing, valuation, trans-boundary water issues, environment and biodiversity, disaster prevention, food and agriculture, pollution and energy. And Global Water Partnership (in particular the GWP Toolbox) is listed as the principle source of information on IWRM.

## 2.2 Overview of IWRM Development in African Context

The situation at a glance<sup>4</sup>...

- Africa is one of the driest continents – it has 9% of global fresh water resources; these are unevenly distributed due to erratic rainfall and varying climate
- The amounts of surface and ground water generated from rainfall is low for all sub-regions on the continent – rain water is not being harvested, instead it is being lost, in large part, through evaporation.
- Upwards of 75% of the population of Africa use ground water as their main source of drinking water; yet groundwater accounts for only 15% of the continent's total renewable water resources. Excessive bore hole drilling is stressing these limited ground water resources.
- Of the total amount of water withdrawn, 85% is for agriculture, 9% is for community water supply and 6% is for industry (note these figures are estimates from the 1990s). The amount of water withdrawn for these three major uses amounts to only 3.8% of internal renewable resources – a fact suggesting a low level of development and use of water resources on the continent.
- There has been a widespread perception that water is an infinite and free commodity
- There are 60 international river basins. In 14 African countries, almost all the landmass falls within trans-boundary river and lake basins. Trans-boundary cooperative mechanisms are underdeveloped to handle competing requirements for domestic, agricultural, industrial and environmental needs
- 300 million people in Africa face water scarcity

Africa's water development has been shaped greatly by the global events and commitments described above. In the wake of the International Drinking Water and Sanitation Decade (1981-90), African leaders met in Cote d'Ivoire to review the state of water development on the continent and to progress achieved against their 1980 – 2000 Lagos Plan of Action which endorsed the objectives of the global campaign. The forward looking 'Abidjan Accord' emerged from this conference renewing the commitment to focus on water and sanitation and laying out a Pan-African perspective and set of principles for the formulation country strategies.

It seems, however, that a key formative moment in the development of Africa's response to the continent's water and sanitation challenges came in the late 1990's with the formulation of a continental vision statement. Responding to a call from the first World Water Forum (Marakech, 1997) African leaders (government and non-government) gathered in Gaborone (1999) and Abidjan (2000) to formulate the [Africa Water Vision for 2025](#) – a document designed to re-inforce and be re-enforced by the World Water Vision (see Section 2.1).

The Africa Water Vision draws upon the insights of national stakeholder groups and upon the growing body of knowledge about the Africa's water situation that is resident in the African Development Bank (AfDB), United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA), United Nations Development Program (UNDP), World Bank, and the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). GWP's regional bodies in Southern Africa (known at that time as the Southern Africa Technical Advisory Committee - SATAC) and West Africa (West Africa Technical Advisory Committee – WATAC) facilitated the consultative process that created the Africa Water Vision.

---

<sup>4</sup> This information is taken from: a) the UN Water/Africa, document, [The Africa Water Vision for 2025: Equitable and Sustainable Use of Water for Socio-economic Development](#) (2000), pages 8 and 9; b) WHO/UNICEF report, [Meeting the MDG Drinking Water and Sanitation Target – A Mid-Term Assessment of Progress](#) (2006).

The shared vision is for:

“An Africa where there is an equitable and sustainable use and management of water resources for poverty alleviation, socio-economic development, regional cooperation, and the environment.”

More specifically...

- There is sustainable access to safe and adequate water supply and sanitation to meet the basic needs of all;
- There is sufficient water for food and energy security;
- Water for sustaining ecosystems and biodiversity is adequate in quantity and quality;
- Institutions that deal with water resources have been reformed to create an enabling environment for effective and integrated management of water in national and trans-boundary water basins, including management at the lowest appropriate level;
- Water basins serve as a basis for regional cooperation and development, and are treated as natural assets for all within such basins;
- There is an adequate number of motivated and highly skilled water professionals;
- There is an effective and financially sustainable system for data collection, assessment and dissemination for national and trans-boundary water basins;
- There are effective and sustainable strategies for addressing natural and man-made water-resources problems, including climate variability and change;
- Water is financed and priced to promote equity, efficiency, and sustainability;
- There is political will, public awareness and commitment among all for sustainable water-resources management, including the mainstreaming of gender issues and youth concerns and the use of participatory approaches.

The finished product was presented to the Second World Water Forum in the Hague (2000), and has since provided the continent with a set of milestones and targets with which to measure progress.

Milestones and targets have been set for the following actions.

### **Improving Governance**

- 1 Developing national IWRM policies and comprehensive institutional reform;
- 2 Making an enabling environment for regional cooperation on shared water;

### **Improving Water Wisdom**

- 3 Improving systems for information generation, assessment and dissemination
- 4 Finding sustainable financing for information generation and management
- 5 Building capacity for IWRM (including: public awareness, addressing knowledge gaps, research capability)

### **Meeting Urgent Water Needs**

- 6 Decreasing the proportion of people without access to safe and adequate water supply and sanitation
- 7 Increasing water productivity for food security
- 8 Developing water for economic activities (agriculture, power generation, industry, tourism and transportation (national level)
- 9 Conserving and restoring the environment, bio-diversity, and life-supporting ecosystems
- 10 Effective management of droughts, floods and desertification.

### **Strengthening the Financial Base for the Desired Water Future**

- 11 Securing sustainable financing for
  - o policy and institutional reform and capacity building
  - o information generation and management
  - o urgent water needs (implementing pricing and full cost recovery, increasing private sector participation, and mobilizing finances from national and international sources)

There have also been developments on a larger scale. In the midst of many economic, social and political challenges besetting the continent during the 1990's there was a call for renewal which would eventually see the transformation of the internally conflicted Organization of African Unity (OAU) into a new political body, the African Union.

The Constitutive Act of the AU calls for greater political integration, commitments to principles of democracy, human rights, good governance, gender equality, and people centred development. The socio-economic development program of the AU, the [New Partnership for Africa's Development \(NEPAD\)](#) identifies water and sanitation as a priority area.

In April 2002, African Ministers in charge of water affairs met in Abuja, Nigeria and, on the strength of commitments made at the International Freshwater Conference in Bonn six months earlier, agreed to the formal launch of the [African Ministers' Council on Water](#) (AMCOW). This pan-African inter-governmental body, with sub-regional committees, a technical advisory committee and a secretariat, has emerged as a principle mechanism for policy dialogue on water related issues. AMCOW's mandate

is pegged to achievement of the African Water Vision and, more specifically, a set of deliverables set out in the Abuja Ministerial Declaration on Water. The Council's functions include:

- Keeping the state of Africa's water resources and the financing of the water sector under review
- Facilitating sub-regional, regional and international cooperation by coordinating water policy and programming among African countries
- Supporting international cooperation on water related issues through the development of common positions with regard to relevant conventions and international agreements
- Encouraging best practices in such areas as: water policy reforms, IWRM, food security, water supply and sanitation.

Since inception, AMCOW has established the African Water Facility to coordinate donor resources toward achievement of WSSD/MDGs on Water and Sanitation. The African Development Bank hosts this initiative. AMCOW has also secured several significant partnership commitments with: World Bank, European Union, Germany and the G8 group. Of relevance to the PAWD project, AMCOW has also indicated a commitment to foster relationships with non-government water stakeholders and has asked GWP to play a role in fostering dialogue.

At the African Union's Summit in July 2008, the focus of discussion will be Africa's water agenda. Delegates will review progress against the various African and global targets (including the MDGs and the targets set out in the Africa Water Vision). AMCOW's Executive Committee met in May to develop their positions for this meeting.

Some data generated from a global [GWP survey in 2005](#) demonstrates progress in IWRM planning within the region. Among the 28 countries in East, West and Southern Africa, five already had plans/strategies in place, or a process well underway that incorporates the main elements of an IWRM approach, and 17 were in the process of preparing national strategies or plans, but require further work to live up to the requirements of an IWRM approach. The rest of the countries in the region either have taken only initial steps toward IWRM planning, or have not reported their data. This distribution shows that the status of IWRM planning in these sub-regions of Africa is similar to (or slightly behind) the global average. On the surface, the Africa data in the global survey does not show an appreciable change since [GWP's first survey in 2003](#), though GWP cautions that straight comparisons cannot be made given survey content and country participation in the surveying process. All countries participating in the CIDA funded PAWD project are listed in the second category – a situation to be expected given the time the survey was administered.

There are two other sub-regional bodies of relevance to the water development in Africa and to GWP and the PAWD project, in particular.

[The Southern African Development Community \(SADC\)](#) – From its headquarters in Gaborone, Botswana, SADC's mission has evolved over the past 28 years to focus on development and economic growth through regional integration – the harmonization and rationalization of policies, programs,

administrative systems, institutional mandates and functions that, in turn, enables a pooling of resources to achieve collective self-reliance.

SADC's Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan (RISDP) takes up water as a priority concern<sup>5</sup>. It points to the 1995 SADC Protocol on Shared Watercourse Systems as the pinnacle legal and policy framework for regional cooperation on water issues. Integrated Water Resource Management is recognized as the preferred approach to water sector planning and management. The Protocol is operationalized through the Regional Strategic Action Plan, now in its second five-year cycle. GWP in Southern Africa (GWPSA) has contributed to the formulation of these planning documents and assisted in implementing the plan, in part through awareness raising on IWRM and through the facilitation of a regional and country level multi-stakeholder platforms. As part of the World Water Visioning process, promoted by the World Water Council/Forum, GWPSA has also facilitated a multi-stakeholder process to formulate the 2025 SADC Vision for Water, Life and the Environment.

[The Economic Community of West African States \(ECOWAS\)](#) – This is a regional group of fifteen countries, founded in 1975. Its base is Abuja, Nigeria. ECOWAS's mission is to promote economic integration in "all fields of economic activity, particularly industry, transport, telecommunications, energy, agriculture, natural resources, commerce, monetary and financial questions, social and cultural matters .....". In a 2000 decision ECOWAS adopted the Sub-Regional Action Plan for Integrated Management of Water Resources and mandated the ECOWAS Department of Agriculture, Rural Development and Environment to implement it. The plan sets out to:

- establish a regional cooperation framework for integrated resource management,
- be supportive of member states in the implementation of their national water resource management action plans,
- harmonize policies and legislation on water resources, and exchange of experiences,
- strengthen IWRM partnerships,
- mobilize financial resources for the implementation of projects, and
- harmonize national, sub-regional and international action plans for the integrated management of water.

Within the past year, the Water Resources Conservation Unit (WRCU) of ECOWAS has developed an action plan for integrated water resources management in West Africa. Along with its support to country water partnerships in West Africa, GWP's regional partner network, the West Africa Water Partnership (WAWP) has: facilitated multi-stakeholder involvement in the regional IWRM process, convened a regional workshop concentrating on water financing, commissioned a study on integrating IWRM and

---

<sup>5</sup> According to the SADC website, the purpose of the RISDP is to deepen regional integration in SADC. It provides SADC Member States with a consistent and comprehensive program of long-term economic and social policies. It also provides the Secretariat and other SADC institutions with a clear view of SADC's approved economic and social policies and priorities.

gender aspects into PRSPs, and has provided IWRM training to organizations applying IWRM principles at the level of river basin planning.

### 2.3 GWP – Profile

The Global Water Partnership was founded in 1996 by the World Bank, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), and the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA), four years after the ground breaking Dublin Conference on Water and the Environment and the Earth Summit. Its founders asserted that to address the critical water development issues of the day, a world wide, interdisciplinary, multi-stakeholder network is needed to leverage the necessary financial, technical, policy and human resource inputs for the task. And they put forward *Integrated Water Resource Management* (IWRM) as the key operational approach to ensure sustainability.

GWP's mission is, "to support countries in the sustainable management of their water resources". More specifically, its objectives are to:

- Clearly establish the principles of sustainable water resources management
- Identify gaps and stimulate partners to meet critical needs within their available human and financial resources
- Support action at the local, national, regional or river basin levels that follows principles of sustainable water resources management
- Help match needs to available resources.

Toward these ends, GWP has created multi-stakeholder platforms at the global, regional and country levels.

- **Globally** – GWP partners with the UN system and other global actors involved in development initiatives (e.g. bilateral development organizations).
- **Regionally** – GWP partners with regional and sub-regional political bodies such as economic communities, regional development banks, multi country development initiatives such as NEPAD, actors in trans-boundary river basin initiatives, and international NGOs. Around the world these bodies tend to be networked as Regional Water Partnerships (RWPs), usually with regionally specific identifiers embedded in the name – examples relevant to this evaluation are: GWP-SA (Global Water Partnership – Southern Africa), GWP-EnA (Global Water Partnership – East Africa), and GWP-WA (Global Water Partnership - West Africa).
- **Nationally** – GWP partners with national and sub-national political bodies as well as non-state actors (including NGOs, water user groups, media organizations, academia, and private sector entities). Around the world these bodies tend to be networked as Country Water Partnerships (CWPs), often with the name of the country embedded in the name. Examples relevant to this evaluation are: MWP (Malawi Water Partnership), ZWP (Zambia Water Partnership), KWP (Kenya Water Partnership), Mali CWP and Senegal CWP. National clusters of members may

also be designated as Area Water Partnerships (AWPs). Memberships of these organizations are broadly based within specific geographic locales (often watersheds) and are focused on issues specific to that area.

Around the world, the organization operates in 14 regions (including five in Africa) and over 70 countries – predominantly developing and transition countries.

Stockholm, Sweden is home for GWP's secretariat (known as GWPO), the body responsible for implementing the GWP work program. The GWP Technical Committee, an international, technical advisory body of 12 experts act as an independent 'think tank' and provide consultancy support to the GWP network. GWP members gather on an annual basis – the consulting partners meeting – where they are consulted on major strategic and policy issues. The 22 member GWP Steering Committee provides oversight and guidance on the organization's work program. This is an elected body.

GWP defines IWRM as,

“a process that promotes the coordinated development and management of water, land and related resources, in order to maximize the resultant economic and social welfare in an equitable manner without compromising the sustainability of vital eco-systems.”

In its Strategy Paper for 2004 – 08, GWP states its strategic intent to focus on the network's comparative advantage in: a) facilitating IWRM change processes at the area/country/regional levels, and b) developing the subject of IWRM – i.e. “demystifying its principles and developing tools to help stakeholders turn principles into practice”. Regarding the latter, GWP has developed policy documents, IWRM related manuals and guidelines and the internet based [IWRM Toolbox](#) – a compendium of effective practices.

## **2.4 PAWD – Project Description**

GWP is the executing agency for CIDA funded Partnership for Africa's Water Development (PAWD) project, the subject of this evaluation. PAWD can trace its origins to the G8 Summit in Kananaskis, Canada in July 2002. At the Summit, then Prime Minister Jean Chretien announced the \$500 million Canada Fund for Africa and a bundle of regional socio-economic, governance, environment, health and education related initiatives to support Africa's development. Included in his list of priorities was water management. In his remarks, the Prime Minister indicated Canada's intent to support NEPAD and the G8 African Action Plan.

A contribution agreement was signed with GWP on December 30, 2003 for \$10 million over four years<sup>6</sup>. PAWD was to support five African countries (Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Senegal and Zambia) to manage their water resources in a sustainable manner in order to contribute to poverty reduction, human well-being and the protection of natural resources.

---

<sup>6</sup> During 2006, Ministerial approval was given for a one-year, no cost extension to March 31, 2008.

At the country level, PAWD focuses on three components, which are directly related to the project's outcomes/longer-term results:

- Support to National IWRM Frameworks;
- Support to the institutional development of existing, new and emerging multi-stakeholder national and regional water partnerships;
- Support towards the integration of water into Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRSPs) or their equivalent.

According to early project documentation, the choice of the components introduced above was shaped by the desire of some regional stakeholders to focus Canadian resources on the acceleration of progress within participating countries toward the 2002 WSSD targets, specifically, “to stop the unsustainable exploitation of water resources and to develop integrated water resources management and efficiency plans by 2005”. It was from a series of design meetings during 2003 that GWP identified the five African countries most ready to embark on IWRM planning and most prepared – i.e. with some form of country partnership in place - to take on a project with IWRM plan development as its focus.

PAWD **outputs** as specified in the Contribution Agreement are:

- Established partnerships with stakeholders in selected countries
- Better knowledge and awareness by stakeholders of IWRM issues in each selected country, within the context of trans boundary basin management.
- Potential actions and solutions identified for improved management
- Proper IWRM framework developed for an enabling environment, institutional roles and management instruments; and, secured buy-in of framework by relevant entities, ministries and stakeholders.
- Existing institutions better perform with respect to framework implementation.
- Approved and widely accepted strategy and process by all stakeholders.
- Capabilities and competencies of the partners enhanced.
- Guidelines (in appropriate languages) are developed on how to integrate IWRM into the PRSP process.
- Increased capacity of stakeholders and ministries to influence the PRSP process.

The evaluation team understands 'outputs' to be: a) changes directly related to activities and over which the project has substantial control, b) important steps in the results logic where the potential is being created for the outcomes to occur.

PAWD **outcomes** as specified in the Contribution Agreement are:

- National frameworks for sustainable water resource management and service provision are in

place and/or well advanced for the selected countries.

- Ownership of the National Frameworks through a process involving a wide range of stakeholders.
- Improved water resource management and water service delivery.
- Stronger collaboration with potential relevant financing institutions to support projects.
- Strengthened regional and country level partnerships in selected countries to ensure that they function as effective multi-stakeholder platforms.
- Water issues are integrated into PRSPs for a selected number of African countries.

The evaluation team understands that ‘outcomes’ represent the changes the project claims it can bring about by the end of its life cycle, recognizing that the implementor (GWP) does not have control over the changes – but enough direct influence given the time and resources available to it.

### 3.0 Assessment of PAWD's Relevance

This section examines the Project's continuing relevance to the water sector in Africa, the internal consistency of its design logic, and the alignment of the project to: a) CIDA's goals of poverty reduction and sustainable development, and b) CIDA's gender policy and GWP's own gender policy objectives. Specifically, it addresses the following questions:

1. Has PAWD's multi-stakeholder approach continued to be relevant and strategic to the implementation of IWRM in partner countries?
2. Is the internal logic of PAWD (connection between inputs/activities and outputs/outcomes) still intact toward the end of the Project?
3. Have the activities being implemented under each of the three components been well selected to achieve the defined outcomes?
4. Is the Project's design and delivery consistent with CIDA's gender equality policy: a) more equal participation of women with men as decision makers in shaping the sustainable development of their societies, b) reduced inequalities between women and men in access to and control over the resources and benefits of development? Is the Project's design and delivery consistent with GWP gender equality objectives?
5. Will the Project continue to be relevant to CIDA's poverty reduction and sustainable development goals? Does project design and delivery reflect: a) local ownership, b) alignment with other water related development initiatives, c) harmonization with other donors, d) a management for results focus?

## Summary of Findings and Conclusions

PAWD has remained highly relevant to water reform efforts in Africa

Literature shows that, in the last fifteen to twenty years, water has become internationally recognized as a critical development issue – governments recognize that old ways of planning for and servicing water needs do not work.

IWRM planning, under-girded by enabling policy and legal frameworks, is put forward as the most likely starting point for water sector reform at a country level.

IWRM philosophy and approach is catching the eye of planners/managers in water related sectors (agriculture, local government, environment, forestry) who see possibilities for using it as part of allied sector reform processes.

International and African commitments and targets - Agenda 21, the Millenium Development Goals, WSSD, Africa Water Vision - have created expectations *vis a vis* water reform, generally, and IWRM specifically, and the push is on to meet those targets. The rationale for PAWD is to be understood within this context.

For the most part, the activities of PAWD make sense given the Africa water sector reform efforts being guided through various multi-lateral fora. There may be some confusion over the 'vantage point' of the strategic results framework. In some instance the government activities appear to be confused as GWP's. The confusion in the framework perhaps mirrors the set up of at least three Country Water Partnerships where roles and lines of accountability between the country water partnerships and the government authorities have been a source of confusion, particularly during the earlier phases of the Project.

PAWD started without a gender mainstreaming component and was allowed to run for a year before the means to develop and implement a gender strategy were formulated. As it turned out, the African institution named by the gender consultant to help PAWD develop its gender strategy was unable meet its mandate. Consequently the program's gender work has proceeded without the infusion of a strategic approach. Training activities led by the regional water partnerships have reached key people in the PAWD countries and have been evaluated positively, but these have not been well synchronized with national gender programming and have not been reinforced with follow-on activities.

## Section 3: Recommendations

**Recommendation 1:** That in the formulation of further IWRM planning/implementation initiatives, CIDA/GWP ensure that RBM/Outcomes Mapping is utilized to sort out in a participatory way who, precisely, is implementing the initiative and which stakeholder groups are experiencing a change or benefit at the output, outcome and impact levels. Further, that where the initiative involves multiple countries (or discrete programming areas), consideration be given to replicating the exercise at this smaller scale.

**Recommendation 2:** That in the formulation of further IWRM planning/implementation initiatives CIDA/GWP ensure that gender analysis is carried out with key partners in the design phase of the initiative with a view to having gender dimensions commonly understood and strategies agreed upon by the end of the inception phase.

### 3.1 PAWD's Relevance to the Country Contexts

As set out in the literature cited in Section 2.0, water reform has emerged as a critical development issue over the past 20 years, and IWRM has become recognized globally as the operational means by which stakeholders rationalize water use within known environmental parameters. As noted in the UN Economic and Social Council's CSD-12 Report of the Secretary General, entitled, [Freshwater management: progress in meeting the goals, targets and commitments of Agenda 21, the Program for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21, and the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation \(April 2004\)](#),

“Most analyses indicate that the “water crisis” is primarily an institutional problem reflecting lack of capacity, finance and political will to manage water resources and provide water services, rather than a water crisis as such. Knowledge, skills and technologies exist for managing water resources and providing water services for all in support of sustainable development”.

Water agenda targets have been set, notably:

- the MDGs – and specifically Goal 7 – “to ensure environmental sustainability” which carries the target, “**halve by 2015 the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and sanitation**”,
- the WSSD targets set in 2002 related to IWRM – in particular, “**develop Integrated Water Resource Management and Water Efficiency Plans by 2005**”, and
- for Africa specifically, the milestones and targets of the Africa Water Vision for 2025 (see list under Section 2.2).

PAWD was designed within the context of these developments and the pressures exerted as a result of the targets set out above.

At the time, PAWD was on the drawing board, WHO/UNICEF was assembling its mid term assessment of progress towards the MDG drinking water target. Its findings were that between 1990 and 2002, most parts of the world had made progress and were on course to achieve the MDG target by 2015. Sub-saharan Africa, while making progress (49% to 58% coverage for access to clean drinking water), was lagging behind, and at the current pace would not reach the required 75% coverage by 2015. The

assessment pointed to the generally low priority given to water and sanitation as one of three key obstacles to progress.

The Commission on Sustainable Development, at its first and second sessions (CSD-11 (2003) , CSD-12 (2004)) following the Johannesburg Summit, expressed concern that it would be difficult to achieve the IWRM target of WSSD without the concerted actions of governments and other stakeholders.

In its developmental stages, CIDA and GWP in consultation with other donors envisaged the project accelerating partnership development and the more rapid realization of the IWRM plans than could otherwise be achieved.

Looking back over the four-year project, respondents in all five countries note that PAWD has been instrumental in bringing their country plans to fruition. They point to the procedural help obtained through IWRM training (all countries), commissioning of consultants to carry out specific studies (sector analyses and inventories of relevant projects and programs) for the plan (Zambia, Malawi, Mali, Senegal), the public consultation processes with drafts (all countries), heightened public profile generated through the media, and the technical advisory support provided GWP TEC inputs (all countries). In Zambia and Kenya, a considerable amount of drafting work took place within the designated water authority with other donor support (notably that of GTZ), but in these scenarios there was little readiness (budget and plan) to undertake public consultation despite a recognized need to do so. In Kenya, for example, the water authority acknowledged that, without consultation, the plan would be deficient. As one senior manager in the Water Resources Management Authority (WRMA) stated, “we were not relaxed (in formulating the plan), we were being *boxed from the sides* by GWP – reminded that the Water Act and Policy made it essential to consult”.

### **3.2 Internal Consistency of the PAWD’s Results Logic**

The results framework for the PAWD project has not changed substantively at the outcome and impact level since it was approved as part of the Contribution Agreement. Activities and outputs were elaborated upon in the Inception Report though without substantively changing the design of the project. According to the Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) used in PAWD reporting, there are 12 activities allocated across the three programming components:

- Support to the Development of National IWRM Frameworks
- Support to the Institutional Development of Water Partnerships
- Support for the Integration of IWRM into PRSPs

The delineation of Activities and Outputs follows quite closely the IWRM planning process as described by GWP in its 2004 publication, [Catalyzing Change: A handbook for developing integrated water resources management \(IWRM\) and water efficiency strategies](#), as well as in some of GWP TEC papers and other resources in the GWP Toolbox. Key among these items are the following:

- Mobilise “political will and commitment” to the IWRM process

- Carry out capacity-building activities to support the IWRM planning process
- Undertake a water sector situation analysis and issues identification
- Assess water management functions and strategies at all levels
- Launch a public consultation process for the draft plan
- Identify fundable sector programs and projects
- Assist members of multi-stakeholder platforms build their core competencies in such areas as participatory approaches, conflict resolution, fundraising, planning and management, and support the functioning of the country partnerships
- Establish the link between sustainable resource management on the one hand and economic development and poverty reduction, on the other; and facilitate stakeholder to influence PRSP process.

The evaluation makes the following observations about the activities and outputs listed in the operational version of the results framework – i.e. a version that is later than the framework included in the Contribution Agreement :

- The activities are well delineated from each other, however there appears to be some confusion over the vantage point from which the PAWD framework is written. In most activity statements it is clear that GWP is implementing the activities (as seems appropriate), with the Secretariat, the regional and the country partnerships each taking a share in the tasks. However, in two places the Government, itself, becomes the implementing agent. Activity #8 reads, “Government drafts IWRM plan with input/participation of multi-stakeholders”. While this statement is consistent with the spirit of IWRM, it surely represents a ‘result’ from the vantage point of GWP as the implementing agent. Activity #10 reads, “Develop actions into fundable implementation programs and project portfolios pursuing funding from national sources and international donors and build implementation capacity”. It would seem that this activity is also ascribed to government and not GWP. It would surely not be GWP’s responsibility to “pursue funding from national sources and from international donors”.
- As many as six statements listed as activities are worded more as results statements (mostly at the output level). This is problematic to the extent that it obscures what is actually to be done to achieve the result. In one so called activity statement – “Major stakeholder groups participate in a country water partnership and by representation in overall project management and a system for wider national consultation is established and used at strategic steps in the development of the IWRM plan” – the reader is left with few clues as to what project actions are envisioned”.
- At 12 activity and output statements, the framework is cumbersome, and all the more so because of the mix up of activity and results statements noted above. Here, the evaluator agrees with assessments made by an external consultant following a review of the LFA at a PAWD operational meeting in Dakar in November, 2004. At that time, consideration was given

streamlining the logic model. Understandably, the idea was eventually rejected given that the project was already one year into implementation.

As noted in Section 2.4, PAWD activities and outputs were to build toward six outcomes. The Project's architects envisioned that by the close of PAWD:

- IWRM plans would be completed or well advanced in selected countries.
- Ownership of these national plans would extend beyond delegated authorities in government to include all stakeholders (government and non-government).
- There would already be a change in the way water resources are managed and water services are delivered.
- Potential financing institutions would be engaged more fully in supporting projects under the IWRM plan.
- Participating regional and country level partnerships would be functioning as effective multi-stakeholder platforms.
- Water issues would be integrated into PRSPs or other National Development planning documents for a selected number of African countries.

The logical connection between PAWD activities and results at the outcome level is compelling with regard to the first two and the last two outcomes, but more troubling with regard to the third and fourth outcomes. From the project documentation, it is clear that PAWD's *raison d'être* is to facilitate, even accelerate the process of IWRM plan formulation, to foster recognition of water at higher levels of national planning, and to establish durable multi-stakeholder platforms to facilitate IWRM planning and implementation. Accordingly, it seems reasonable that, to have IWRM plans in place or well advanced with strong stakeholder 'buy in' represent results over which PAWD has direct enough influence to produce with the time and resources available. The same is true for PAWD's claims about being able to integrate water into national level planning and about nurturing durable, relevant multistakeholder platforms.

By contrast, PAWD's claims to, "strengthen collaboration with potential relevant financing institutions to support projects being prepared" and, most especially, to "improve water resource management and service delivery", reach beyond PAWD's sphere of direct influence. Arguably, these results appear to be more within the sphere of influence of the national governments of participating countries, or at least the water related ministries and agencies in those governments. As discussed in Section 4.1, CWP informants across the board have found it difficult to deliver on these outcomes.

Lastly, the evaluators observed that all PAWD countries operated from a single, program-wide results logic model rather than from tailored country frameworks. One probable merit of this approach is that it eases the task of amalgamating reports into a single program document. Arguably, though, the exercise of thinking through the PAWD logic by country might have helped the country water partnerships to think through their design and work planning with the rigour that RBM offers. And to

have done so might have gone some way towards clarifying the institutional set up between the partnerships, their hosts and the lead water authorities in government. Arguably, to have country specific logic models and performance measurement frameworks does not negate the possibility of being able to stitch together a program story, though some care has to be taken in the design phase to ensure a modicum of consistency between the two levels of planning and reporting.

### 3.3 PAWD Alignment with CIDA's Gender Policy and GWP Gender Equality Objectives

CIDA's gender policy seeks to:

- Advance women's equal participation with men as decision-makers in shaping the sustainable development of their societies;
- Support women and girls in the realization of their full human rights; and
- Reduce gender inequalities in access to and control over the resources and benefits of development. (CIDA's Gender Policy Objectives)

In a manner consistent with these objectives, GWP recognizes gender mainstreaming as an essential element in each of the three mutually reinforcing spheres of IWRM planning.

- **The enabling environment** - developing gender sensitive laws, policies, strategies and budgets.
- **Institutional roles and organizational frameworks** – balancing representation of women in legislative bodies at all levels, and building capacities within water authorities to undertake and act upon gender analyses of operations.
- **IWRM Strategies and plans** - carrying out a good gender analysis as part of creating a knowledge base for decision-making; anchoring women in the decision-making process; and developing gender-disaggregated indicators and incorporating them in monitoring and evaluation systems.

The organization's understanding of the gender in the context of IWRM is set out in [GWP's Policy Brief No 3 - Gender mainstreaming: An essential component of sustainable water management](#).

Both the PAWD Project Document and the Inception Report make mention of gender as a cross-cutting theme and in a way that is consistent with GWP's gender approach set out above, but only in general terms. No specific gender mainstreaming strategies are mentioned in these documents.

Recognizing that gender remained to be addressed a full year after the start of the project, the Canada Fund contracted a gender equality specialist to review project documentation and consult with project team members (Secretariat, regional and country levels) over a gender strategy. The consultant recommended actions be taken by the GWP Secretariat and the regional and country PAWD teams, including that:

- The Gender and Water Alliance (GWA) be engaged as an associate partner to “conceptualize and support the implementation of PAWD gender equality mainstreaming activities”.
- Gender dimensions be included in PAWD’s results logic model and Work Breakdown Structure, and that gender equality mainstreaming indicators be integrated into the performance management framework.
- The program conduct gender awareness raising at the regional and country levels, build skills in gender analysis, integrate gender analysis into the situational analysis components of the IWRM planning process, ensure women and women oriented water related organizations are integrated into the multi-stakeholder platforms.

From conversations with CWP managers it appears, that since 2004, gender mainstreaming has gained recognition by stakeholders as a key consideration in IWRM planning. This is a trend toward which PAWD has contributed, mainly through the regionally organized trainings combined with encouragement for gender balance in various IWRM fora.

In at least three countries PAWD’s gender contributions have found their place amidst government wide affirmative action initiatives wherein ministries and agencies are obliged to maintain workforces with certain proportion being women. In Kenya for example, the expectation is that women make up at least 30% of the staffing complements of ministries and agencies<sup>7</sup>. Beyond that, though, the theme has remained elusive. As one country manager put it – “we have been at a loss to know how to incorporate gender into this work”.

A more detailed appraisal of progress achieved is set out in Section 4.5.

### 3.4 PAWD’s Contribution to CIDA’s Goals of Poverty Reduction and Sustainable Development

CIDA’s 1995 Policy on Poverty Reduction stipulates that the Agency’s programming must, in a sustainable way, address the “causes of deprivation and inequity”. Remedial action can occur on a local, regional, national and international level but, at whatever level, must address root causes and structural factors. That is to say, initiatives may be focused:

- **Directly on the poor** – by improving productive capacities and participation in governance;
- **On organizations which represent and/or serve the poor** – through building organizational capacities to give the poor a voice or to design and deliver programs and services; and/or
- **On policy initiatives** - aimed at replacing systemic constraints on the poor with enabling conditions for sustainable, pro-poor decision-making.

---

<sup>7</sup> In this regard, PAWD has been supporting the Gender Desk at the Ministry of Water and Irrigation in its efforts to implement this affirmative action program.

As set out in project documentation and as described to the evaluators by several informants during the Project, PAWD is a policy intervention aimed at democratizing decisions surrounding the conservation, allocation and utilization of water. One defining quality of IWRM is its intent on bringing the full range of stakeholder groups to the discussion table to reconcile what are often competing interests, and to do so with the benefit of sound data on water flows and thresholds. For governments engaged in national reform/decentralization processes, IWRM represents a new way of doing business, for which there is considerable interest across sectors. Other ministries are looking to emulate PAWD's multi-stakeholder approach to policy development.

In all countries, PAWD is credited by government water stakeholders for contributing a practical understanding of how to proceed with the IWRM planning process. This is not to say that the planning process has been without difficulties. To varying degrees across the participating countries, government agencies charged with IWRM planning and implementation and the country water partnerships have faced difficulties sorting out roles and accountability relationships – a testament, perhaps, to the newness of this form of inter-sectoral, government - non-government engagement. Keyna serves as the most dramatic example in this regard. There, difficulties lead to an impasse that was only resolved in the final 18 months of the project.

## 4.0 Assessment of PAWD Results

This section examines PAWD's progress against expected project results mainly at the outcome level, the Project's level of success in addressing its gender intentions, and its handling of contextual factors helping and hindering progress. This examination of results draws upon the findings of a survey questionnaire administered by the evaluators during the evaluation workshop (please see Section 1.4 for a description of the evaluation methodology). Across the five countries 84 workshop participants completed the questionnaire in the workshop sessions. Most participants were well familiar with PAWD from their vantage points in government, NGOs/civil society, water user groups or 'other'. Those listed in the 'other' category tended to be from Academia, CWP staff or international development partners. The table below provides a profile of respondents across the five countries:

**Figure 4-1: Number of Respondents to the Evaluation Self-Assessment**

	Gov.	NGO	Private Sector	Water User Group	Other (e.g. academia, CWP)	Total Respondents
<b>Kenya</b>	4	6	2		4	<b>16</b>
<b>Mali</b>	11	3	1	1	1	<b>17</b>
<b>Malawi</b>	2	4			4	<b>9</b>
<b>Senegal</b>	19	4	2	2	3	<b>30</b>
<b>Zambia</b>	6		2	1	3	<b>12</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>84<sup>8</sup></b>

Key questions guiding the evaluation are<sup>9</sup>:

1. What progress has been made by GWP in the IWRM planning process?
2. What PAWD supported initiatives stand out most for their positive contribution to these results? Why is that so? What factors have constrained PAWD the most? How well were these factors managed by the project?
3. Have patterns of participation and perceived ownership shifted between and among the different CWP members over the life of PAWD? Do all stakeholders claim ownership over the IWRM plan?
4. Have governments agreed that all water related stakeholders (such as irrigation officials, water utilities, tourist businesses, hydro power authorities) are part of an established mechanism to review the IWRM plan in an interactive planning and implementation process?
5. Can changes attributable to PAWD be observed in water resource management and service delivery? In particular...
  - o Shifts in knowledge/understanding over the management of water resources?
  - o Evidence that government is debating recommendations related to creating an enabling environment for improved water management – e.g. recommendations related to a legislative framework, or to financing and incentive structures?
  - o Evidence that gender issues related to water resource management and water service delivery have been discussed and integrated into plans that address these issues?

<sup>8</sup> In each of the country surveys there were missing responses to some questions. Percentages have been worked out using the total number of people who answered the question.

<sup>9</sup> These questions are abstracted from a longer list of questions set out in the PAWD Evaluation Workplan.

- Evidence that government has introduced harmonized water-related policies, a revised legislative framework, or has adopted financing and incentive structures all in the service of building an enabling environment for improved water management?
6. What are the patterns of participation in CWP/RWP deliberations across the various stakeholder groups? Have these altered over time? In particular...
    - Impetus behind CWP/RWP activities/events
    - Locus of leadership in agenda setting
    - 'Air time' in discussions, by different stakeholder groups in the CWP
    - Change in level of participation by women and/or women centred organizations – presence in CWP/RWP and inclusion of gender analysis in CWP/RWP discussions
    - Level of collaboration between and among CWP/RWP members
    - Willingness of CWP/RWP to project a unified position on water related matters.
  7. What are the Partnerships' evolving roles as IWRM transitions from design to implementation? What role can CWP/RWPs play beyond integration of water in PRSPs, etc.)
  8. Are capacity building activities guided by an assessment of needs and opportunities?
  9. Have water issues been integrated into PRSPs in participating countries?

## Summary of Findings and Conclusions

Measured against its six outcomes, PAWD has can claim full success in: finalizing IWRM plans (**Outcome 1**), with broad based stakeholder involvement (**Outcome 2**). By most accounts these two outcomes have been the focal point of PAWD.

PAWD can claim partial success in its strengthening of country and regional partnerships to ensure they function as effective multi-stakeholder platforms (**Outcome 5**). The partnerships have accumulated valuable experience working in this collaborative mode, and in the process have established a mechanism that appears to be offering a reason for them all to participate. The trust level is building with experience. That said, at least three partnerships remain vulnerable as PAWD comes to an end – i.e. without an adequate financial base, a clear legal status and a strategic focus for IWRM implementation.

The program can also claim partial success in integrating water issues more fully into PRSPs (or National Development Plans) (**Outcome 6**). In two countries, partner efforts to highlight IWRM in national development planning have yielded high level government commitments (in one case quite specific). A similar situation exists in a third country though attribution to PAWD is not as direct. And in two countries partners have not been able to make headway to this point, though one country partnership is addressing the point at the time of writing.

Tremendous gains have been made, overall, in financing to the water sector in each PAWD country (**Outcome 4**) – a trend that is largely attributable to the larger water sector reform initiatives underway. That said, PAWD's contribution is not insignificant. At the regional level, GWP using PAWD among other sources, has been encouraging international donors to coalesce around water financing. And, in country, the plans themselves are drawing increasing government and donor attention.

Over the past five years, the PAWD process in pursuit of these outcomes has yielded many rich insights from an institutional/team development perspective. Stakeholders in most countries experienced an unexpected, early and prolonged settling period. Among the contributing factors were: a) a lack of clarity over role delineation between the platform and the government's lead water agency, b) awkward hosting relationships for the country water partnerships that manifested in the slow disbursement of funds and issuance of financial reports, and c) the dynamic nature of government itself – notably changing personnel operating within institutions subject to the uncertainties of decentralization.

PAWD embarked on an ambitious capacity building initiative to support the IWRM planning process and to strengthen the multi-stakeholder platforms. The evaluators encountered plenty of positive comments on the design and delivery of the training sessions, particularly those geared to understanding the IWRM planning process itself. Generally they were noted for being relevant and interactive, a few have commented that the regional nature of training sessions took away some of the specificity from the content. In all three regions it took much longer than originally envisaged to launch the capacity building program. When this happened, in late 2006 early 2007, PAWD was already half completed. Some training events were now out sequence with country program schedules. Evaluations were usually done at the end of sessions but in the end, neither the RWP nor the CWPs were able to provide the follow up assessment and support to help participants put their skills into practice. Meanwhile, as the IWRM planning process has unfolded in each country over the five years, the demand for training has grown exponentially, requiring in-country capacities to meet this demand. The positioning of the CWPs to address this emerging challenge is still being worked at the close of PAWD.

Gender training has taken place within each of the three regions under the initiation of the RWPs. Consistent with PAWD's capacity building intent, participants were sought for their potential to apply gender content in the service of IWRM planning and implementation and for their abilities to train others. As with the findings on other training topics, participants roundly appreciated the training received. That said, the dozen or so participants met during the evaluation have commented that while necessary and useful to their own professional development, the training sessions received have not been sufficient to help them integrate gender analysis into the IWRM planning process. The evaluators' review of the IWRM plans bear this out. All country IWRM drafts contain gender sections, but these provide a only cursory treatment of gender – more than anything, stating the need for gender analysis to be applied to IWRM initiatives contemplated in the plan. Several respondents expressed a feeling that throughout, PAWD's gender intentions have not been well thought out.

## Summary of Findings and Conclusions

Please refer to the recommendations in Section 6 "Assessment of Prospects for Sustainability"

### 4.1 Progress Against Stated Outcomes

Overall, GWP can claim success in achieving planned results, though this success is uneven across the six PAWD outcomes, as shown immediately below. The scoring, represents a combination of stakeholder feedback from the evaluation workshops held in each country, combined with the overall assessment of the evaluators. (each 'ð' represents one point on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is 'little or no progress' and 5 is 'full achievement').

**Figure 4-2 Overall Assessment of Outcomes Achievement**

1. National frameworks for sustainable WRM and service provision in place and/or well advanced for selected countries.	ð ð ð ð ð
2. Ownership of national frameworks and process developed by all stakeholders.	ð ð ð ð ð
3. Improved water resource management and service delivery.	ð

4. Stronger collaboration with potential financing institutions to support projects.	🕒🕒
5. Strengthened regional and country level partnerships in selected countries to ensure that they function as effective multi-stakeholder platforms	🕒🕒🕒
6. Water issues are integrated into PRSPs for a selected number of African countries.	🕒🕒🕒

Progress against each outcome is discussed below.

**Outcome 1: National frameworks for sustainable WRM and service provision in place and/or well advanced for selected countries**

**Indicators: Number of Frameworks in Place**

In all five countries national IWRM plans – that meet or exceed technical specifications - have been made ready for submission to government for approval. In Mali, the plan has been approved at the time of writing (April 2008). In Kenya, Zambia and Malawi, the documents are in an approvals process at cabinet level. In Senegal, the document is finished but, at the time of writing, the process for approvals and the mechanism for implementing the plan remains to be finalized.

The documents contain most, if not all, of the components envisaged for IWRM plan and set out in the [Integrated Water Resources Management Plan Training Manual and Operational Guide, March 2005](#) – a key resource for IWRM stakeholders that was produced with PAWD support. The components include:

**Situation Analyses** – examinations of hydrological aspects, water demand and supply, sanitation systems, water resource legislation, and the current institutional set up for water resource management.

**Goals, Strategies, Roles and Mechanisms** – including national water vision statements, medium and long term goals, strategies to address key issues (including risk management), methods to maintain public participation, water management and governance.

**Financing Aspects** – IWRM project profiles, financing strategies and mechanisms.

**Implementation** – including inter-sectoral coordination, IWRM communications strategies, monitoring and evaluation.

**Satisfaction among the evaluation survey respondents with Plan Formulation – all countries...**

- 60% - that the Situation Analysis report has been shared with politicians and senior members of government (25% indicate that effort has been put in but that the situation is not as desired).
- 76% - that their IWRM planning process has produced medium and long-term goals towards sustainable management of water resources in their country.
- 53% - that institutional roles for water related governmental agencies are defined/refined in their plan (33% indicate that effort has been put in but that the situation is not as desired)
- 46% - that conflicts over water resources are addressed in the plan (41% indicate that effort has been put in but that the situation is not as desired)
- 56% - that government is debating strategies to make it easier for IWRM to take place (e.g. legislative framework, financing and incentive structures) (32% indicate that effort has been put in but that the situation is not as desired)

In at least three countries, early drafts of documents have been critiqued internally and externally (by the TEC teams) for being fragmented – i.e. for not adequately following issues through from discovery in the situation analyses narrative to solution in the action planning part of the documents. Some of the documents have been critiqued for insufficiently aligning their analysis and proposed actions to national policy documents.

In part, these deficiencies are a function of the sheer breadth of documentation required from across many disciplines to assemble a comprehensive planning document.

Understandably, contributions were made by many individuals, further complicating the task of building coherence into the plan. Many of these concerns have been ironed out through successive drafts and stakeholder

consultations, though as several key respondents invested in the drafting process noted, these documents cannot be perfect. They represent a work in progress.

What is important here is that these documents are, for the most part, anchored in higher level policy commitments, are embedded in larger, longer term water sector reform initiatives, and are the subject of ongoing dialogue among stakeholders. Inter-ministerial coordination mechanisms dedicated to water development have emerged in at least three countries.

Across the five countries, the evaluators frequently encountered the view that, at the end of the day, the IWRM planning document represents the most comprehensive source of information and insight about water development. That said, several informants noted shortcomings that are, by all accounts, minor and cautionary rather than compromising. These shortcomings were witnessed in the self-assessment questionnaire, in conversations with key stakeholders, or through observation of a national validation exercise. They include:

- Difficulty committing to specifics in the areas of water efficiency standards, and tariffs. On this, one person provided some thoughtful insight - that these areas are delicate discussion topics in an IWRM planning process where to be too forthright and insistent may engender resistance before the plan gets approved and implemented.
- Putting in place functional mechanisms for inter-agency/ministry coordination in bureaucratic structures that are not accustomed to this way of working. The comment here is that it is one thing

to aspire to this level of information sharing and coordination, it is another to foster the organizational culture that enables it.

- In the same vein, calling for policy harmonization across ministries/agencies represents a move in a positive direction, but actually bringing about the needed agreements and commitments is a very large and probably drawn out process that lies beyond the influence of those promoting the IWRM agenda.
- That the task of communicating the plan at the catchment level is enormous and perhaps bigger than anticipated. The same is true of the task of building the needed capacities for communities to engage in IWRM and for line staff to facilitate such.

**Outcome 2: Ownership of national frameworks and process developed by all stakeholders**

**Indicators: Number of Institutional Structures in Place**

Across the five countries, CWP's have built broad based support for the plans through: a) public consultations at national and district levels, and b) encouragement of inter-ministerial/agency participation in the drafting process. Program-wide, the presence of a larger water sector reform agenda – complete with policy, legal framework and/or ministerial strategic plans - has been instrumental to the extent that these higher level commitments set out the institutional arrangements for the implementation of IWRM and make it easier for IWRM champions to advocate for inter-sectoral involvement and public participation.

In Zambia, where the Water Act is currently under review after almost passing into law under a predecessor government, there is some concern that the IWRM plan lacks this legal framework as its anchor.

The PAWD process, as it is commonly called in GWP, brings stakeholder participation into play more than has been the case in the past. Policy planning exercises have traditionally focused on the technical content of the plan instead of public engagement; this process represents a marked departure. Several informants have commented that water's national strategic importance may have a further tempering effect on government's willingness to give up control of the water agenda. What is clear from a survey of the five countries is that the threshold of tolerance for participation varies from country to country according to political/administrative traditions and likely a host of additional social-cultural factors unexplored in this evaluation. The insight that flows from this tolerance differential is that there is no 'one size fits all' participation formula in IWRM or any other public policy initiative of this type.

While noting that participatory process builds 'buy in', many informants – including those in government - have acknowledged that it also takes time, patience and trust. As shown in the box above, the picture is promising – 63% of respondents across the five countries believe the relationship between their government and the national platform is 'good' (and only 7% believe that corrective action is required). Unfortunately, there is no baseline figure to compare this with, however the documented experience of

the five CWP platforms suggests that the trend is an upward one. From a conversation at the Kenya evaluation workshop with representatives of all major stakeholder groups came the following proposition:

- That NGO/CSOs and the private sector need government to recognize that they know conditions at the local level and are well placed to provide programs and services that can complement those provided by government.
- That government needs non-government stakeholders to participate with ideas and practical assistance – they bring “energy, money and ideas” to the table.
- The platform is to be the meeting place – “the honest broker” - where there is discussion and action that builds on synergies and avoids duplication.

In Kenya, where the relationship between government and the platform was nearly moribund at the mid point of PAWD, workshop participants suggested that the new relationship is building toward that suggested above. And NGO informants in at least three countries, including Kenya, have noted how the presence of CWP platforms has created a new space for dialogue with government on water issues.

**Satisfaction among the evaluation survey respondents with Stakeholder Participation – all countries...**

- 66% - attendance at platform meetings and participation of government officials (27% indicate that effort has been put in but that the situation is not as desired).
- 66% - that other relevant non-governmental actors are invited to be part of platform meetings (29% indicate that effort has been put in but that the situation is not as desired).
- 52% - that individuals who attend platform meetings on behalf of their partner organization are able to participate and contribute effectively (45% indicate that effort has been put in but that the situation is not as desired).
- 63% - that the relationship between the government and the CWP (platform) is good; i.e. that government trusts members of the partnership (33% indicate that effort has been put in but that the situation is not as desired).
- 58% - that key partners have become more knowledgeable about IWRM (38% indicate that effort has been put in but that the situation is not as desired).

Fostering the involvement of highly placed officials from national planning and/or budgeting agencies stands out as a key strategy to build constructive multi-stakeholder working relationship. This has been born out in all five countries at different times. Indeed, the RWP – SA argues from their experience facilitating many country and basin IWRM initiatives, that the IWRM planning process should begin not with the lead water ministry/agency, but with a senior official of one of these higher placed entities, or even with the prime minister/president’s office.

At the same time, the evaluators became aware of the implications of government playing a dominant and some would argue overbearing, role in IWRM deliberations. In the Kenya situation, WRMA’s cautious stance toward KWP and desire to control the drafting process led many non-government stakeholders to back away. Now, in this new

phase of cooperation, KWP is working to re-recruit members. In Senegal, where the government’s lead agency the Directorate for Management and Planning of Water Resources (DGPRE) is a key driving force, concern was expressed by some that while a strong champion for IWRM, the agency is not communicating as fully as it might. The broad-based Pilot Committee comprised of 66 members, only met twice during PAWD, once to approve the IWRM road map and then again to validate the IWRM

draft. There remains some uncertainty over the collective vision *vis a vis* the institutional roles of government in implementing the plan.

Notwithstanding the strategic benefits that appear to be flowing or, at least, building with the presence of multi-stakeholder involvement, the evaluators have learned of at least two operational challenges on the efficacy of the multi-stakeholder process. These are not uncommon among networks.

- Discontinuity among organizational/ministry representatives – those present may not be prepared to participate or make decisions
- Lack of clarity on the role of the platform/PAWD *vis a vis* IWRM (sometimes despite explanations – may be linked to the point immediately above)

The evaluators certainly encountered private sector stakeholders in the partnerships, but on the whole their participation seems proportionately less prominent than either their stake in water or their political influence over its development. The mining, hydro electricity, water engineering and plantation industry sectors are suggested by several key informants to be very important to the success of IWRM.

However, the evaluators did not encounter any outstanding success stories involving the participation of these actors. In one meeting with an active member of a CWP who is employed by a plantation, the stance of the business sector toward IWRM was portrayed as follows:

- The business case for taking action to conserve and protect water trumps environmental or social considerations – savings on water use are good to the extent they improve business efficiency.
- Many businesses will not be happy with ‘polluter pay’ arrangements, nor will they be willing to relinquish unused water rights.
- Businesses will respond to regulations if they have confidence in the systems for monitoring compliance.
- It is unlikely that businesses will help sustain non-statutory bodies like water partnerships through paid memberships. They may be more willing to pay for services rendered.

These insights above come from only a few sources but, to the extent they are valid, the evaluators suggest that they pose an important challenge to CWPs. As the leading edge of IWRM makes its presence felt at the catchment level, one could expect private sector interests to become more involved. This is where they would most likely find themselves confronting the implications of IWRM. There is a suggestion in the characterization above that, in this scenario, businesses will be protective.

Procedurally, they may complicate negotiations with their demands. There would seem to be a need/opportunity here for CWPs to be proactive, to find a way to engage with at least the largest industrial water users, perhaps through their associations, on terms that are mutually beneficial.

At a practical level, CWP managers in three countries observed that their country plans could have been finished months earlier had they cut short the ‘back and forth’ drafting process. However, they note how government sensitivity to wording issues could have easily lead to frustration if the lead

agencies had felt rushed or somehow challenged. They also suggest that this sensitivity can be thought of as an indicator of 'buy in', though herein lies a some tension. The drivers of the drafting process – can find themselves in a catch-22 situation where, on the one hand, their lead ministries or authorities need to be thoroughly engaged while, on the other, those same ministries expect the actual drafting/editing work to be done by the core team.

Lastly, there is the question of whether catchment level IWRM pilots would have represented a good accompaniment to the IWRM planning process – and, more specifically, would have provided opportunities to greatly increase the involvement of stakeholder entities – namely, government staff at the district level, NGOs active in the catchment and water user groups. GWP in Stockholm and in the regions tended to discourage active participation by CWP's under PAWD citing the need to stay clear from an actual implementation role and focused on the planning process. But looking back most stakeholders across the program either lament not taking up a pilot or not taking it up to the degree desired. Not only do they argue that a pilot could deepen stakeholder knowledge and commitment, but also that it could generate a body of knowledge and experience to nourish the national planning process and provide concrete examples to bolster public messaging on IWRM benefits.

The Zambia Water Partnership elected to proceed with a pilot and engaged with stakeholders in the Chalimbana catchment area – a location rife with conflict and environmental issues. In the end however, ZWP was unable to engage stakeholders in anything more than some preliminary information sessions and to procure and place some gauges to track water flows along the river. Key informants (including an individual from the catchment water association) note that the process became bogged down in procedural issues connected to larger questions of who is driving the PAWD process, and to time delays with the release of procurement funds from the ZWP's host institution. Arguably, the Zambia experience in large part demonstrates GWP's concern about CWP's getting too immersed in catchment level complexities given the newness of the PAWD intervention. In Senegal, the CWP also engaged in a catchment level process at Lac des Guiers, and with greater success, to date. In this instance the pilot is embedded in a larger internationally funded IWRM process, a factor which may be making a difference.

<b>Outcome 3: Improved water resource management and service delivery</b>
<b>Indicators: Decrease in conflicts between competing users of water resources</b>

The evaluators learned of 'on the ground' changes in at least three countries. Innovations tend to be early and centred around specific water users or individuals in specific water catchment areas – those who have been directly engaged in IWRM activities by virtue of living in a so called "hot spot", or who have been exposed to IWRM concepts through awareness raising initiatives. So far, improvements are not systemic in nature, though Kenya is moving quickly to implement catchment level strategies across the country. The level of attribution to PAWD is generally low across the five countries.

Examples of changes in water resource management and service delivery are set out below:

- Zambia Sugar (a member of the ZWP) is implementing new irrigation techniques with savings on water use.
- The placement of hydro-metric gauges along the Chalimbana River, site of ZWP's pilot project, are providing water flow data to inform contentious discussions between upstream and downstream users.
- At lac des Guiers, in the Ndiaye region, Senegal, the Ministry of Agriculture is using an IWRM approach to address competing urban-rural water uses (vegetable farmers versus city water consumers). With PAWD support, agreements have been reached to limit water use and protect quality both with positive results. The Ministry is now looking for ways to replicate the approach in other settings.
- The combination of media promotion – particularly notable in Malawi and Zambia – and district level consultations generated new interest and awareness of IWRM at the local level. One common finding in at least three countries is that the stewardship principles intrinsic to IWRM, while couched in different language, are not out of line with traditional rural practices. As noted by several informants, this bodes well for further IWRM awareness raising.

**Satisfaction among the evaluation survey respondents with Progress toward IWRM Plan Implementation...**

- 45% - that there is an increased public understanding of the need for water resources to be managed in an integrated way (45% indicate that effort has been put in but that the situation is not as desired)
- 31% - that there are tangible changes in the way water resources are managed since 2004 (the majority 53% indicate that effort has been put in but that the situation is not as desired)
- 56% - that there is evidence that government is debating strategies to make it easier for integrated water resource management to take place – e.g. legislative frameworks, financing and incentive structures (32% indicate that effort has been put in but that the situation is not as desired)

Beyond PAWD there are other funded trans-boundary and/or catchment level IWRM initiatives underway in all countries as part of water sector reform programs. The evaluators are aware that these processes, by virtue of their closer proximity to water users, are creating ground level ripple effects that are similar or greater than those created by PAWD. For example:

- As part of Kenya's catchment level IWRM planning process (supported by GTZ), staff members of the national water authority are seeing on the ground changes in attitude

toward water conservation and protection. One senior official recalled how on a visit to a community, local leaders were responding to a government stipulation that riparian zones of 10 meters be maintained. Contrary to expectations they did not complain but, rather, called for a wider band of protection along the river.

- Other funded catchment level IWRM processes are underway or planned in Senegal and Mali wherein engagement is leading or expecting to lead people at the local level to act differently around water resource management. Since 2004, for example, the Senegal River Basin Water Resources and Management Project has been setting up and strengthening basin management

committees and water user associations for the control of invasive plants and control of soil degradation.

Evaluation workshop participants in Zambia, Malawi and Mali indicated that had they pursued catchment level pilots, or been able to fulfill their pilot project aspirations (Zambia) there would have been more concrete changes to report in water resource management and service delivery.

There do appear to be policy and programming changes percolating through at least some water related ministries and agencies. In Senegal, for example, IWRM concepts are written into the strategic plans of several water related ministries. Still in Senegal, the evaluator heard about the passage of the Agro-sylvo pastoral Bill in 2005 wherein IWRM is given as the main approach to controlling water use and the development of agriculture over the next 20 years. And in Kenya, IWRM approaches are contemplated for the development of a new National Land Use policy.

Others referred to the lack of an IWRM pilot project in PAWD which would have contributed to seeing some tangible results during the past four years.

**Outcome 4: Stronger collaboration with potential financing institutions to support projects**  
**Indicators: Number of exchanges/steps (documented) undertaken with potential financial institutions for project preparation support**

Since 2004 (and earlier), financing for the water sector, overall, has increased in all five countries. In Malawi, for example, water development is now considered second priority in national development

**Satisfaction among the evaluation survey respondents with Progress toward obtaining financing for plan implementation...**

- 45% -that financial strategies are in place to obtain support for the plan (40% indicate that effort has been put in but that the situation is not as desired)
- 28% - that financial instruments are secured to undertake projects under IWRM.

planning, and resource allocations have increased by 40% since 2006. Against the larger backdrop of global and Africa-wide action to address the water crisis (see Section 2.1 and 2.2), country assessments by the donor community (including the World Bank, EU, GTZ) have already helped draw attention to the needs and opportunities for financing.

Overall, the level of attribution of these positive financing trends to PAWD is more modest than is the case with the first two outcomes, but greater than the level of attribution evident under the third outcome (IWRM management and service delivery).

To varying degrees the RWP's have played a role encouraging the main international donors to coalesce around water financing. To the evaluators knowledge contributions have centred on the collection of IWRM progress data (and development of systems to do that post-PAWD), and organization of donor round-table workshops.

By many accounts, the formulation of the IWRM plan and communication surrounding it has helped bring focus to the sector and, in particular, to the resource management side of it. As described to the evaluators, this facet of water sector reform has traditionally been given less attention than water infrastructure and services. This is perhaps most notable in Zambia where the IWRM plan has been substantially included in the country's Five Year National Development Plan (FNDP), Zambia's principle strategic planning document for garnering and allocating resources.

Program wide, respondents point out that with the plans approved, the lead authorities in each country are in a stronger position to continue garnering resources for IWRM projects, though in at least two countries (Kenya and Malawi) more explicit strategies may need to be formulated first. Marketing will be essential to secure necessary financing to implement all the projects specified in the plans. In Mali, for example, there is an intent to use the now official IWRM plan as the basis for a donor round table.

During evaluation workshop discussions in three countries, stakeholders speculated that the focus on finishing the IWRM plans was so much the priority that it may have resulted in the program focusing less on collaboration with financial institutions.

<b>Outcome 5</b>	<b>Strengthened regional and country level partnerships in selected countries to ensure that they function as effective multi-stakeholder platforms</b>
<b>Indicators:</b>	<b>Number of joint activities conducted between various stakeholders and degree of satisfaction</b>

Functional multi-stakeholder platforms are in place in all five countries, and in all cases PAWD has been decisive – providing a significant infusion of financial and technical support. At the conclusion of PAWD, all platforms have established a sound governance arrangement in line with GWP's accreditation standards, have found a comfortable working relationship with their government mandated water authorities, and enjoy higher public profiles than they had at the outset of PAWD.

Getting to this point has not been easy in at least four countries. Progress has been constrained by uncertainties over the respective roles of the platforms, on the one hand, and the lead water authorities in government, on the other.

- **CWP Senegal** became active in 2005 and only in 2007 did it organize its first general assembly. Up to this point, the partnership and PAWD were largely subsumed under the Government's lead water agency, DGPRES. The year 2007 is described as a turning point for the partnership – it amended its statutes aligning with GWP's conditions for accreditation. Under the leadership of its Scientific and Technical Committee CWP Senegal also adopted a work program which included provision for capacity building activities. Up to this point, the partnership had not taken much advantage of PAWD capacity building resources despite the urging of some of its members. In the past year, it has developed a strategic plan for the period 2008–12 wherein it identifies a strategic role for itself during IWRM implementation.

- **In Mali**, the MaWP's membership has doubled to 100 over the past four years with the creation of eight area water partnerships within the country. According to several respondents in the partnership, these local level entities proved instrumental in mobilizing participation during IWRM plan consultations. The current Chair of the MaWP is also the Director of the IWRM Unit at the Direction Nationale de l'Hydraulique (DNH). For some this development signals an 'internalisation' of the partnership, opening the question in Mali as to the most appropriate power balance and role delineation between government and non-government stakeholders.
- Since the re-engagement of KWP in the IWRM process with WRMA in mid-2006, **Kenya's** multi-stakeholder platform has (re) gained the recognition of government and non-government stakeholders. This represents a convergence of opinion that each entity around the KWP table has something to give and to gain from mutual association. For KWP this marks a significant recovery. Up to this point the relationship between WRMA and KWP had suffered from communication breakdowns, growing mistrust and problematic PAWD management. The partnership has now positioned itself strategically in close proximity to, but apart from, the Ministry. Physically, it has situated itself within the 'flagship' building of the Ministry of Water and Immigration in Nairobi – a move, widely credited for its confidence building effect on the Ministry and WRMA. In the past eighteen months the platform has completed an extensive public consultation/validation process with the IWRM plan draft and, internally, has reconstituted itself.
- With the IWRM implementation plan now complete, **Zambia's** multi-stakeholder platform, ZWP has become well recognized, at least within the sectors directly tied to water resource management and service delivery. From all accounts it has filled a gap by creating an inter-sectoral mechanism for information exchange and discussion. This was its original 'niche' when formed in 2000. However, early on, ZWP and PAWD ran into difficulty over the accountability relationship between the Ministry of Energy and Water Development (MEWD) and ZWP's host institution, the University of Zambia School of Mines. To some within MEWD, it felt as if ZWP was treading in territory that was properly that of the governments under a sector initiative called the Water Resources Action Program (WRAP). The tension over role delineation combined with administrative difficulties in accessing program resources through UNZA lead to delays that compromised the partnership's ability to complete a catchment level pilot project. Much of this tension abated in the final two years, however, as the institutional arrangements were clarified and ZWP underwent its own constitutional reform.
- Overall, it seems the evolution of **Malawi's** country partnership has been the smoothest of the five, but even here there was a long formative period. Such was the newness of the experience of sitting together, that it took almost a year for the MWP to develop a work program. There was also a pivotal moment in 2006 when the Project Core Team realized that their IWRM process was running in parallel to and potentially overlapping with the some preparatory work for the large World Bank funded National Water Development Program. But with the support of

the Principle Secretary of the Ministry of Irrigation and Water Development and the participation of high level officials in other water related ministries a complementary work arrangement was formulated effectively setting the course for the rest of the planning phase. MWP was to specialize in the stakeholder consultation process for the draft IWRM document. With about a year to go in PAWD, the MWP leadership turned their attention to a post-PAWD future creating a strategic plan for the period 2007-12.

Arguably, the presence of PAWD, replete with its package of staffing support, training and advisory services has also effected the development of the country partnerships positively and negatively. In Kenya, Zambia and Malawi, PAWD has been largely synonymous with the nascent partnerships. According to key contacts in each of these countries, it was easy for key stakeholders to take the level of resourcing available under PAWD for granted, overlooking the fact that it was finite in time. Some suggest that this had a deleterious effect on the sense of urgency these partnerships felt toward securing their futures beyond 2008.

**Outcome 6: Water issues are integrated into PRSPs for a selected number of African countries.**

**Indicators: Guidelines available and IWRM promoted towards management of PRSP preparation.**

A survey of the PAWD countries reveals a range of results. In two countries, partner efforts to highlight IWRM in national development plans have yielded high level government commitments. Here, attribution to PAWD is strong. In a third country, the specific IWRM related commitments are embedded

**Satisfaction among the evaluation survey respondents with Progress toward inclusion of IWRM content into National Development Planning Strategies...**

- 56% -that there are links between the IWRM plan and the PRSP/National Development Planning strategy (both directions) (28% indicate that effort has been put in but that the situation is not as desired)

in the high level development plan and PAWD, through the planning process, has played an instructive role in defining that commitment. Here attribution to PAWD is evident but less direct. In a fourth country, an uncertain working relationship between the partnership and the lead water agency over two years has made it difficult to build a case for integration. And in a fifth country, the partnership is now addressing what

is perceived as short coming in their process, by asking for specific IWRM commitments to be included in the country's national plan.

More specifically:

- In **Zambia**, the IWRM is entirely consistent with the national government's five-year development plan (FNDP – 2006-10); indeed the chapter on water is largely based on the IWRM planning document with some of the more specific operational details set aside for inclusion in what the Ministry of Environment and Water Development (MEWD) refers to as the IWRM Implementation Plan. The decision to elevate large parts of the IWRM planning text came on the advice of the

Directors of Planning from various ministries at a conference convened by the Ministry of Finance and Planning (MOFP) on behalf of the partnership in 2006.

- In **Malawi**, the IWRM plan is anchored in the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS), the country's principle medium term planning instrument. Building to this, the Ministry of Economic Planning and Development along with the Ministry of Irrigation and Water Development (MoIWD) took up the recommendations of a PAWD supported review of Malawi's PRSP. According to MWP key informants, the text itself is pitched at a higher level (with less detail) than is the case in Zambia.
- In **Mali**, the high level planning instrument referenced by the MaWP is the 2004 National Plan for Access to Potable Water (PNAEP). The principle implementing partners for this plan are the Ministry of Mines, Energy, Ministry of Water, and the Ministry of Environment and Sanitation, brought together in the wake of criticism that water was being managed in an uncoordinated fashion and without a line of sight to the MDGs. Integrated management of water has been a pillar of this new tri-ministerial approach, and the PAWD process has, by several accounts, assisted the institutions involved to define more specifically what can be envisioned using IWRM approaches.
- In **Kenya**, the IWRM is not inconsistent with Kenya's larger scale, longer term planning, but with the uncertain relationship between KWP and the WRMA during the latter part of 2004 until early 2006, there has been little or no foundation upon which to advocate for specific IWRM commitments. As described to the evaluator, the PRSP has not been as much a focus for the Ministry of Planning and Finance as two other planning processes: the Investment Program for the Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment (a.k.a. the IP), Kenya's national five year rolling strategic planning document; and the Country's 2030 Vision document, both of which pay attention to water sector reform.
- Similarly, in **Senegal**, key informants involved in the preparation of the plan note that they have not yet made a direct link to the PRSP, despite water sector reform being among the priorities named in the strategy. At the time of writing, the partnership is addressing the situation. Specifically, the ministry in charge of water has sent a note to the Minister of Finance requesting inclusion of IWRM commitments in the PRSP.

## 4.2 PAWD Handling of Factors Enabling and Constraining Success

During the evaluation workshops, an historical timeline exercise explored key moments in the life of the PAWD project in each country. These are displayed in photos in the individual Country Findings Reports (Appendix V). The evaluators asked participants to characterize the partnership and/or IWRM planning process over the life of PAWD. They offered nomenclature coined by Tuckman – Forming, Storming, Norming, Performing ([Bruce Tuckman's 1965 Team Development Model](#)) – as the basis for discussion.

The following key insights emerged:

- For most countries, there was an early and prolonged period of ‘forming’ and ‘storming’ (at least two countries), mostly born from a lack of clarity about the institutional set up of the partnerships. In retrospect, most respondents agree that at the beginning, relationships were not worked out sufficiently in discussion and then set out on paper. As many noted, the sheer newness of the multi-stakeholder model mitigated against sure footedness. The global backdrop to this is there is commonly a mutual distrust or uneasiness between national governments and civil society. The PAWD countries are no exception. In one, possibly two countries, it is suggested that a lack of an articulated partnership vision may have further muddied the waters.
- In the early days of PAWD, a limited number of stakeholders – government and non-governmental - understood IWRM and, at that, mostly at a conceptual rather than a practical level. This was particularly the case in Malawi, Mali and Zambia. PAWD was, for the first time, providing the practical wear-with-all to implement an IWRM planning process – a conceptual roadmap, training, technical support, and through the partnerships a vehicle for stakeholders to engage in the process.
- In three countries (Zambia, Malawi and Kenya), the long forming and storming dynamic set out above was exacerbated by awkward partnership hosting relationships. These manifested most prominently in the way funds were disbursed and reported on.
- All partnerships to varying degrees dealt with the dynamic nature of government - changing actors, institutional cultures operating under pressures imposed by sector reform agendas, power differentials among ministries and agencies, even changing governments.
- The last eighteen months to two years have been by far the most productive ones for all CWP. In this ‘performing’ period, the organizational dysfunctions of the initial period have mostly been resolved and the push has been on to finalize the IWRM plans.

Arguably, against the constraints noted above, the PAWD teams with the support of GWP’s regional and Stockholm teams, responded ably, for the most part. It would be easy for the evaluators to suggest that more care should have been taken in the institutional set up for PAWD in each country. However, in proposing this line of reasoning with PAWD stakeholders the usual retort has been that with the benefit of hindsight this is a sound proposition, but that when in the fray of setting up PAWD the knowledge of what kind of clarity was needed was much less obvious.

As noted in Section 5.1, the interventions by the Regional Water Partnerships and the larger GWP network during these formative times were usually instrumental in a positive way. As one RWP put it, a key challenge was to be attuned to the dynamics of the government – who are ultimately in charge, while not losing sight of the multi-stakeholder imperative.

The country PAWD teams, themselves, have demonstrated creativity and sensitivity in the face of the constraints noted above. All have been attuned to the need to nurture support beyond the lead water authority and the specific sector reform initiative with which the IWRM planning process has been most closely associated. And, in Kenya, where the PAWD project encountered what was perhaps the

greatest turbulence, KWP/GWP EnA employed some well thought out strategies to re-engage the Water Resources Management Authority (WRMA) including:

- Hiring a senior, roundly respected, diplomatic scholar to lead the partnership into an exploration of the possibilities for a re-engagement with government and eventually to re-establish the relationship.
- Appealing to the WRMA's need – by virtue of the Water Act – to open up the IWRM draft to public consultation.
- Locating the new office of the KWP inside the Ministry of Water and Irrigation (MoWI), while ensuring that the governance structure of the partnership provides for broad based representation.

Enabling factors – helping forces - were also evident over the life of PAWD. Among these the evaluators most commonly heard about the following:

- The presence of IWRM-sympathetic water policies, legal frameworks and ministry strategic plans - these provided much needed leverage to the IWRM planning process in that they documents set out expectations toward which the IWRM planning process could contribute and, in at least some settings, expectations against which ministry and agency performance could or would be judged.
- The presence of higher level regional commitments and targets relevant to water resource management, as well as regional or pan-african bodies to champion them – notably: AMCOW, ECOWAS and SADC. In a manner similar to the national level policies and frameworks, these regional bodies and their commitments also provide a set of expectations for countries to follow. Here, the evaluators were not able to get a clear picture of the extent to which these higher level bodies influence or are influenced by the ministries and agencies involved in implementing water policies and programs. Several respondents cautioned that the link between high level intent/commitment and mid-level management/ implementation can be tenuous because:
  - The ability of ministries/agencies to provide hard data to show their progress in IWRM is not yet well developed.
  - Given the broad scope of ministerial mandates, these individuals may be too far removed from the operational aspects of the particular units, divisions or authorities addressing IWRM.
- The pool of rapidly accumulating experience with multi-stakeholder platforms and with the IWRM planning process stands as an important enabler for many. Regional workshops and 'team building workshops' led by RWPs were frequently cited for bringing forward the issues of importance to CWPs. RWPs/GWP-O are also credited for providing relevant capacity building sessions on a variety of practical IWRM program management related topics.

- The availability of resources for the translation of IWRM materials into local language stands as an enabling factor in at least two countries in that it facilitates the progression of IWRM from it central – policy/planning focus toward a decentralized – programming focus.

### **4.3 Progress Against PAWD’s stated Capacity Building Intentions**

In a bid to pool (financial, human and knowledge) resources, and maximize efficiencies across the regions – each RWP organized IWRM capacity building initiatives to be delivered on a region wide basis. The exercise kicked off with a capacity needs assessment process that was closely referenced to the key stages of IWRM planning. The assessment was to identify knowledge and skill areas required to: a) build commitment and participation in the IWRM reform process, b) help prepare the IWRM strategy and action plans, c) finance, implement and monitor IWRM activities at ground level.

The plans came together during 2006 through consultation workshops with CWP’s and regional training partners. The capacity building plans were readied for implementation by July (GWP – SA), November (GWP – EnA) and December (GWP- West Africa). The assessment of PAWD’s success with these plans is summarized in the following points below. These were offered by CWP and RWP staff as well as by partnership key informants across the five countries. They are brought into a single list because they are in general alignment.

- The intent to regionalize IWRM capacity building (including CIDA and Dutch funded CWP’s) was laudable and probably essential given the limited availability of resources.
- The needs assessment process captured general capacity building needs, and trainings were usually well received, but at times the regional nature of the sessions compromised opportunities to properly contextualize the material in their own country settings.
- The completion of the capacity building plans at least two and a half years into the program (mid to late 2006) made for a short time frame to implement identified training priorities and put some of the training topics out of sync with the IWRM processes already unfolding at the country level<sup>10</sup>.
- Providing resources to CWP’s to implement specific trainings is also seen as a good way of localizing training capacity.
- Capacity building may have been the intent, but in the end subject areas were handled more as training events without the follow on support that one would expect in a capacity building process. The time available and the content covered was often not sufficient to lead participants directly into training roles themselves.

---

<sup>10</sup> The PAWD project document, under its description of Component 2, envisaged that the, “organizational support resources will be put into place during the first three months of the program”.

- Trainings were often announced with little notice, limiting the ability of CWPs to nominate the best placed individuals for the positions – i.e. those well placed to use the knowledge and skills to best effect and/or to pass it along to others who could benefit.
- CWPs' were most often unable to follow up with participants to capture learnings or assist them in implementing knowledge/skills learned. There is little data to show how knowledge and skills gained has been applied.

The demand for certain kinds of training has grown exponentially as the IWRM plans have been developed and discussed/ tested among widening groups of stakeholders - namely district officers and community leaders. Indeed the demand has far outstripped the capacity of a regional training delivery model. At the same time, CWPs have not yet positioned themselves to either deliver their own capacity building process, or find others to provide this service. In other words, across the board, there appears to be a gap emerging between the rising demand for skills development and the capacity to meet that demand.

That said, awareness of this gap is playing on the minds of those in CWP leadership roles. In Kenya, for example, one of the last acts under the PAWD program is to undertake a thorough national capacity building needs assessment. In Zambia and Malawi, the partnerships are exploring the nature of their capacity building roles as the IWRM planning process transitions into implementation. This exercise includes an exploration of capacity building resources existing or emerging, in country, to meet the burgeoning demand.

#### **4.4 Progress Against PAWD's stated Gender Equality Intentions**

Section 3.3, sets out the Gender Equality intentions of PAWD. In short, after some focused discussion with PAWD team members at all levels, a gender consultant recommended that PAWD draw on the expertise of the Gender Water Alliance (GWA) to develop and support a gender mainstreaming strategy for PAWD. The strategy would focus at the country and regional levels on gender awareness and on developing gender analysis into the situational analysis components of the IWRM planning process. It would also foster the integration of women oriented, water related organizations into the multi-stakeholder platforms.

In implementation, gender training has taken place within each of the three regions under the initiation of the RWPs. Much of this has been targeted at individuals and organizations involved with the IWRM planning process – staff members of water authorities, representatives of organizations engaged in the country water partnerships. Consistent with PAWD's capacity building intent, individuals were sought for their potential to apply the gender content in the service of IWRM planning and implementation, and for their abilities to train others. Much of this training was set up with a train-the-trainer concept in mind. However, in the end, PAWD has not had the resources either regionally or in country to provide the essential follow up.

PAWD's gender work has been documented in its annual reports, albeit without gender specific indicators, as was recommended by the gender specialist consultant. The reports feature a section under outputs and outcomes for gender mainstreaming.

The narratives paint a generally positive picture about the trainings, and the half dozen of so participants across the three regions that the evaluators met concur with this assessment. They add, though, a cautionary note that, while necessary, the trainings were not sufficient to help participants facilitate gender analyses as part of the planning process.

In discussions about PAWD's gender mainstreaming initiatives at the country evaluation workshops, there is a split. Slightly more than half of the respondents feel gender has been adequately addressed in the IWRM plans, while slightly less than half feel that while gender aspects are featured in the plans, proper gender analyses were not carried out. The evaluators' cursory review of the gender sections of four of the IWRM plans supports the latter view. The gender sections – all a page or less in length - describe why gender considerations are important to the analysis of water development and then, in general terms, advance the need to undertake gender analysis at the front end of planned initiatives. In the case of Mali, the authors identify and promote incentives for women to be involved in water resource management

Some respondents note, also, that there are few, if any gender specific strategies. In Malawi, the fact that gender was not identified as a water sector priority during stakeholder consultations lead the project core team to shift attention away from its gender mainstreaming intentions. The evaluators take this as a sign that, at least in this programming context, the question of how to address gender as a cross-cutting theme may not have adequately been covered.

In the evaluation workshop timeline exercise in two countries, it appeared that the gender training happened late in the project, and in one case after the country partnership had prepared its gender mainstreaming strategy. One or two individuals in Malawi noted that the lack of synchronicity between training and plan implementation compromised the overall gender mainstreaming effort.

Several people asked to comment on gender mainstreaming in PAWD, commented that they would like to have seen more women involved in the CWP and the IWRM planning process. Due to lack of gender disaggregated data, the evaluators do not have an accurate count of the proportion of women to men involved in the partnerships across the five countries but can say that, among the stakeholder encountered across the five countries, men outnumbered women on at least a three to one basis. One comment raised several times was that gender does not have to be the domain of women as appears to be the perception. As one noted, 'you don't have to be a woman to do gender analysis, but you do have to have the training to do it well.'

Lastly, two of the RWP managers independently offered the thought that it would be more holistic and much more saleable as a concept to treat gender concerns within a larger social equity frame of reference. In the IWRM context this might mean, for example, that when addressing the question of

water pricing and subsidies, discussion considers gender aspects embedded in other social, economic and cultural variables like level of poverty/vulnerability, age, or household structure.

## 5.0 Assessment of PAWD Management

This section examines the manner by which PAWD has been managed. The actors here include: the PAWD Managers within each country water partnership; key contacts in their host agencies with responsibilities for receiving and disbursing funds, and for providing financial information; managers of the regional water partnerships and finally the team in Stockholm who play the overarching PAWD management role and stand as the main point of contact with CIDA.

Here, the evaluators have been guided by the following evaluation questions:

1. Are the roles and responsibilities of assigned personnel at GWPO, RWP and CWP: a) clearly defined, b) understood, c) realistic given time and budget, d) congruent with actual work?
2. Is their equal participation by gender in management structures? Are gender equality issues identified and addressed by management? If yes, how (provide examples)?
3. Does the flow of communication between and among implementing teams facilitate informed decision-making and action?
4. Do CWP members, RWP and GWPO share insights about their work? Is information sharing influencing work practice?
5. What are the most expensive activities at each level (GWPO, RWP, CWP) and have managers considered alternative ways of delivering to enhance cost effectiveness?
6. Are project timelines realistic? Are they being respected?
  - o How has GWPO managed risks and what type of risks have been most problematic?
  - o From a field perspective to what extent has GWPO been able to support CWP/RWPs technically and administratively?
7. Is the Project working to an agreed overall management plan?
8. Have annual plans been prepared and implemented?
9. Are all plans being appropriately reported upon? On time?
10. Is reporting consistent with CIDA and other stakeholder requirements?
11. Do reports adequately describe activities completed and results achieved?
12. How useful has GWP's outcomes mapping (M&E) schema been for measuring progress and communicating results?
13. What has been done to report on gender aspects into the project? Is there gender disaggregated data being collected and reported on?

### Summary of Findings and Conclusions

By and large, annual workplans have been referenced to the three PAWD program components and to the PAWD strategic results framework at the activity and output levels. It appears that CWPs, RWPs and the PAWD team in Stockholm maintained a cycle of dialogue and synthesis in producing regional and program wide planning documents. Several involved in the exercise, lamented however, how easily these workplans became dated as a result of the dynamic contexts in which they are working. A 2005 training on Results Based Management and Reporting was noted as instrumental in helping PAWD managers at all levels integrate results focused design, work planning and reporting instruments.

Because this PAWD initiative is so embedded in other IWRM related initiatives occurring at country, trans-boundary river basin, regional and pan African scales there are many opportunities for team members and/or active members of CWP steering committees to come together. The evaluators had no sense that

any one CWP or RWP was working in isolation from another.

Overall, PAWD has been managed with program outcomes in mind – and, in particular, with the completion and uptake of national IWRM plans. To some this ‘product’ orientation has given PAWD teams something tangible to work towards. To others this approach to program delivery has been detrimental to capacity building aspects of the program. In the rush to get the IWRM plans together and properly reviewed, they say, there has not been the time to focus on building relevant individual and organizational skills/ experience. For example, they argue that involvement in reasonably scaled IWRM pilots could have helped consolidate multi-stakeholder involvement in IWRM, simply by giving organizations a live experience of working together on the inherent challenges of the catchment.

PAWD program has had to adapt to several common management challenges including the length of time it has taken for the institutional arrangements of the partnerships to become settled. The newness of the experience was in no small way a contributing factor. In three countries, less than optimal working arrangements with CWP host institutions also mitigated against smooth management.

Supported by the RWPs as well as the PAWD team in Stockholm, the country teams have, for the most part, shown diligence and creativity in their management roles. By all accounts the RWPs and GWP staff in Stockholm have had to play their support roles delicately - facilitating rather than directing, but all the while keeping an eye on the mandate and operating principles of GWP. Generally, RWP interventions to mediate (when needed) or to simply suggest courses of action have been done well, though there is a measured critique that in certain times and places GWP might have become too involved in country activities.

Women have made up a minority of core team roles across the five countries despite the fact that several CWPs actively recruited women members through women’s NGOs. In at least three countries, women were playing leadership roles within CWPs.

PAWD narrative reporting describes outputs and outcomes though, at times, results claims are made without supportive evidence. Given the large number of results to report against, the outside reader can easily lose sight of the general progress of the program – the detailed fragments obscure the general drift of progress towards outcomes. There also appears to be a lack of documentation showing the more ‘countable’ aspects of program delivery, such as the number and types of training events held. Arguably, without this, the reader is unable to gauge the volume of work done under each of the program components.

Aspirations to design and test Outcomes Mapping as a monitoring tool in PAWD, yielded a useful design concept and a self-evaluation tool, but these have not been tested within this program as was envisaged. That said, Outcomes Mapping has been taken up by GWP. The organization has now created a full concept and intends to institutionalize it within GWP.

Knowledge Management is written into the PAWD design as a ‘component’ with its own budget line. Many discrete initiatives are built into this component – training manuals, surveys, translation of documents, process documentation, TV and Radio documentary production, website development, among others. The evaluators understand the need to be flexible with this component – however, they note that there are few, if any, specific results expectations attached to it.

## Section 5: Recommendation

**Recommendation 3:** That in the formulation of further IWRM planning/implementation initiatives, CIDA/GWP integrate Knowledge Management more fully into the program/project logic model in a way that helps managers discern and track priority uses for the resources.

### 5.1 Workplanning and Management Aspects

With regard to operational planning, the PAWD inception report envisaged a dynamic relationship between the GWP entities at the national, regional and global levels. Within the parameters of the PAWD design document, participating CWPs would provide draft annual work plans to their respective RWP managers, who in dialogue with the CWPs, would prepare integrated regional work plans for submission to the GWP in Stockholm. Finally, on the basis of this field input, GWPO would prepare a program level work plan for CIDA.

By and large this schema has worked. More than anything, it appears that the three program components – Support National IWRM Frameworks, Support to Institutional Development of Water Partnerships, and Support to Integration of IWRM into PRSPs/National Planning Documents - have served as the defining parameters for program work. The logic model with its finer grained delineation of activities and outputs has also served this purpose, particularly since a round of training on RBM and results-based reporting was carried out for program staff and country level partnership chairs in 2005. Several respondents volunteered that this training helped clarify the relationship between: the logic model – as conceptual roadmap, the work plan – as operational plan for carrying out program activities, and results based reporting – as a means of documenting progress against planned outputs and outcomes.

The main difficulty with the work planning arrangements, according to managers at all three levels is that they quickly became dated as contextual factors intervened. The Program Manager in Stockholm was particularly cognizant of these dynamics. From his vantage point at the nexus of PAWD management, he had to account for variance experienced across the five countries and three regions. To some degree, the difficulty of operating from dated work plans has been offset by the abilities of managers at all levels to interact with each other formally and informally. This has occurred through email correspondence and through regular encounters of staff and core team members at a variety of regional and global IWRM meetings taking place outside of PAWD. Indeed, the evaluators were aware of just how embedded PAWD is into other IWRM agenda's including those pertaining to trans-boundary water issues or to the business of AMCOW or SADC.

Several key informants have argued that with policy focused initiatives like PAWD, the need for a highly flexible work planning arrangement referenced to a procedurally focused results logic is essential. A procedural focus, they suggest, would have given more latitude to focus on building individual and organizational capacities, needed institutional alignments and on field testing IWRM innovations. They suggest that the PAWD logic model has been too product focused – i.e. latched to the completion of broadly supported IWRM plans set in a supportive national policy and planning framework.

Adjusting for the variable absorptive capacities of the country partnerships has been a particular management challenge throughout PAWD. Contributing factors have included:

- The length of time taken for the lead water authorities in government and the country water partnership to establish comfortable working relationship. This centred on reaching a common, working understanding of accountabilities and roles – **all countries**.
- The country water partnerships' choice of institutions to act as their fiscal agents for PAWD. Choices were based on historical and programmatic synergy more than on an assessment of the host institution's compatibility with or capacity to service the financial management and reporting requirements of an internationally funded program – **Zambia, Malawi, Kenya**;
- The selection of PAWD managers without the experience, skill sets and management disposition to navigate their country water partnerships through the formative phases of the program – **note, this was only the case in Zambia, Kenya during the first one to two years; elsewhere PAWD benefited from the continuity and experience of its staff.**

Two additional background factors mitigating against smooth program delivery were:

- The simple newness of the experience for all stakeholders concerned - informants involved in management in all five countries noted the ground-breaking nature of setting up a multi-stakeholder platform, and facilitating a consultative, inter-disciplinary policy design process. As one person put it in Kenya, "there was no guide book to help us agree on how to work together".
- That IWRM is usually being introduced into institutions that are in the midst of government reforms which by their nature are unsettling to managers and staff.

Regarding the difficulty in establishing roles and accountabilities, evaluation workshop participants in Zambia offered a thought for future practice; that there may be merit in withholding the payment of the first installment until such time as a sufficiently specific agreement is written into a formal document.

By and large, RWP and GWPO managers are credited with providing timely assistance to help address operational difficulties such as those noted above. The evaluators heard about the following kinds of interventions across the five countries:

- Facilitating discussions among core team members (including key contacts within government ministries) to clarify institutional arrangements for implementing PAWD (all countries).

- Troubleshooting bottlenecks within CWP host institutions such as providing training or coaching support for staff with PAWD financial management responsibilities (Zambia, Malawi, Kenya).
- Assisting with the hiring of PAWD managers and providing advisory support to them on a variety of management topics (Zambia, Kenya).
- Hosting training events to help orient key stakeholders to the IWRM planning process.
- Providing expert advice on technical matters related to the plan drafts (all countries).

At the same time, evaluators encountered mention of some irritants to the relationship, including:

- An over reliance on the use of the English language in documents – particularly during the early years (Mali, Senegal).
- A difference of opinion between the CWPs on the one hand, and the RWPs and the larger GWP network on the other, over the question of whether the former should enter into IWRM pilots (all countries), and whether they should seek their own independent legal status (Zambia, Malawi and Kenya).
- Insufficient consultation regarding the allocations and ceilings for the budget lines, and lack of flexibility regarding transfer from budget lines (Mali, Senegal).

Regarding the nature of the support role played by the RWP and PAWD team in Stockholm, one RWP manager described the fine line between being too directive and too *laissez faire*. As he put it, “we understand that government should have leadership in the IWRM planning process but, at the same time, we know there should be some checks on the lead authorities so that they don’t do their work without involving other stakeholders (other government ministries/agencies and non-government actors)”.

In Kenya, GWP EnA based in Entebbe, Uganda has played a much more directive role in PAWD than is the norm. This is a result of several factors including the poor performance of the host institution and the first PAWD manager, and difficulties sorting out the roles and accountabilities between the KWP and the Water Resources Management Authority (WRMA). Several members of KWP noted that, while well intentioned and at times critically important, GWP EnA’s interventions, overall, may have had an undermining effect on the development of the KWP. The situation is described more fully in the Kenya field report in Appendix V.

And, in an otherwise positive assessment of support by the GWP – WA, some Mali respondents pointed to rigidity in PAWD budget lines that restricted program choices and lead to some delays in disbursements in the early part of 2008 that required the cancellation of several wind down activities.

Regarding gender considerations in the context of PAWD management, program staffing, at all levels, has predominantly been predominantly male. Women have made up a minority of core team roles across the five countries. That said, several CWPs actively recruited women members through women’s NGOs and in at least three countries had leadership roles within the CWP.

As noted earlier, the gender dimensions of the program were not discussed in depth until early 2005. At this time, several recommendations were made by a consultant to integrate gender mainstreaming strategies with the assistance of the Gender Water Alliance. The Program has made good on its commitment to undertake gender training and has introduced a gender component into its program reporting format (see below). However, neither the Gender Water Alliance, or any other entity has been able to equip PAWD management with the wear-with-all to integrate gender analysis as a management tool, at least to the extent envisioned. Without strong gender leadership from PAWD management, the treatment of the cross-cutting theme has been modest. The evaluators encountered participants of gender training who have played advocacy roles in IWRM plan deliberations and in the constitution of the CWPs. In some countries, Kenya and Malawi for example, their efforts have dove-tailed with other gender mainstreaming/affirmative action initiatives underway.

## **5.2 Performance Measurement and Reporting Aspects**

The PAWD Contribution Agreement stipulates that financial and narrative reports are due on a quarterly basis, and that progress documentation should be referenced to planned results. In addition, annual reports are to provide a more detailed analysis of the year past and a work plan for the year ahead. Similar to the scenario for work planning, the Inception Report sets out a reporting schema that builds from the country level upward in an iterative process.

In practice, country reports are compiled in larger regional reports and submitted to CIDA in a comprehensive program package. Since the 2005 RBM training and design process to create a results focused reporting format, narrative reports across the five countries and three regions have uniformly referenced planned outputs and outcomes. The evaluators' general observations of the narratives are set out below:

- Overall, PAWD managers are describing outputs and outcomes achieved. The Malawi reporting stands out as the best example of this. Their statements are often integrated with descriptions of activities – a defensible practice given that the reader must understand what was done to bring these results about. Results claims across the countries, are often made without supportive evidence, however. For example, claims are made about “enhanced skills and awareness” without the reader gaining insight as to the relevance of this capacity to the PAWD process.
- Arguably, because of the large number of results (particularly outputs at 12) to report against in any given country or regional report, it is easy for the outside reader to lose sight of the ‘forest’ for the ‘trees’. Or, to use another analogy, when reading the reports it feels like one is standing too close to a TV screen such that one can only see the pixels rather than the image on the screen.

- Overall, PAWD reporting comes up short in documenting the more countable aspects of program delivery. From the reports reviewed, it is difficult for the evaluators to know such details as:
  - Number and types of trainings done, by subject
  - Number of training participants, by country/organizational background
  - Number of IWRM plan consultations organized by CWPs at the national, regional, catchment level
  - Number of participants included in consultations, by background
  - Number and type of knowledge sharing products created, by country, by subject area

This is problematic in that the reader cannot easily get a sense of the volume of work done through PAWD in each country. Some of this data exists in the reports, but to the evaluators' knowledge, it is neither pulled together by country nor at a program level. Indeed, the reader can find themselves reading about the same activities and results in the reportage of the country and the relevant regional partnership.

In the March 2005 RBM and Results Based Reporting consultation, a decision was taken to downplay the use of indicators in reporting. The view at the time was that to focus reporting on the indicators given in the framework would complicate rather than clarify the reporting process, and that taking the time to refine the indicators at this point in the program cycle would be imprudent. In retrospect, the evaluators question whether an exercise with CWP and RWP managers to refine indicators might have given them more grist around which to organize their reporting. For example, it might have served the reporting process, to have obtained agreement on output indicators, like those mentioned above. A cautionary note here; by arguing that there should be more comprehensive activity and output reporting, the evaluators are not advocating a shift of emphasis away from results reporting. Rather, they are advocating for more of a balance of the two. Furthermore, the evaluators are not suggesting a large outlay of effort and cost to develop more systematic outputs reporting. They are arguing that what is required is a program wide formulation of key outputs (and their indicators) and an agreement to collect that data at a partnership level. Such an arrangement could emerge from a single program wide workshop.

### ***5.2.1 Progress in Implementing Outcomes Mapping***

Concern about the ability of the PAWD logic model and accompanying indicators to help managers track PAWD's progress has led GWP to experiment with a complementary results tracking methodology called Outcomes Mapping (OM). This method has been pioneered by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and written up in the document entitled, [Outcomes Mapping: Building Learning and Reflection into Development Programs](#).

The method centres on the idea that when considering the results logic of a project, it is important to be explicit about the stakeholder groups who are within a project's sphere of influence at the outcome level. These groups are known as 'boundary partners'. For each outcome, progress markers are identified under the headings: "expected" "desirable" and "optimal". Process markers are descriptors of the outcomes and, as such, are not unlike indicator statements, except that they tend to be more 'open' and process focused.

At an early stage in this exploration of alternative results tracking methods (late 2005 – early 2006), GWP anticipated that it could conceptualize a system and test it during a formative mid-term evaluation and again during this PAWD final evaluation. Its champions succeeded in developing a thoughtful applied OM methodology, but in the end have only been able to test it out within PAWD in Zambia in a mid-term review exercise. Here, unfortunately the exercise did not yield a finished product, for reasons that are not clear to the evaluation. Nonetheless, the idea to use OM to track the progress of IWRM planning and implementation remains a priority within GWP. In February 2007, the organization launched an 'internal project' to institutionalize OM as a program reporting tool. And, at the time of writing, GWP is finalizing a [Guide for the Introduction of Outcome Mapping within GWP](#).

In relation to PAWD, the team assigned to develop an OM schema conceptualized PAWD's capacity building agenda as follows:

- Through the efforts of GWP Secretariat in Stockholm, the Regional Water Partnership (RWP) managers and their secretariats, and the Country Water Partnership (CWP) coordinators and secretariats, PAWD's reach extends to government and non-government organizations/institutions that can in some way influence the way water resources are managed within and between participating countries.
- PAWD outcomes call for the presence of a broadly owned integrated plan and requisite improvements in the capacities/ performance of **relevant ministries, private sector interests and non-governmental organizations** with water management and service delivery roles to play.
- They also call for greater participation by **financing institutions** in projects under the IWRM and for the adoption of IWRM related recommendations by other **less directly involved ministries** (e.g. Ministry of Finance or Planning) with key roles in establishing national development strategies. In this scenario, changes in quality of life and in environmental integrity of participating countries/regions would fall into the domain of project impact. As such they represent results over which PAWD has only indirect influence.

During 2006, GWP began sorting these social actors using the concept of boundary partners. The team delineated between government and non-government actors, on the one hand, and between those directly engaged in multi-stakeholder platform and those that are not. This arrangement is portrayed in the Figure below.

Figure 5-1: PAWD Boundary Partners

	Project Teams	Boundary Partners			
G l o b a l  R e g i o n a l  N a t i o n a l	GWPO staff				
	RWP Manager and Secretariat	Non-governmental social actors members of Water Partnerships	Individuals in government or government institutions members of Water Partnerships	Non-governmental social actors <b>not</b> members of Water Partnerships	Individuals in government or government institutions <b>not</b> members of Water Partnerships
	CWP co-ordinator and Secretariat				

Source: GWP: PAWD Project Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Plan, October 2006, Page 6.

The table below shows GWP’s choice of boundary partners and progress markers for the first PAWD outcome.

Figure 5-2: PAWD Boundary Partners

Outcome	Progress Markers		
	Expected	Desirable	Optimal
<b>1. National frameworks for sustainable WRM and service provision in place and/or well advanced for individual countries</b>	The governments of the five countries discussed a national plan for the integrated management of water resources submitted as a result of the PAWD activities with strong stakeholder participation.	The ministries of planning and finances endorsed the IWRM plan submitted to government and it is now being discussed at high political level	The IWRM plan is approved by government and is being implemented as part of the national development strategies

Source: GWP: PAWD Project Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Plan, October 2006, Page 9.

The evaluators see great promise in the use of OM. As demonstrated in the example above, the progress markers focus attention on the essential changes that a program like PAWD is trying to bring about, but in way that integrates procedural change among the actors with the creation of product. In essence, OM helps make explicit the theory of practice underlying complex initiatives like PAWD. Arguably, had OM been operationalized in PAWD, the results story would have come through much more clearly in the reporting than was the case.

### 5.3 Knowledge Management

The PAWD inception report envisages a program component called “Knowledge Management and Synergy Building”, to be driven by GWPO. Its objective is “to design and put in place knowledge sharing mechanisms within the program (inward and outward looking)”, and to “generate and share knowledge through these mechanisms”. Roughly 15% of the program budget has been set aside for knowledge management activities. Inclusion of this component is consistent with PAWD’s intent to serve as a learning ground for other and future IWRM planning processes.

The evaluators have been made aware of the following key products of this component.

- **Training materials** – most notably the [Integrated Water Resources Management Plan Training Manual and Operational Guide, March 2005](#), and the accompanying, [Catalyzing Change: A handbook for developing integrated water resources management \(IWRM\) and water efficiency strategies](#). By all accounts, these documents provide a very thorough practitioner’s introduction to IWRM methodologies and were produced at a critical point in time where a practical understanding of how to proceed with IWRM planning was deemed necessary.
- **Surveying of the IWRM and WE Plans Development Process** – this was a component of GWP’s second global survey that has served an important purpose in informing key decision-makers on progress against the WSSD IWRM target (see Section 2.2).
- **French and local language translation** – Briefings and other documents provided to support GWP’s catalytic role with AMCOW have required translations; and awareness raising materials into local languages to engage communities.
- **Summative process documentation of the PAWD process** – the hiring of knowledge management consultants around the region to create a retrospective of the IWRM planning process and a cataloging of program learnings. At the time of writing, these remain works in progress.
- **TV and Radio series** – including 13, one hour TV programs on IWRM in Zambia that has been aired on national TV several times and adapted for radio; a similarly crafted series of seven 15 minute programs in Malawi; reportage in the print media of all countries, much of which is coming from journalists with declared interests in raising the profile of water sector topics.

- **Promotional materials** – such as brochures, display signs posters, and briefs; some in multiple languages, mostly geared to audiences within each country with interests in IWRM from vantage points in government, academic/technical training institutions, and non-governmental organizations.
- **Website development** – CWP websites launched or under development (KWP launched its website while the evaluator was in the country; it is still under development, but can be found at <http://www.kenyawaterpartnership.org/kwp/>).

It appears that many discrete knowledge management/sharing activities have taken place under this component at country, regional and global levels. What these activities have in common is their intent to engender public awareness and engagement in IWRM practice locally or at a country or larger scale. The evaluators feel hard pressed to comment on the quality of the component in its entirety or the results that it has generated, either because several of its products were not concluded at the time of the evaluation or that they simply did not view them.

The evaluators do question the overall looseness of the component. Knowledge management has represented a significant portion of program expenditure (24% up to the beginning of 2007), but it has very little specific results expectation attached to it. The component does not feature explicitly in the PAWD logic model at the output level, where one would expect to see some 'enabling' results expressed.

That said, the evaluators understand the need for this component to remain open and flexible. There is need for balance here. As it stands, it is not clear that the program had enough control over this component to provide assurance that knowledge management resources are being used well to pave the way for the achievement of program outcomes.

## 6.0 Assessment of Prospects for Sustainability

This section examines the sustainability of the IWRM planning process and the country water partnerships. Here, the evaluators have been guided by the following questions:

1. How sustainable are the benefits produced by the project?
2. What major factors that have influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability?
3. In what ways might the project's overall impact and sustainability have been enhanced?
4. What are the key lessons learned that may inform future CIDA programming in integrated water resource management?

### Summary of Findings and Conclusions

Significant sectoral reforms are taking place in all five PAWD countries. Water financing is on the increase, policies and legal frameworks are being updated, institutions are being created or recreated and aligned in new ways, and people are starting to be mandated and trained to engage stakeholders in catchment level discussions of water use. Overall, the *management of water resources* is gaining ground as an accompaniment to *water infrastructure and services*. IWRM philosophy and approaches are central to these reform shifts. This bodes well for the results obtained by PAWD.

The evaluators encountered nothing on the horizon to suggest a slowing of the reform process. Its character will evolve with the transition from the current pre-occupation on planning, institutional re-alignment and financing, toward IWRM implementation and monitoring. The character of the reform will also change as the locus of attention extends beyond the national level to fully embrace communities in the districts/catchments. Both these trends will exert demands on the country and regional water partnerships for knowledge sharing, network building and coordination, training and advocacy.

PAWD is closing at a time when at least four country water partnerships lack one or more of the following: a sufficient and secure financial base, clarity on legal status, and agreement on future programming strategy. Up to now, the push to bring the IWRM plans to fruition has made it difficult for them to attend to these important sustainability questions. There is also a worry Notwithstanding these vulnerabilities, there is clear resolve in each partnership to continue, and some bright prospects for future roles embedded in the IWRM plans they have helped to create.

Climate Change is providing additional impetus for water sector reforms. The phenomenon is clearly on the minds of officials in the policy and programming areas where its effects are already being felt. Climate change variability is discussed in all five IWRM plans and is featured as a priority issue in four of them. The widespread view amongst stakeholders is that the decentralized, inter-sectoral, multi-stakeholder orientation of IWRM practice is highly suited for dealing with climate change mitigation and adaptation.

The PAWD experience has been rich with lessons for future practice. Those learned by the evaluators from their interactions with stakeholders are included in Figure 6-1 and replicated in the front of the document.

#### Section 6: Recommendations

**Recommendation 4:** That GWP undertake a rapid assessment of the former PAWD partnerships to determine a level of financial support required over the next six to twelve months to ensure a seamless IWRM launch and dissemination in each country, and to assist the partnerships to resolve their questions of legal standing, identify their programming niche and formulate and begin to implement a sustainability strategy. Further, that with this information in hand, GWP assist the CWPs access transitional funding support.

**Recommendation 5:** That the CIDA Pan Africa Program explore possible funding modalities (including Mission funds) that could be accessed to provide transitional support to identified CWP's according to specifications worked out in the implementation of Recommendation 4.

**Recommendation 6:** That if CIDA is to take up climate change as a programming priority, that it: a) consider IWRM as a pertinent philosophy and approach for identifying climate change issues and for formulating mitigation and adaptation policies and strategies, and b) look to GWP as an organization with the experience and presence to convert climate change concepts into actionable strategies at the country and, in some settings, catchment level.

## 6.1 IWRM concepts in partner countries

When asked, "what are the most important changes in the way water is managed in your country since 2003?" workshop participants described substantive institutional, attitudinal and programmatic changes. These suggest that within the five countries water sector reforms are taking hold in a profound way and that IWRM concepts are central to these reforms. Responses are organized by major themes below:

**Institutional/Policy Change** Updated policy and legal framework with clarity in the definition of roles for water supply and sanitation, and water resource management – **Zambia**

- New Water Policy (2005) fully incorporates IWRM necessitating changes to the Water Act – **Malawi**
- Complete re-organization of the institutional arrangements for water development – separation of water services from water resource management functions and delineation of institutional roles at central, district and catchment/water user levels; mainstreaming of Sanitation under water resource management – **Kenya**
- IWRM in place and integrated into PRSP – the latest PRSP has more of an accent on sustainable management of water resources – **Mali**
- Institutional and legal reforms in the water sector due to non-application of water policy – **Senegal**
- New programming approaches in water sector geared to meet MDGs - **Senegal**

### **Financing**

- Improved budgeting mechanism, level of financial commitment and upward trend in the amount of funding available – **Zambia**

- 40% increase since 2006 in funding to the water sector by both government and the donor community - **Malawi**
- Increased budget allocation to the water sector by 300% between 2003 and 2007 – **Kenya**
- Improved financing mechanism for water management through the decision by government to establish a Water Sector Development Fund - **Mali**

#### **Knowledge/Attitude Shift**

- Improved appreciation of IWRM approach, enabling collaboration among stakeholders and, in particular, growing regional and trans-boundary perspective in water resource management - **Zambia**
- Government leaders, Heads of NGOs, Chiefs of Communities more aware that demand for water is rising and that the resource is finite (a significant realization in Malawi context); the Government now regards water as a tool for development and is now considered #2 priority in the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS) - **Malawi**
- Decentralized process for management and decision-making along catchment boundaries – **Kenya**
- Taking into account of IWRM in water management activities in the NGO sector – **Mali**
- Improved understanding of the water resource situation because of the situational analysis – **Mali**
- Recognition of IWRM principles - **Senegal**

#### **Public Engagement**

- Improved stakeholder participation with increased local level participation – **Zambia**
- Involvement of district assemblies and communities in discussions of water resource management – **Malawi**
- Legal framework and improved trust has made possible effective dialogue and collaboration in planning and implementation of IWRM – **Kenya**
- Improved knowledge of water sector actors through multi-stakeholder platform – **Mali**

#### **IWRM Innovation**

- Implementation of IWRM in practice (specific instances) – e.g. irrigation dams, fish farming – **Zambia**
- Improved rate of water access coverage, particularly in rural areas – **Senegal**
- Improved involvement of women in local water point management committees - **Mali**

With little doubt, profound water sector reforms are underway in each of the five countries. PAWD takes its place as a contributor to these reforms, and these will continue apace after the PAWD program closes.

When asked to project forward five years from today, respondents identified the following preferred scenarios regarding the implementation of IWRM approaches in their country (representative sample):

<b>From</b>	<b>To</b>
Stakeholders have limited knowledge of the content of the plan - <b>Zambia</b> Water and sanitation strategy and other IWRM related strategies being developed - <b>Zambia</b> Having 60-70% of the required budget to implement IWRM activities - <b>Zambia</b>	Sectors are implementing parts of the plan Decentralization Policy, Water and Sanitation strategy and other IWRM related strategies being implemented Having a higher proportion of the required budget in place
From a single IWRM & WE plan...- <b>Kenya</b> Ministry of Water alone...- <b>Kenya</b> Weak instruments – i.e. monitoring, participation, early warning...- <b>Kenya</b>	Formal incorporation of IWRM principles into other sector plans Numerous integrated implementing institutions Strong instruments
A few water related projects following IWRM principles – <b>Malawi</b> A few training institutions dealing with IWRM content areas - <b>Malawi</b> A few people in local government are aware of IWRM - <b>Malawi</b>	All water related projects following IWRM principles All relevant training institutions offer training in IWRM and apply it on the ground Many more local government officials know about IWRM and show this in their work
Finished IWRM plan - <b>Mali</b> Those that are managing water at the local level for decentralization being the least informed about IWRM - <b>Mali</b> Water policy elaborated - <b>Mali</b>	Implemented IWRM plan Capacity for IWRM at local level improved Favourable environment (legal, regulatory, institutional) for implementing IWRM plan
IWRM plan finished and unapproved - <b>Senegal</b> Weak anchoring of IWRM principles at local level - <b>Senegal</b> Final stage of IWRM plan - <b>Senegal</b>	IWRM plan implemented Ownership and application of IWRM principles by all stakeholders (local, civil society, government etc.) Management Tool for sustainable water resource planning and management

These appear to be formative times in the reform process. Over the life of PAWD, the leading edge of IWRM has moved from the national level within each country toward the catchment level. The evaluators see nothing on the horizon in any of the five countries to slow down this continuing trend. Another shift in the reform process that will undoubtedly take place from this point on is that from the current pre-occupation on planning and on institutional and financial mobilization toward implementation

and the monitoring of progress. Both these shifts will place new and significant demands on the multi-stakeholder platforms.

### **6.1.1 Perceptions of IWRM in the Face of Climate Change**

From interviews in each of the PAWD countries, it is clear that the spectre of climate change is on the minds of some in academia and on policy makers in water, agriculture, forestry and environment related ministries. The topic is starting to enter into the public realm.

- In Zambia, for example, the Ministry of Environment, Tourism and Natural Resources Development has recently launched an awareness campaign on climate change consequences. The campaign targets agricultural extension officers, forestry extension officers, and fisheries officers. Others to be sensitized are Zambia Wildlife Authority (ZAWA) officers, non-governmental organizations associated with environmental issues, district planning officers and district councils. The three provinces worst affected by the 2006/2007 floods are the initial focal point of the campaign. While the evaluator was in country, the President made a launch speech on the subject.

Climate change variability is discussed in all five IWRM plans and is listed as a priority issue in four of them. Along the way, the evaluators collected opinions from GWP/RWP/CWP contacts, academics, ministry officials and representatives NGOs and the media on the relevance of IWRM as an approach to address climate change. These are summarized below:

- Water represents the 'front line' in addressing climate change.
- The effects of climate change – e.g. severe droughts or floods – can exacerbate conflict among water users. IWRM envisages conflict and the need for mediation and good monitoring data to foster evidence-based decision-making.
- Climate change needs to be demystified at the local level – people know there is something odd happening to their climate, but they can't explain it. The decentralized, multi-stakeholder character of IWRM provides an important mechanism for disseminating and discussing climate change concepts.
- Climate change mitigation and adaptation need to be addressed in an interdisciplinary fashion. IWRM decision-making mechanisms are, by design, inter-sectoral.
- The effects of climate change are often localized. With its focus on catchment level planning and implementation, IWRM is easily scaled to formulate localized mitigation and adaptation strategies.

GWP has produced a technical paper on [Climate Change Adaptation and IWRM](#). Not surprisingly, it argues in a manner consistent with the comments set out above, "that the best approach to manage the impact of climate change on water is that guided by the philosophy and methodology of Integrated Water Resources Management".

## 6.2 Country Water Partnerships

While maturing and full of resolve to continue onward, at least four partnerships are in a delicate transitional state at the close of PAWD.

- Four CWPs – Zambia, Malawi, Kenya and Senegal - lack a base of financial support. PAWD funds have made up by far the largest proportion of their operating funds. All have small reserves comprised of membership dues and fees from contracts completed, but these amounts are not sufficient to maintain CWP operations at the level they did under PAWD. They will likely lose staffing which in all three cases represents a significant setback. As pointed out by several respondents, this turn of events comes at a time when the IWRM plans, once approved, stand to be launched in some public, celebratory way and then their contents promoted far and wide. The fear is that most of the partnerships will lack the organizational strength they have had during PAWD to play a supportive role in these launches.
  - In the longer run, there is optimism in all four places that the partnerships will be able to generate resources from IWRM related work, possibly project work identified in the IWRM plans. This optimism is shared by at least one of the RWP managers.
  - Some worry that the memberships of these organizations may now be accustomed to the idea that they are part of well-funded and staffed entities and, as a consequence, may be slow to pitch in themselves. That noted, the evaluators are reminded of turn of events in Kenya at the lowest point in KWP's evolution. A network of stakeholders continued to operate informally, sharing information on the development of the IWRM draft itself and monitoring developments in WRMA. As described to the evaluator, they did this with the conviction that a solution was possible, and that the idea of stakeholder participation was too important to give up.
- All CWP have identified several possible programming niches that they could fill as the IWRM plan is implemented, but at the time of writing only three CWPs (Senegal, Malawi, Zambia) have strategic plans that project a role for them beyond the PAWD project. The most common niche areas that have been identified for the CWPs include:
  - Broad based, localized communication/awareness raising about IWRM topics – **Malawi, Senegal, Mali**
  - Playing a public scrutiny, 'watchdog', role with regard to the implementation of IWRM, including treatment of values related questions surrounding water rights and advocacy for the poorest – **Malawi, Kenya, Zambia, Senegal**
  - Capacity building – directly or more likely through careful brokering of service providers to users; some focus on TOT and locally adapted learning packages to encouraging skill development at the catchment level – **Zambia, Malawi, Kenya, Senegal, Mali**
  - Mobilizing partners and/or catchment level partnerships – **Zambia, Kenya**

- Three CWPs – Zambia, Malawi and Kenya - have yet to resolve the question of their future legal status. At the time of writing all are exploring their options with some urgency, understanding that resolution here is an important antecedent to charting out their strategic plan. The process has been complicated by the conflicted perspectives on how country partnerships should evolve:
  - Water ministries in each country have indicated that they would prefer to deal with a registered entity.
  - GWP has advised that CWPs should remain part of the global network with its secretariat in Stockholm and be hosted by a nationally registered entity.
  - CWPs have uniformly expressed interest in becoming registered so that they have greater autonomy from their host institutions and are able to generate funds themselves.
  - To register as an NGO or association would be problematic for at least some of the governments in question. They could not enlist as a member, thus jeopardizing the intent of the multi-stakeholder partnership.
  - Other legal terms, “Trust”, “Company” and “Society” where applicable defy the essence of the partnership.

KWP appears to have resolved this conundrum through their discovery of the designation, “Company Limited by Guarantee”. In Kenya, there are already two analogous organizations carrying this designation.

The concerns about the sustainability of the PAWD country partnerships need to be understood within the larger context of CWPs in Africa that have been accustomed to operating without the level of resources afforded the five partnerships through this program. Arguably, some could argue that these five countries have enjoyed the advantages of a well endowed program, and that is now over – that it is time to sink or swim. Others could argue that the level of funding provided, to date, has created a level of organization, performance and expectation that needs some careful management as this external funding winds down. The evaluators are sympathetic to the second view, for sustainability reasons. A small amount of outside support dedicated to a good IWRM launch and plan dissemination, and helping the partnerships: a) resolving questions of legal standing, b) hone in on their programming niche, and c) develop a sustainability plan would make for a sound investment.

### 6.3 Compendium of Lessons Learned

The following is a list of practical insights that PAWD practitioners have learned through experience and shared with the evaluators<sup>11</sup>.

**Figure 6-1: Compendium of Lessons Learned**

<p><b>On introducing funds to ‘grass roots’ entities...</b></p>	<p>Care is required when introducing a relatively large and generously funded project to a fledgling organization with lots of “chuptzpa” but little in the way of financial resources. While few would argue that the infusion of project resources opens up possibilities to realize the aspirations of the organization, several observe that some of the vital chemistry – in particular, the volunteer work ethic – may be compromised. Stakeholders may start placing demands on the secretariat that they would have otherwise resourced themselves, and they can lose sight of the fact that the level of resourcing that their organization enjoys is only temporary.</p>
<p><b>On finding the optimal working relationship between government and multi-stakeholder platforms...</b></p>	<p>The strategic positioning of water governance platforms is vital and is something that requires continuous and careful management. On the one hand, given water’s strategic importance to the national interest, these platforms must remain well aligned with the mandates and priorities of water related ministries; on the other, they must show the ‘welcome mat’ to private sector and civil society through effective operations and demonstrated success fostering information sharing, coordination and collaboration. When operating well, stakeholders around the table have something to give to and to glean from each other. There also has to be a foundation of trust.</p> <p>One cannot underestimate the importance of convening properly mandated representatives at the beginning of a multi-stakeholder planning process like PAWD to agree in writing on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Which entity is driving the process, ultimately – the platform or the government</li> <li>○ Context specific objectives of the planning project (within the frame of the program objectives)</li> <li>○ Role delineation and the accountability structure that links the government’s own water authority, the core team, the executive function of the partnership, the project team and key contacts within the host institution</li> <li>○ Communication and decision-making modalities</li> </ul> <p>That said, such an agreement cannot guarantee clarity of roles and common purpose in practice. The chemistry has to be right and a stable presence of champions is helpful.</p>
<p><b>On using RBM and Outcome Mapping concepts to sort out who is ‘implementing’ and who is ‘benefiting/changing’...</b></p>	<p>One of the merits of RBM and Outcomes Mapping is that these planning and management tools can help stakeholders clarify: a) which actors are implementing the program/project, b) what they DO and what they wish to CHANGE with the time and resources available; and c) what in that change process the program/project has control over (outputs), what it has direct influence over (outcomes), and what it can only contribute towards with its indirect influence (impact). In complex policy settings like PAWD, this kind of design rigour is essential.</p>
<p><b>On being ready to work in a larger institutional reform context</b></p>	<p>Understanding that IWRM is likely to be occurring within a context of sector or institutional reform, one must expect uncertainty and possibly upheaval inside participating institutions. In this context, the missionary zeal that many might feel when advocating for IWRM solutions, may not be shared by all occupying strategically important positions. Accordingly, it is important to...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Work with an understanding of the mindsets of people who may feel insecure in their current roles.</li> <li>○ Plan on losing champions along the way as they are re-assigned.</li> <li>○ And, as much as possible, nurture understanding/appreciation for IWRM (or</li> </ul>

<sup>11</sup> Guided by the insights of stakeholders, the evaluators have infused some of their observations into this compendium of lessons learned.

	whatever reform strategy contemplated) among those who may be in important decision making roles in the future.
<b>On knowing whether the idea of a multi-stakeholder platform has ‘staying power’</b>	One measure of the relevance of a multi-stakeholder platform is the extent to which it continues to function when there is no enabling environment to support it.
<b>On choosing a host institution</b>	There may be compelling programmatic reasons for a new multi-stakeholder platform/partnership to choose a particular institute to be its host. Perhaps it is because key individuals in the partnership hold positions in those institutions, or that the mandates of those institutions are entirely relevant and potentially very helpful to the work. However, if a major function of the hosting relationship is to provide fiduciary services to the program/project, then the capacity of the candidate institution to provide those services must be carefully assessed.
<b>On choosing the right staffing</b>	The project manager/coordinator position in a multi-stakeholder process is critical to its success simply because the person in that position must navigate the sometimes divergent interests of all the actors. They must be technically competent in the subject matter, procedurally competent (i.e. with an intuitive sense of how to work with people), and should have about them the ‘social’ power to be able to relate well with people in senior roles. Because theirs is essentially an organizational change facilitation role, they must be comfortable working with ambiguity. They must be able to keep their eye on the overarching purpose of the work, despite the distractions and irritants.
<b>On the changing character of IWRM as it is applied at the catchment level.</b>	As IWRM planning and implementation works its way downward to the catchment/water users level, two important trends are evident: a) the likelihood of encountering divergent interests and conflict increases tremendously; and b) the demand for capacity building – broad awareness raising as well as technical (e.g. flow monitoring), procedural (e.g. conflict management) rises exponentially. These trends have important downstream implications for IWRM practitioners.
<b>On (not) being too bent on formulas for success in IWRM programming</b>	For a wide range of reasons including political and administrative tradition and cultural norms around citizen participation, there is no one formula to follow in setting up a stakeholder involvement process. Perhaps the best guides one can follow are those champions already embedded in that particular setting.
<b>On engaging the private sector</b>	<p>The PAWD process has not been as successful engaging the private sector as it has other non-government entities. From this, one can postulate that the terms by which the private sector chooses to interact with multi-stakeholder platforms on IWRM is sufficiently distinct from the terms by which government, academia, the media, and NGOs choose to interact. This may warrant a highly tailored engagement strategy for the partnerships.</p> <p>Once engaged (assuming this happens), the partnerships may need to be ready to handle the power and influence that larger business entities – notably large-scale water dependent industries and agribusinesses - yield by virtue of their roles as employers, their relative financial means, and their political connectedness.</p> <p>As IWRM works its way toward planning and implementation at the catchment level, partnership readiness to facilitate interactions with private sector entities will be tested. This is the place where substantive water user grievances are likely to be aired; one can expect private sector presence and participation at this level.</p>
<b>On creating a gender mainstreaming agenda</b>	<p>Without explicit gender mainstreaming results and gender equality mainstreaming indicators, a program like PAWD has nothing to guide its gender approach.</p> <p>In a program like PAWD one might be looking at training focused on awareness, leading to applied analysis, leading to agreement on country specific strategies that can be monitored. All this though, must be predicated on a common conceptual understanding of how ‘gender equality/ mainstreaming’ and the core subject matter relate.</p> <p>Gender analysis should properly begin at the design phase of a program when the thinking of how to integrate gender considerations can itself be integrated into the design logic of the program. As demonstrated in PAWD, it is very difficult to return to fundamental discussions on design once the program has started. That is not to say that gender strategies (and program logic models) cannot be revisited – they should, but for the purpose of refining, not (re)creating, them.</p>
<b>On the inclusion of knowledge management</b>	The intent of knowledge management is to ensure an ample, smooth flow of explicit and tacit knowledge among those with a ‘need to know’ in order to help make the program successful. Any knowledge management system has to be

**in institutional capacity building and policy development programs like PAWD**

flexible to emergent requirements. That said, it is a component that can use up an inordinate amount of valuable resources if left unchecked; there should be some management/reporting tool in place to help program/project teams track the merit and worth of individual knowledge management initiatives.

## 7.0 Conclusions

By and large PAWD is a success. The program fit well with the IWRM needs and aspirations of the five participating countries, and, over four and a half years, has helped them move their IWRM agendas forward. In turn, their experiences have helped other CWPs pass through a similar process.

It is clear from the literature, and from conversations held during the evaluation that the philosophy and methodology of IWRM is integral to the larger, longer-term water sector reforms underway. This bodes well for many of the gains made in PAWD. It seems very likely that implementation of the IWRM plans will occur as part of these continuing reform initiatives. Having struggled with roles and accountabilities for half the program, there now appears to be a level of comfort that government is driving the IWRM process with a disposition honouring interdependency and seeking complementarity.

Well supported by GWP, the nascent Country Water Partnerships have demonstrated the value of multi-stakeholder participation in policy and planning. While PAWD is leaving some of them with important financial, legal and organizational questions to resolve, there are good reasons to believe that they all have a future. They enjoy a higher public profile and continue to be connected to a well-spring of water sector/IWRM expertise. They are roundly appreciated for a basic but profound role that is so necessary given the inter-disciplinary, multi-sectoral and multi-scaled nature of IWRM – that is to share and exchange information, and to coordinate action.

# Appendices

## **Appendix I – PAWD Final Evaluation Terms of Reference**

### **Canada Fund for Africa Terms of Reference for an Evaluation of Partnership for Africa's Water Development (PAWD)**

#### **Introduction**

The present Terms of Reference (TORs) set forth the rationale, background, objectives and basic methodology for an end-of-project evaluation of the CIDA-funded Partnership for Africa's Water Development (PAWD). PAWD is \$10 million project managed by the Global Water Partnership and funded through the Canada Fund for Africa.

#### **Background**

The Partnership for Africa's Water Development (PAWD) is one of four water initiatives in Africa funded through the Canada Fund for Africa (CFA). In June 2002, the Government of Canada established the CFA as a response to the G8 Africa Action Plan, itself a response by G8 countries to the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). Developed and presented at the G8 Summit in July 2001, which was held in Genoa, Italy, the NEPAD identified water as one of several priority areas for Africa's development. Canada committed \$50 million out of the CFA's \$500 million budget for programming related to improved water management and access to water and sanitation in Africa.

PAWD is executed by the Global Water Partnership (GWP), which was established in 1996 with the purpose of promoting the sustainable management and utilization of water resources worldwide. GWP advocates an Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) approach, which works to balance the needs and contributions of all water users (urban, rural, industrial, agriculture and households) and to draw in participation from all stakeholder groups (government departments, academics, community groups, NGOs, the private sector, regional institutions, other countries, etc.). IWRM's overall goal of IWRM is to facilitate sustainable development, poverty alleviation and economic growth through the effective management of water resources. Since its inception, GWP has established a global network that is creating awareness and capacity in IWRM and effecting a sharing of knowledge and experience in water resources management. Approximately 1,200 organizations around the world, representing an array of stakeholder groups, are now registered as GWP Partners.

In 2004, GWP produced a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan using the principles of results-based management (RBM), including a results chain, a logical framework analysis (LFA) and traditional monitoring and evaluation tools. In 2006, further to difficulties in implementing the M&E Plan, GWP proposed to opt for a monitoring and evaluation alternative based on the principles of Outcome Mapping (OM), which has been developed by Canada's International Development Research Centre (IDRC). GWP's intention, over 2007-09, is to develop a customized alternative approach to monitoring and evaluation, and eventually to planning, adapted from OM.

#### **Project Description**

The overall goal of PAWD is to support five African countries (Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Senegal and Zambia) to manage their water resources in a sustainable manner in order to contribute to poverty reduction, human well-being and the protection of natural resources. At the country level, PAWD focuses on three areas, which are directly related to the project's outcomes/longer-term results:

- Support to National IWRM Frameworks;

- Support to the institutional development of existing, new and emerging multi-stakeholder national and regional water partnerships;

- Support towards the integration of water into Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRSPs) or their equivalent.

Some of the project's short-term outputs include building awareness and capacity on IWRM; developing action plans and IWRM transition strategies in a participatory manner; developing guidelines (in appropriate

languages) for integrating IWRM into PRSP process; and increasing the capacity of stakeholders and ministries to influence the PRSP process.

The project appears to have made some important inroads in these areas, although the degree of success has varied from country to country.

### **Evaluation Rationale**

CIDA's Performance Review Policy requests periodic independent evaluations of its policies, programs, projects and operations. Evaluation results contribute to more informed decision-making, help to foster an environment of learning-by-doing and promote greater accountability for performance.

The initiatives of the Canada Fund for Africa will sunset on March 31, 2008. The evaluation is being carried out in the interests of maximizing final impact, ensuring a smooth wrap-up and contributing to lessons that may inform future CIDA programming in integrated water resource management.

### **Evaluation Objectives**

The evaluation's purpose is to gauge PAWD's success in meeting its objectives, and to learn from the experiences gained through the project's implementation. Furthermore, recommendations arising from the evaluation will offer an opportunity for CIDA, GWP and other major stakeholders to address any challenges and/or weaknesses associated with the IWRM approach.

### **Scope and Focus**

In addition to the broad objectives, the evaluation will:

Assess the **relevance** of the project to the priorities and policies of its primary partners, including:

To what extent are the original objectives still valid?

Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the overall goal and attainment of outcomes and objectives?

Do the results contribute to the Agency's overall goals of poverty reduction and sustainable development?

Is the project well aligned with CIDA's gender equality policy and GWP gender equality objectives?

Does the project reflect and advance the aid effectiveness principles of local ownership, alignment, donor harmonization and managing for results?

Assess PAWD's **progress** toward the attainment of its objectives and articulated results, primarily at the outcomes level (as evidenced by the achievement of the outputs), including:

To what extent is the project meeting its stated objectives and results?

What are the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of objectives?

Identify unexpected results of both a positive and less positive nature

What kinds of mitigation strategies have been or are being employed to address challenges and how effective have these been?

How effective has the project been in achieving gender equality results? What tools and approaches has the project adopted to address gender equality?

Assess the project's **efficiency** in producing outputs with the agreed-upon resources, including:

Does GWP's project-specific management systems efficiently support the attainment of results, including gender equality results? Does it support the effective communication of objectives and sharing of lessons among all stakeholders?

Are activities cost efficient?

Are timelines realistic? If so, are timelines being respected?

Do reporting systems conform to requirements (of both CIDA and other stakeholders) and do they adequately communicate progress?

How useful is Outcome Mapping for GWP as a tool for measuring progress and communicating results?

Determine the kinds of positive or negative **changes** the project has produced, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended, in the countries, institutions and beneficiaries targeted by the project.

Assess the **sustainability** of benefits produced by the project, pinpointing the major factors that have influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability. In particular, recommendations are sought on ways in which the project's overall impact and sustainability might have been enhanced and lessons that may inform future CIDA programming in integrated water resource management.

### **Methodology and Accountabilities**

The evaluation will be carried out in conformity with the principles, standards and practices set out in the CIDA Evaluation Guide<sup>12</sup>. A key principle of the approach will be strong stakeholder involvement, inferring meaningful involvement by supported national and regional water partnerships. Stakeholder participation is to be an integral component of evaluation design and planning; information collection; the development of findings; evaluation reporting; and results dissemination.

The consultant(s) will provide reporting to the CIDA Manager who will retain overall responsibility for the evaluation. In particular, the consultant will:

**Prepare an Evaluation Work Plan** that sets out a detailed methodology for the execution of the evaluation. The work plan will be approved by CIDA and act as the agreement between parties for the precise manner in which the evaluation will be conducted. The work plan will refine and elaborate on the present Terms of Reference and will address the following:

- Overview of the project
- Expectations of the evaluation
- Roles and responsibilities
- Detailed methodology, including strategy and tools for information collection and analysis
- Evaluation framework, including key evaluation issues and questions
- Reporting
- Work scheduling

**Conduct 4-5 country visits**, designed to coincide, if possible, with workshops organized by the GWP. In addition to participation in the workshops, the consultant will use the occasion to meet with representatives from the range of national and regional water partnerships and collect the information required for the CIDA evaluation. Countries include Kenya, Malawi, Senegal and Mali (and possibly Zambia).

**Prepare an Evaluation Report** that describes the evaluation process and sets out key findings, recommendations and lessons learned. The presentation of results is to be intrinsically linked to the evaluation issues and questions, establishing a flow of logical development derived from the evidence/information collected.

If possible, evaluation results are to bring a focus to the factors set out in CIDA's Framework for Results and Key Success Factors.

### **Deliverables**

The Consultant will produce:

- A draft Evaluation Workplan, to be submitted within two (2) weeks of the signing of the contract;
- A final Evaluation Workplan, due within one (1) week of receiving CIDA's comments on the draft work plan;
- A draft Evaluation Report, to be submitted within four (4) weeks of returning from country visits;

---

<sup>12</sup> The Evaluation Guide is available at:

(<http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/CIDAWEB/acdicida.nsf/En/EMA-218132515-PMZ>).

A final Evaluation Report, in accordance with standards identified in the CIDA Evaluation Guide, due within two (2) weeks of receiving CIDA's comments on the draft report. The final report will include an abstract and executive summary.

These deliverables are to be prepared in English and submitted in hard copy (2 copies) and electronic format to CIDA.

**Evaluator(s) Qualifications**

The scope of the program and the focus of this evaluation may warrant the need for a team of two consultants. The evaluation team must possess the following qualifications:

A university degree, at the Bachelor's level

At least five years (or more) experience in the evaluation of large development initiatives, including evaluation at the program, project or institution levels

Experience in or knowledge of capacity building programs (in the water and sanitation sector would be an asset)

Experience with multi-country programming and working with multiple stakeholders, such as international networks

Experience with implementing or assessing gender equality programs, including capacity building or training in gender equality

Experience working in Africa, preferably Kenya, Zambia, Malawi, Senegal or Mali

A proven record in the delivery of professional results in the realm of evaluation

Excellent communication, facilitation and cross-cultural skills

Excellent analytical and writing skills

Extensive experience in Performance Management, particularly Results Based Management; and familiarity with Outcome Mapping methodology

Ability to work in English and French

**Estimated Level of Effort and Budget** (based on one consultant and subject to change)

<b>Activity</b>	<b># of days</b>
Document review and initial meetings with CIDA headquarters	7
Work plan Preparation	3
Country visits – information collection (4-5 countries, depending on budget constraints) * 3-4 days per country including travel-time	30
Debriefing, Analysis & Report(s) Preparation	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>

The total budget for the evaluation should not exceed \$85,000. The travel and incidentals budget should be limited at \$30,000 (based on one consultant and subject to change).

**Timelines**

It is expected that the evaluation will be completed by March 2008. The timing of country visits will be determined in consultation with GWP, but will most likely take place by January 2008.

## Appendix II – PAWD Evaluation Matrix

KEY TOPICS	KEY QUESTIONS	INFORMATION/ DATA SOURCES AND METHODS
<b>1.0 RELEVANCE</b>	<b>1.1 Mandate</b>	<b>See legend below...</b>
	1. Has PAWD's multi-stakeholder approach continued to be relevant and strategic to the implementation of IWRM in partner countries?	A, B, C, D, E (Interviews & Workshop), F
	2. Is the internal logic of PAWD (connection between inputs/activities and outputs/outcomes) still intact toward the end of the Project?	A, B (Interviews), F
	3. Have the activities being implemented under each of the three components been well selected to achieve the defined outcomes?	A, B (Interviews), F
	4. Is the Project's design and delivery consistent with CIDA's gender equality policy: a) more equal participation of women with men as decision makers in shaping the sustainable development of their societies, b) reduced inequalities between women and men in access to and control over the resources and benefits of development? Is the Project's design and delivery consistent with GWP gender equality objectives?	A, B, C, D (Interviews), F
	5. Will the Project continue to be relevant to CIDA's poverty reduction and sustainable development goals? Does project design and delivery reflect: a) local ownership, b) alignment with other water related development initiatives, c) harmonization with other donors, d) a management for results focus?	A, B (Interviews & Workshop)
<b>2.0 EFFICIENCY</b>	<b>2.1 Management</b>	
	5. Are the roles and responsibilities of assigned personnel at GWPO, RWP and CWP: a) clearly defined, b) understood, c) realistic given time and budget, d) congruent with actual work?	A (Interviews), F
	6. Is their equal participation by gender in management structures? Are gender equality issues identified and addressed by management? If yes, how (provide	A (Interviews), F

KEY TOPICS	KEY QUESTIONS	INFORMATION/ DATA SOURCES AND METHODS
	<p>examples)?</p> <p>7. Does the flow of communication between and among implementing teams facilitate informed decision-making and action?</p> <p>8. Do CWP members, RWP and GWPO share insights about their work? Is information sharing influencing work practice?</p> <p>9. What are the most expensive activities at each level (GWPO, RWP, CWP) and have managers considered alternative ways of delivering to enhance cost effectiveness?</p> <p>10. Are project timelines realistic? Are they being respected?</p> <p>How has GWPO managed risks and what type of risks have been most problematic?</p> <p>From a field perspective to what extent has GWPO been able to support CWP/RWPs technically and administratively?</p>	<p>A (Interviews), F</p> <p>A (Interviews), F</p> <p>A (Interviews), F</p> <p>A (Interviews), F</p>
<b>2.2 Planning and Reporting</b>		
	<p>1. Is the Project working to an agreed overall management plan?</p> <p>2. Have annual plans been prepared and implemented?</p> <p>3. Are all plans being appropriately reported upon? On time?</p> <p>4. Is reporting consistent with CIDA and other stakeholder requirements?</p> <p>5. Do reports adequately describe activities completed and results achieved?</p> <p>6. How useful has GWP's outcomes mapping (M&amp;E) schema been for measuring progress and communicating results?</p> <p>7. What has been done to report on gender aspects into the project? Is there gender disaggregated data being collected and reported on?</p>	<p>A (Interviews), F</p> <p>A, B-Zambia (Interviews), F</p> <p>A (Interviews), F</p>
<b>3.0 RESULTS AND SUSTAINABILITY</b>	<b>3.1 National frameworks for sustainable water resource management and service provision are in place and/or well advanced for the selected countries</b>	

KEY TOPICS	KEY QUESTIONS	INFORMATION/ DATA SOURCES AND METHODS
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What progress has been made by GWP in the IWRM planning process? Notably...               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Awareness raising about IWRM.</li> <li>b. Identification of stakeholders for countries that do not have a partnership and/or consultation with existing partnerships.</li> <li>c. Identification, assessment and prioritization of IWRM issues for each of the selected countries.</li> <li>d. Identification and definition of management functions.</li> <li>e. Identification of management potentials and constraints.</li> <li>f. Preparation of an IWRM framework and sensitization of governments at the highest political level.</li> <li>g. Capacity-building within relevant institutions for framework implementation.</li> <li>h. Preparation of a strategy for the creation of a project portfolio and financing requirements.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	A, B (Interviews, Workshop, Self Assessment Tool), F
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. In participating countries is there a finished national IWRM plan?               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Produced with strong stakeholder participation? What role have women played in the process?</li> <li>b. Endorsed by ministries of planning and finances?</li> <li>c. Discussed at high political levels?</li> <li>d. Approved by government?</li> <li>e. Implemented as part of the country's development strategies? Integrated with the gender equality strategy within the country?</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	A, B (Interviews & Workshop), F, C, E
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. What PAWD supported initiatives stand out most for their positive contribution to these results? Why is that so? What factors have constrained PAWD the most? How well were these factors managed by the project?</li> </ol>	A, B, C (Interviews & Workshop), F, E
<b>3.2 Ownership of the National Frameworks</b>		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Which stakeholders have (have not) joined the platform? And under what circumstances? What are the membership trends in each country?</li> </ol>	A, B, C (Interviews), F
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. What mandates do representatives have while participating in CWPs? How are the CWPs enabled to make decisions on behalf of their members?</li> </ol>	A, B (Interviews), F

KEY TOPICS	KEY QUESTIONS	INFORMATION/ DATA SOURCES AND METHODS
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Have patterns of participation and perceived ownership shifted between and among the different CWP members over the life of PAWD?</li> <li>4. Do all stakeholders claim ownership over the IWRM plan? In particular...               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. CWP members/partners (including NGO and government – though not necessarily in an official capacity)?</li> <li>b. Non-partner stakeholders?</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. Have governments agreed that all water related stakeholders (such as irrigation officials, water utilities, tourist businesses, hydro power authorities) are part of an established mechanism to review the IWRM plan in an interative planning and implementation process?</li> </ol>	<p>A, B (Interviews, Workshop), F</p> <p>A, B, C (interviews), F</p> <p>A, B, C (interviews), F</p>
<b>3.3 Improved water resource management and water service delivery</b>		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can changes attributable to PAWD be observed in water resource management and service delivery? In particular...               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Shifts in knowledge/understanding over the management of water resources?</li> <li>b. Evidence that government is debating recommendations related to creating an enabling environment for improved water management – e.g. recommendations related to a legislative framework, or to financing and incentive structures?</li> <li>c. Evidence that gender issues related to water resource management and water service delivery have been discussed and integrated into plans that address these issues?</li> <li>d. Evidence that government has introduced harmonized water-related policies, a revised legislative framework, or has adopted financing and incentive structures all in the service of building an enabling environment for improved water management?</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>A, B, C (Interviews, Workshop, Self Assessment Tool), F, D, E</p>
<b>3.4 Stronger collaboration with potential relevant financing institutions to support projects being prepared</b>		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are multi-stakeholder platforms ready and appropriately positioned to:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Develop projects</li> <li>b. Seek funding</li> <li>c. Manage/administer projects</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>A, B (Interviews, Workshop), F</p>

KEY TOPICS	KEY QUESTIONS	INFORMATION/ DATA SOURCES AND METHODS
	d. Maintain collaborative links with other IWRM stakeholders (in-country, in-region/globally)	
<b>3.5 Strengthened regional and country level partnerships in selected countries to ensure that they function as effective multi-stakeholder platforms</b>		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What are the patterns of participation in CWP/RWP deliberations across the various stakeholder groups? Have these altered over time? In particular...               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Impetus behind CWP/RWP activities/events</li> <li>b. Locus of leadership in agenda setting</li> <li>c. 'Air time' in discussions, by different stakeholder groups in the CWP</li> <li>d. Change in level of participation by women and/or women centred organizations – presence in CWP/RWP and inclusion of gender analysis in CWP/RWP discussions</li> <li>e. Level of collaboration between and among CWP/RWP members</li> <li>f. Willingness of CWP/RWP to project a unified position on water related matters.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Do members see utility in continuing their participation in multi-stakeholder platform as the IWRM transitions from design to implementation?</li> <li>3. What do you see as the Partnership's evolving role as IWRM transitions from design to implementation? What role can CWP/RWPs play beyond integration of water in PRSPs, etc.)</li> <li>4. Are capacity building activities guided by an assessment of needs and opportunities?</li> <li>5. Does the CWP evaluate the results of capacity building activities and modify strategies accordingly? – If yes, how does the CWP evaluate results of capacity building, i.e. what are their key indicators of success?</li> </ol>	<p>A, B (Interviews, Workshop, Self Assessment Tool), F</p> <p>A, B (Interviews, Workshop, Self Assessment Tool), F</p> <p>A, B (Interviews, Workshop, Self Assessment Tool), F</p> <p>A, B (Interviews, Workshop), F</p> <p>A, B (Interviews, Workshop), F</p>
<b>3.6 Water issues are integrated into PRSPs for a selected number of African countries.</b>		

KEY TOPICS	KEY QUESTIONS	INFORMATION/ DATA SOURCES AND METHODS
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have water issues been integrated into PRSPs in participating countries? In particular...               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Have water ministries submitted recommendations from the IWRM plan to the ministry of finance/planning for inclusion in their poverty reduction/ national development strategy?</li> <li>b. Has the ministry responsible for planning/finance considered the recommendations from the IWRM plan when formulating their poverty reduction/ national development strategy?</li> <li>c. Does the text of the PRSP/ national development strategy include recommendations from the IWRM plan?</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>A, B (Interviews, Workshop, Self Assessment Tool), F, D, E</p>

## Appendix III: List of Key Informants

### Outside/Interested Agencies

<i>Name</i>	<i>Affiliation</i>
Mr. Nicholas Drouin	Senior Program Officer (to 2004) CIDA – Canada Fund for Africa, Senior Program Officer
Mr. Jean Stephane Couture	Senior Program Officer (2006 - ) CIDA – Canada Fund for Africa,
Ms. Belinda Chesire	Development Officer, CIDA, Nairobi
Mr. Halifa Omar Drammeh	Special Advisor on Africa, Office of the Executive Director, United Nations Environment Program
Mr. Tefera Woudeneh	African Water Facility, African Development Bank
Ms. Birguy Lamizana	African Water Facility, African Development Bank

### GWP – Secretariat/ Regional Partnerships

<i>Name</i>	<i>Affiliation</i>
Ms. Margaret Catley Carlson	Former Chair, GWP
Mr. Daniel Lopes	PAWD Program Officer, GWPO (Stockholm)
Mr. Axel Julie	PAWD Network Officer, GWPO (Stockholm)
Mr. Alex Simalabwi	Regional Project Manager, GWP Southern Africa (Pretoria)
Mr. Jason Oyugi	Regional Project Manager, GWP East and Central Africa (Entebbe)
Mr. Dam Mogbante	Regional Project Manager, GWP West Africa

### Zambia

<i>Name</i>	<i>Affiliation</i>
Ms. Joyce Musiwa	Principal, Cooperative College, Lusaka – Member of PAWD Task Team
Mr. George Phiri	Project Coordinator, Zambia Small Scale Irrigation Project (AfDB) – ZWP Executive Committee Member and Chair of Task Team
Mr. Chimambo R. Kunda	Community Rep. Chalimbana River Catchment Conservation Committee
Mr. Chimwang'a Maseka	PAWD Program Manager
Ms. Florence Simumba	Acting Senior Planner, Ministry of Environment and Water Development (MEWD)
Mr. Oswald Chanda	Director, National Water Supply and Sanitation Council (NWASC) – Chair, ZWP

<b>Professor Nyambe</b>	School of Mines, University of Zambia – ZWP Executive Committee Member
<b>Mr. Morgan Muleya</b>	Irrigation Engineer, Zambia Sugar PLC – PAWD Core Team Member
<b>Mr. Christopher Chileshe</b>	Assistant Director, Water Management Section, Department of Water Affairs
<b>Mr. Chanda Chimba III</b>	Executive Producer, Phibajo PBJ Productions – Produced television series on IWRM shown on ZNBC
<b>Ms. Laura Sustersic</b>	Technical Advisor in MEWD for GTZ
<b>Ms. Monica Chundama</b>	Independent Consultant – ZWP Treasurer
<b>Ms. Mildah Kayawe</b>	PAWD Program Assistant
<b>Evaluation Workshop Participants</b>	
<b>Mr. George Phiri</b>	Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
<b>Ms. Monica Chundama</b>	Zambia Water Partnership
<b>Mr. Jacob Nkomoki</b>	Zambia Meteorological Department
<b>Mr. Chanda Chimba III</b>	Phibajo PBJ Productions
<b>Ms. Joyce Musiwa</b>	Cooperative College
<b>Mr. Benny Chundu</b>	Ministry of Energy and Water Development
<b>Mr. Oswald M. Chanda</b>	National Water Supply and Sanitation Council
<b>Mr. Kunda R. Chimambo</b>	Chalimbana River Catchment Conservation Committee
<b>Mr. Chimwanga Maseka</b>	Zambia Water Partnership
<b>Ms. Mildah Kayawe</b>	Zambia Water Partnership
<b>Mr. C. Chileshe</b>	Ministry of Energy and Water Development
<b>Ms. M. Mutale</b>	Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources
<b>Mr. Jonathan Kampata</b>	Rapporteur
<b>Mr. Philip Cox</b>	Facilitator

#### Malawi

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
<b>Mr. McLawrence Green Mpasa</b>	General Manager, Lilongwe Water Board – Seconded to MoIWD to Prepare National Water Development Project Phase II (World Bank)
<b>Mr. Sam Kainja</b>	PAWD Program Manager
<b>Mr. Sam Bota</b>	Chancellor College – Chair MWP

<b>Mr. Boniface N.C. Gondwe</b>	Director of Water Supply and Sanitation Ministry of Irrigation and Water Development
<b>Evaluation Workshop Participants</b>	
<b>Mr. Samuel Bota</b>	Natural Resources College - MWP Chairman
<b>Misford Mikuwa</b>	Min. of Irrigation & Water Dev.
<b>Mr G. Mzumara</b>	Forum for Environmental Comm (NGO)
<b>Mrs. T. Mkandawire</b>	Malawi Polytechnic - MWP Secretary/Treasurer
<b>Ms Ulemu Munthali</b>	CURE (NGO)
<b>Mr Bright Kumwembe</b>	Ministry of Transport, Public Works & Housing
<b>Mr. James Mambulu</b>	CIDA-PSU, Water & Environmental Specialist
<b>Prof. V. Chipofya</b>	Malawi Polytechnic - MWP Coordinator
<b>Mr. W.P.C. Chipeta</b>	MoIWD
<b>Mr. Samuel Kainja</b>	MWP - Project Manager
<b>Mr. E. Laisi</b>	CEDRISA, Director

## Kenya

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
<b>Mr. Vincent Njuguna</b>	KWP Chair
<b>Mr. Silvester Kiai</b>	Technical Manager, Water Resources Management Authority (WRMA)
<b>Mr. Fred K. Mwango, S.S.</b>	Director, Water Resources Management, Ministry of Water and Irrigation
<b>Eng. Peter O. Mangiti</b>	Deputy Director of Water Services Development Programs Coordination, Ministry of Water and Irrigation
<b>Eng. Mwalimu K. Masau</b>	Executive Director, Kenya Water Institute
<b>Prof. George O. Krhoda</b>	Department of Geography and Environmental Studies – Editor, IWRM&WE Plan for Kenya
<b>Dr. Patts M.A. Odira</b>	Senior Lecturer and Chairman of Civil Engineering Department, University of Nairobi – Consultant to GWP EnA to Manage PAWD (200, KWP Steering Committee Membe
<b>Mr. Mike Lane</b>	Consultant - Secretary KWP
<b>Ms. Agnes Mbuyua</b>	MOIWD, Vice Chair, KWP
<b>Dr. Munguti Katui</b>	Community Management Training Services – KWP Executive

## Mali

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
<b>Mr. Maiga Housseini</b>	Head of IWRM Unite, Department of Hydraulic, Ministry of Energy Mines and Resources, MaWP Chair
<b>M. Abdoulaye Tandina</b>	African Development Bank
<b>Mr. Diarra Adama Tiémoko</b>	University of Bamako, member of Technical Committee MaWP
<b>Mr. Chieck S. Keita</b>	Program Support Unit, CIDA
<b>Mr. Nouhoum Ganaba</b>	KFW
<b>Ms. Coulibaly Lala Camara</b>	Economist, Department of Hydraulic, Ministry of Energy Mines and Resources
<b>Ms. Kouyate Groundo Sissoko</b>	Coordinator of the Association of Feminine NGOs (CAFO)
<b>Evaluation Workshop Participants</b>	
<b>Mr. Maiga Housseini</b>	Head of IWRM Unite, Department of Hydraulic, Ministry of Energy Mines and Resources, MaWP Chair
<b>Ms. Kouyate Groundo Sissoko</b>	Coordinator of the Association of Feminine NGOs (CAFO)
<b>Ms. Fatoumata Kane</b>	National Adjoint Director, Department of Hydraulic
<b>Mr. Sidi Toure</b>	Head of Department, Department of Hydraulic
<b>Mr. Ousame Diakite</b>	Head of Department, Norms and Regulations, Department of Hydraulic
<b>Mr. Navon Cisse</b>	Team Leader, National GIRENS Project, Department of Hydraulic
<b>Mr. Dounake Coulibaly</b>	Evaluation expert, IWRM Unite, Department of Hydraulic
<b>Ms. Traore Fanta Kenem</b>	Expert in Water Use, Department of Hydraulic
<b>Mr. Mamadou Tamakaly Traore</b>	Environmental Expert, IWRM Unit Department of Hydraulic
<b>Ms. Coulibaly Lala Camara</b>	Economist, Department of Hydraulic, Ministry of Energy Mines and Resources
<b>Mr. Hamadou Bengaly</b>	National Department of Agriculture
<b>Ms. Sow Tida Toure</b>	National Department of Rural Engineering
<b>Ms. Keita Fatoumata</b>	CSLP Unit
<b>Mr. Dramane Guindo</b>	National Department of Territorial Collectives
<b>Mr. Aboubacar Maiga</b>	National Department of Health
<b>Mr. Abdoulaye Aly Diallo</b>	National Department of Planning and Development

Mr. Modibo Traore	OMVS Unit
Mr. Abdoulaye Kone	Malian Association of Municipalities
Prof. Gaoussou Kanoute	President of Science and Technical Committee MaWP
Mr. Sine Aly Dadara	PLEAH, MaWP
Director	Water Aid Mali / MaWP

## Senegal

<i>Name</i>	<i>Affiliation</i>
Mr. Oumar Ndiaye	PAWD Project Coordinator, Ministry of Rural Hydraulic and National Hydrographique Network
Mr. Ibrahima Mbodji	Executive Secretary, SWP
Ms. Mame Dagou Diop	Wetlands International, Senegal
Mr. Babacar Dieng	Former SWP Chair
Ms. Anta Seck	PAWD, Head of Project, Ministry of Rural Hydraulic and National Hydrographique Network
Amadou BALDE	DAPS/Ministry of Agriculture
Prof. Alioune Kane	Cheik Anta Diop University, Dakkar
Aminata DIONGUE	Senegal Women's Federation, SWP/PNES CST
<b>Evaluation Workshop Participants</b>	
Adama GAYE	Department of Management and Planning of Water Resources, Ministry of Rural Hydraulic and National Hydrographique Network
Farba Oumar SY	Department of Management and Planning of Water Resources, Ministry of Rural Hydraulic and National Hydrographique Network
Mamadou NDOME	JICA
Sidy FALL	SAED/ DAIH
Saliou NGOM	Department of Management and Planning of Water Resources, Ministry of Rural Hydraulic and National Hydrographique Network
Akiko IDA	JICA
Marie Françoise BOISSY	SWP/PNES
Niokhor NDOUR	Department of Management and Planning of Water Resources,

	Ministry of Rural Hydraulic and National Hydrographique Network
<b>Mame Seyni THIAW</b>	ENS
<b>Aïta Sarr SECK</b>	DEEC/ MEPNBRLA
<b>Amadou Seydou DIA</b>	DHU
<b>Ousmane KANE</b>	DPN/ MEPNBRLA
<b>Amadou Matar DIOUF</b>	UICN
<b>Mamadou DAFPE</b>	Senagrosol
<b>Samba WAGNE</b>	Department of Management and Planning of Water Resources, Ministry of Rural Hydraulic and National Hydrographique Network
<b>Marième Soda BADJI</b>	DHU/ MUHHHA
<b>Bruno LEGENDRE</b>	SWP/PNES
<b>Karamoko DIARRA</b>	SWP/PNES
<b>Alioune SARR</b>	DMG/ MMI
<b>Abdoulaye FAYE</b>	Dpt Géologie FST/UCAD
<b>Ibrahima NIANG</b>	DIREL/ MAEL
<b>Alfred Kouly TINE</b>	INP
<b>Ibrahima DEME</b>	INP
<b>Momar DIENG</b>	DBRLA
<b>Aminata DIONGUE</b>	PNES/ CST
<b>Khady NDAO</b>	PNES/ CST
<b>Aimé BOISSY</b>	DAT/PNES/ CST
<b>Chekh Oumar NDIAYE</b>	MDCL/DADL/CS
<b>Baba COULIBALY</b>	ONAS
<b>Michel Birame BASS</b>	DPNPR/DGP/MEF
<b>Amadou BALDE</b>	DAPS/MAEL
<b>Cheikh Hamidou KANE</b>	PNES/CST
<b>Oumar NDIAYE</b>	CT/MHRRHN
<b>Ibrahima DIEME</b>	Dir Agri. /MAEL
<b>Mme Rokhaya Sourang SY</b>	CREPA / Sénégal

<b>Antoine Diockel THIAW</b>	SWP/PNES CST
<b>Babacar DIOP</b>	DH
<b>Mame Dagou DIOP</b>	GWP/AO
<b>Ibrahima MBODJI</b>	PNES/ SE
<b>El Hadji Abdoul FALL</b>	SODAGRI
<b>Amadou B. NDIAYE</b>	DCL
<b>Aboukhadre LO</b>	UAEL
<b>Moustapha NDIAYE</b>	CT/COM/MHRRHN

## Appendix IV – PAWD Evaluation Workshop Outline

Arguably, evaluation should be more than simply a process of collecting data and making independent judgments. Evaluation should engage stakeholders in a collaborative enquiry where there is knowledge sharing and learning. This means that in addition to holding individual interviews with stakeholders and then compiling a report for circulation, evaluators find a way to involve stakeholders, together, in a 'reflective' process – in a workshop. In this setting, stakeholders discuss and deepen their analysis of their experience and learning of the project. A shared evaluation exercise like this, in our experience, can generate a rich body of knowledge that serves the donors' accountability needs while also helping stakeholders look toward the future and their common goals.

- 1. Make Timeline** – construct/review a timeline on large sheets of flip chart paper. Identify contextual factors and key events/milestones along the way from just before the project to current. Invite participants to take a pen and write on the flip chart. Could involve table group discussions prior to posting information on the timeline. **Purpose: To reconstruct a baseline related to IWRM, recall key events/milestones (including PAWD activities/events). To create a shared understanding of the project among workshop participants. To be a 'warm up' for later discussions/analysis of project activities and results.**
- 2. Assess Significant Changes in Water Management** – identify (through a free-listing and clustering exercise – statements written on cards, cards then sorted into themes) the three most important changes in the way water is managed in (country) since 2003. These changes might include, for example: “water plans are factored into planning in the Ministry”, “NGOs/CSOs have increased access to water planning decisions”, or “Budget commitments are made to cover IWRM strategies”. Analyse the results of the exercise using a key question like “why are each of these themes significant?” **Purpose: To distill the most significant changes in water management, and the reasons behind these.**
- 3. Explore Contributing Factors (Including GWP's Contribution) to the Changes in Water Management** - Post the themes generated in (2) along a horizontal matrix. Then identify likely influencing factors – e.g. “deliberations of multi-stakeholder platform”, “technical support provided by GWP”, “leadership from within government”, (some, not all, should be pre-identified with the help of GWP, so that findings can be compared across countries). Post these on the vertical exercise. Invite participants to individually score the contribution of each factor to the changes identified on the horizontal axis. Average the scores. If possible, disaggregate the scores by boundary partners (as defined in the PAWD M&E Plan). In some settings if there is a healthy distribution of stakeholders from across the four boundary partner groups, the whole exercise could be done in those groups. Debrief with questions encouraging analysis and interpretation of observed patterns. **Purpose: To identify and explore the value of a variety of possible contributing factors (including those central to PAWD)**
- 4. Looking Forward** – table group exercise to summarize the status of IWRM in (country) today, and project what they would like to see in place at some (specified time) in the future. Include: what contributing factors need to be in place and what needs to be overcome.

## Appendix V – Country Evaluation Reports – PAWD Evaluation

The following reports summarize the evaluators' findings in each of the five countries visited. Earlier versions of these documents were sent to the PAWD Country Managers for validation.

<b>Country</b>	<b>Validation</b>
<b>Kenya</b>	<b>Confirmed</b>
<b>Mali</b>	<b>Confirmed</b>
<b>Malawi</b>	<b>Confirmed</b>
<b>Senegal</b>	<b>Confirmed</b>
<b>Zambia</b>	<b>Not Yet Confirmed</b>

# Kenya

## Report of Findings

### PAWD Final Evaluation

#### Introduction

Below is a set of country findings of the PAWD evaluator following a visit to Kenya between March 16<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>, 2008.

#### Baseline Conditions

PAWD has been by far the most significant project of the Kenya Water Partnership (KWP) since it was launched in 2003. Indeed KWP and PAWD have been largely synonymous over the past four years. It was during one of KWP's earliest activities, attendance by two members of the governing council at an IWRM planning process design workshop at GWPO in Stockholm (a workshop that was instrumental in the formulation of the GWP IWRM Training Resource that has become key to CWP -IWRM processes within and beyond PAWD), where KWP learned of PAWD and the opportunity to participate in the project as one of the five countries. As described by one individual present in Stockholm at the time the then Minister of Water and Irrigation and the GWP Chair met to discuss Kenya's possible involvement in PAWD, the timing of the project was excellent for Kenya. At the time, there was plenty of institutional commitment within the Ministry of Water and Irrigation to proceed with IWRM planning, but there was also a lack of resources for training and stakeholder involvement, and a need to be linked into a larger network of IWRM practitioners. As he noted, "were we to come home empty handed, we thought we would stall".

#### Historical Overview of the Water Sector in Kenya

There has been an historic tendency to consider water as an infinite resource and, from a policy and planning vantage point, to concentrate on infrastructure and the delivery of services from within the exclusive domains of specific ministries. The tide began to turn in the early 90s – The National Master Plan (1992) drew attention to Kenya's growing water vulnerability and called for new, integrated management approaches; at the same time the Dublin Water Conference set out principles that have become fundamental to IWRM practice. As described by several key informants, Kenya's water infrastructure and services were in a state of collapse by the mid 1990s. This is documented in a follow up study to the 1992 Master Plan which was, itself, antecedent to what is described as the pivotal Sessional Paper #1 of the National Policy on Water Resources Management and Development. This policy document called for an integrated water resources management approach and the drafting of a new Water Act that would set out the institutional arrangements and the legal framework for water reform. This was promulgated in 2002.

Water reform gained political impetus from the Presidential launch of the National Water Resources Management Campaign at a broadly attended conference in March 2002 (13 sector analyses presented by Ministers – 18 Cabinet Ministers in attendance along with representatives of local authorities, regional

development authorities, research institutions, professional bodies, the private sector and civil society organizations). Several persons commented that it was the dire state of the country's water infrastructure and services and its undermining effects on the economy that precipitated commitment for change at the highest levels of government.

The reform process proceeded most quickly in relation to the delivery of water and sanitation services. These were decentralized to seven regional Water Services Boards and related catchment level water boards. Meanwhile, water management aspects of the reform process remained largely dormant until early 2004. The lead agency for this part of the reform process, the Water Resources Management Authority (WRMA) had been established by executive order, but for a while it existed without a program and resources. The nascent KWP assisted WRMA establish its vision and mission, and later in conjunction with incoming donor GTZ, the specific IWRM work steps. From all accounts the working relationship in these early days was purposeful and constructive.

### **PAWD Achievements Against Planned Outcomes**

Over the four years, PAWD has contributed substantially on three of six project outcomes (plan formulation with broad based ownership, and functional multi-stakeholder platform); and has contributed modestly toward the other three outcomes (contributions toward enhanced financing arrangements for IWRM, improvements in water program and service delivery, and integration of IWRM planning into National development planning). That said, KWP/ PAWD cannot claim that its efforts have been exclusive on any of the outcomes. Conversations with key informants from government and non-government organizations yielded the following insights on project results:

- After assisting WRMA find its strategic bearings and providing substantive training on the IWRM planning process the government agency, supported by GTZ, led the drafting process. KWP and WRMA found themselves on divergent paths. Following KWP's mid-2004 conference to launch PAWD, it became increasingly distant from the planning process (elaboration below). In the end, most of the drafting work was done by the WRMA core group. Following a reconciliation process in mid-2006 (more than a year later), KWP/PAWD became involved again, this time in the dissemination of the draft and a stakeholder consultation process which in March 2008 culminated in a broadly attended (government and non-government) final validation conference. At the time of writing, the document is about ready for submission to cabinet, and from the comments of the more than a 100 stakeholders present at this meeting is well supported across government sectors and within civil society.
- The draft covers all aspects expected of an IWRM – needs analysis; vision and goals, strategies; institutional arrangements, projects, timeframes and cost estimates. The robustness of the document was tested at the national validation conference as people rose to question the drafting team on topics as diverse as: coverage of water efficiency issues, inclusion of sanitation, costing of projects, inclusion of gender considerations in catchment level planning, building capacities to monitor water flows (quantity, quality and timing), the requirements for effective inter-departmental coordination/harmonization in planning and implementation, catchment level readiness to handle conflicts among water users, and the treatment of water harvesting and storage at the community level. Despite critical questioning (and one or two expressions of concern that the draft was only issued in time for the meeting), there was an underlying tone of good will. Incidental conversations with two individuals at the validation meeting reinforced this impression (both lauded the consultative, inter-sectoral approach to planning noting that it was a model for others to follow). The Governance Reference Group also gave the draft a generally positive review. There are strong signals that the IWRM will be implemented. Indeed, WRMA has published an IWRM strategy document and has begun catchment level planning processes that are consistent with the IWRM plan.

- The IWRM is not inconsistent with Kenya's larger scale, longer term planning, but with the uncertain relationship between KWP and the WRMA during the latter part of 2004 until early 2006, there has been little or no foundation upon which to advocate for specific IWRM commitments. As described to the evaluator, the PRSP has not been as much a focus for the Ministry of Planning and Finance as two other planning processes: the Investment Program for the Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment (aka the IP), Kenya's national 5 year rolling strategic planning document; and the Country's 2030 Vision document. The water reform agenda is well established in the Water Act (2002) and the Water Policy (1999). Forward momentum is evident in the way WRMA is implementing catchment level water resource management plans – taking up IWRM concepts in their catchment/water user engagement methodologies (ref. Water Resources Users Association (WRUA) Development Cycle).
- Since the re-engagement of KWP in the IWRM process with WRMA in mid-2006, the multi-stakeholder platform has (re) gained the recognition of government and non-government stakeholders. This represents a significant recovery for KWP. It has now positioned itself strategically in close proximity to, but apart from, the Ministry. Physically, it has situated itself within the 'flagship' building of the Ministry of Water and Immigration in Nairobi – a move, widely credited for its confidence building effect on the Ministry and WRMA. This was one of several decisive recovery strategies made by KWP/GWP.
- For a while, non-government actors, hitherto interested in KWP's mandate, lost confidence in the ability of the platform to have a bearing on the IWRM drafting process. Some have become involved again. A representative of one NGO mentioned to the evaluator that, once operative, KWP has provided civil society with increased access to government on water development matters, "we have a space, and government takes us more seriously than before". This sentiment was echoed at the evaluation workshop. As described by participants from NGO, government and private sector at the session, multi-stakeholder platforms represent for government a new way of relating to other stakeholder groups – though some trust building is required for the platforms to work properly.
- Two government representatives with WRMA (including one at the workshop) separately noted that government (and in this instance WRMA) cannot exclude stakeholders. In the context of water, they point out that the Water Act and the Water Policy dictate that stakeholders be involved. Beneath this perception, there is recognition that effective implementation of the Water Policy (specifically, sustainable management of water resources) requires the coordinated participation of multiple stakeholders, under the leadership of government. One participant observed that KWP, over the past year has demonstrated an important filtering function wherein only serious contributors to water development remain in the dialogue, "as the 'honest broker', (KWP) sieves out the 'noise' and puts forward the IWRM message. It is suggested that this is a niche area for KWP.
- According to a couple of individuals present at the validation conference, the consultative process followed in the development of the IWRM demonstrates a new way of working that has strong potential across government. Indeed, a third individual noted how such a process has been tried in the Ministry of Environment, though with only limited success. The reason, in part, is because unlike the water sector, the environmental reform process lacks the same kind of legal backing that is provided by the Water Policy and the Water Act which call for integrated, cross sectoral solutions and for stakeholder participation.
- The water reform process has attracted a substantial increase in national and international donor resources – from approximately 3 billion Shillings in 2001-02 to 12 billion Shillings in 2007-08. This cannot be attributed to PAWD in anything more than a cursory manner. That said, the IWRM plan in consolidating water sector analysis, priorities, projects and financial needs into a single document may provide the government with a new tool for raising/ maintaining the profile of the sector, which may have positive downstream financing implications.
- WRMA's catchment level planning (five catchment areas to date), is bringing IWRM to ground level in Kenya. This process has occurred simultaneously with, cognizant of, but separate from the development of the national IWRM plan. These are early days in the process. One WRMA representative – a person intimately involved in the formulation of the IWRM plan and in catchment level planning, noted that he is seeing evidence of shifting awareness at the community level. He recalled one recent visit to a community where in response to a government stipulation that riparian zones of 10 meters be maintained, the leadership responded that the zone should be 20 meters!

## Analysis of Constraints on Progress

As noted above, the progress in PAWD has been most dramatic over the past two years. The partnership has struggled to overcome considerable organizational challenges. Participants at the evaluation described the history of PAWD in Kenya as having a pronounced and lengthy storming phase. Interview and workshop discussions yielded the following analysis of evolution of KWP/PAWD:

- There may not have been sufficient clarity, or common purpose at the outset of the relationship between KWP and WRMA about critical assumptions, roles and responsibilities – in particular about the extent and sequencing of the consultative process on IWRM that was envisaged – as one person noted, “At the time, the government had the view that it should prepare the plan first and then launch it with an invitation to comment”. There are mixed views on whether design discussions and the eventual formal understanding that was achieved could have been more clear and detailed. Some feel that more could have been done. “We needed a document to drive the process”, said one. Others suggest that the key stakeholders were around the table at the time – i.e. WRMA was one of the original core members. There is consensus that no stakeholder was accustomed to/ experienced in working with others through a multi-stakeholder platform – it was brand new experience for all. In such a loose network, “there was nobody to act as an arbiter”.
- KWP signed a hosting agreement with the Kenya Water Institute (KEWI) – This set out roles and responsibilities for KEWI as the fiscal agent for KWP under PAWD. KEWI is a technical training institution with a desire to expand training competencies into less technical community engagement, resource management pursuits. It was (and remains) an entity with a keen programmatic interest in IWRM. As it turned out, KEWI was entering a significant period of organizational change under the same water reform program. It was to evolve as a parastatal entity with a cost recovery mandate. The ‘shake up’ of staff and organizational culture is said to have compromised KEWI’s ability to meet its fiscal agent responsibilities under PAWD.
- An important footnote to this story is that according to its new Director, KEWI took the GWP commissioned audit’s recommendations seriously and has since revamped its financial management systems. It is currently managing two regional training projects successfully and is lined up to take on more such responsibilities. KEWI remains very interested in KWP and continues to see itself as an important contributor to IWRM training.
- The Project Manager, initially based at KEWI, was eventually judged as a poor fit for the job - unable to demonstrate competencies in communication/reporting and team building, uncomfortable being supervised (likely ill-equipped to navigate the complexities and ambiguities of a nascent multi-stakeholder environment).

## Assessment of GWP-EnA’s (and the larger network’s) Role

GWP-EnA (and to some extent GWP-O) has played an activist facilitation role from the outset with both positive and negative consequences. On the negative side, several KWP and WRMA representatives suggest it has, at times, exceeded its role as an outside entity with the effect that early on it dampened the ability of the KWP to stand on its own feet and it generated discomfort on the part of the government. For example, KWP played, what is described as an overly directive role in the hiring of the project manager. Neither WRMA nor KWP felt adequately consulted on the choice of the individual. It was also the case that, in the wake of severing the hosting relationship with KEWI, GWP-EnA assumed control of PAWD’s financial management in Kenya. This was broadly felt to be expedient given KWP’s alternative of having to find a new and trustworthy host, but it also had an undermining effect on the independence of the partnership. The entity was unable to make any purchases itself; this had to be done by GWP-EnA staff when in country. Adding to this inconvenience, according to one KWP informant, was the frustration of not having been able to secure budget or expenditure information from GWP-EnA for PAWD in country.

On a more positive note, GWP is credited with spearheading the removal of the underperforming project manager, bringing the host institution relationship with KEWI to a premature conclusion (partly on the conclusions of an audit exercise), and hiring a very well placed consultant to manage KWP and attempt to re-ignite PAWD.

The choice of the consultant hired by GWP-EnA to reconcile differences was critical to the revitalization of PAWD. As a senior university lecturer and former senior civil servant, the individual was well respected by government officials. He had the 'currency' needed to engage WRMA/Government and to find the common ground that lead the parties back to discussion, which occurred at what is referred to as the Revitalization workshop in September 2006.

- WRMA was feeling pressured to complete the IWRM plan, but recognized (and was being reminded) that it had an obligation to solicit stakeholder input on the document – something that it knew it was hard pressed to do on its own.
- A largely dormant KWP, at this time loosely represented by an informal five to eight person task force, conveyed KWP's intent to "SUPPORT the development of the IWRM and WE Plan" and its recognition that it was Government's role to deliver it.

Several persons noted that GWP initiated deliberations at the regional level, mainly through the African Minister's Council on Water (AMCOW), exerted influence on the MoWI and WRMA to re-engage with KWP.

The decision by KWP/GWP-EnA not to re-hire for the project manager position, but instead create a hybrid KWP Chair/Coordinator role, and the request to have KWP's new office situated inside the Ministry of Water and Irrigation both served to solidify the new working rapport – or, as the workshop participants put it, "to shift from the storming to norming and performing phases of PAWD".

### **Observations on IWRM Capacity Building in Kenya**

Between 50 and 60 persons have been trained through the PAWD project – some in country, but most within the region. General observations from several interviews are that:

- Training sessions have been held on short notice, so there is little time to get ready.
- Training has been more practitioner-centred than train-the-trainer centred.
- The IWRM tool box (materials) is highly regarded
- 'Capacity-building' has really been more straight forward training with no follow up

### **Observations on Gender Mainstreaming in Kenya**

Gender has been considered in IWRM planning. There is an affirmative action program in place stipulating that at least 30% of government employees be women. This is acknowledged to be a difficult target to meet within the water sector given the male dominated engineering bias of the sector. The IWRM plan calls for the same 30% target to be set in place for catchment participation planning and implementation. Gender analysis, introduced through training, has examined such questions as: gender implications in the setting of water tariffs, the connection between environmental degradation and the burden on women, empowerment of women – strategies. But gender analysis has not been brought into IWRM practice as yet. For now, the gender question remains one of counting men and women in different roles. Several persons noted that this represented an important step forward. The argument is that quota's and staffing targets provide a very tangible basis from

which to introduce gender considerations at a deeper level (e.g. gender analysis as a disciplined part of the planning process).

### **Observations on KWP's Strategic Positioning to Sustain its Multi-stakeholder Platform Role**

It has really only been possible for KWP to concentrate on its own future since the revitalization conference (late 2006). It has re-established its steering committee with representation from the government (MoWI and WRMA), civil society, research and academic institutions, the private sector and the media. It has re-established its three thematic groups (Institutional Roles, Enabling Policy and Legislation and Management Instruments), produced and approved a KWP workplan and is currently working on several research and promotion activities including:

- Conducting a IWRM capacity building needs assessment at the catchment level
- KWP's website <http://www.kenyawaterpartnership.org/kwp/> launched in March 2008
- Promotional materials on IWRM (targeted at the institutional level – academia, CSOs and government)
- Mobilizing stakeholder membership/participation

KWP has several strategic management issues on its plate – most notably, KWP's legal standing, its immediate organizational future post PAWD, and its longer term programming niche.

- Government continues to be uncomfortable dealing a loose network. KWP has no host institution in Kenya. Since terminating its hosting relationship with KWI, fiduciary responsibilities have been the responsibility of GWP-EnA and its hosting institution, the Nile Basin Initiative. In this scenario, expenditures are made on behalf of KWP by GWP-EnA staff. All those interviewed, agree that this is only an interim solution made necessary by the turn of events described above.
- In the past, GWP has signaled that it is not in favour of KWP becoming its own legal entity (one source of irritation with GWP on the part of some KWP Steering Committee members). For its part, KWP feels it has no option than to establish a legal standing, if it wants to remain viable with its current mandate. Quite apart from the government's discomfort with a non-legal entity, KWP has no means to raise its own resources without its own legal status. There are problems with the designations: "NGO", "Company", "Society" and "Trust". Government agencies, for example, would be hard pressed to become a member of an NGO. With some legal assistance, KWP has come up with the alternative designation, "Company Limited by Guarantee". There are two analogous entities that currently have this designation, the Law Society of East Africa, and African Medical and Research Foundation (AMREF).
- KWP has very little in the way of operating resources beyond that supplied through PAWD. As such, the platform will enter an uncertain period following the end of March. Without a fresh influx of resources, KWP will find it difficult to maintain the services of the Administrative Assistant and Chair/Coordinator. By all accounts, these individuals have provided smart, stable, and dedicated support to the project.
- PAWD is coming to a close at a time of important transition – when the IWRM plan is being finalized and spectre of implementation looms. According to those interviewed and those participating in the evaluation, there are several areas where KWP can play important roles:
  - Being a watchdog/monitor in the implementation of IWRM
  - Facilitating capacity building of WRMA, other government leaders and local stakeholders to participate in IWRM activities at the catchment/user levels
  - Rolling out area-wide partnerships to serve similar functions to that envisaged for KWP but at a catchment level.

- Fostering broad public awareness of IWRM concepts and opportunities for involvement at multiple levels
- Promoting the incorporation of IWRM concepts into other sectoral planning processes
- It's a question of where the priorities lie.

## **Key Lessons Learned**

Key informants offered the following insights from the KWP experience that could be taken as lessons learned:

- The strategic positioning of water governance platforms is vital and is something requires continuous and careful management. On the one hand, given water's strategic importance to the national interest, these platforms must remain well aligned with the mandates and priorities of water related ministries; on the other, they must show the 'welcome mat' to private sector and civil society through effective operations and demonstrated success fostering information sharing, coordination and collaboration. When operating well, stakeholders around the table have something to give to and glean from each other.
- One measure of the relevance of a multi-stakeholder platform is the extent to which it continues to function when there is no enabling environment to support it.

Philip Cox

PAWD Evaluator



# Mali

## Report of Findings

### PAWD Final Evaluation

#### Introduction

Below is a set of country findings of the PAWD evaluation following a visit to Mali between March 16<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup>, 2008.

#### Baseline Conditions

PAWD was launched at the same time that significant reforms were made in the water sector and that certain relevant commitments were made by the government. This created a favourable environment for the preparation of an IWRM plan. The first democratic elections in 1999 led to decentralization policies in many sectors. A diagnostic study for the water sector was carried out, with World Bank funding, and a validation workshop was held in January 2002. The adoption of the conclusions of this study included the creation of a national IWRM plan. In June of 2002, the Water Code ('Code de l'eau – Law 02-006) was adopted mandating that the management of water be carried out at the basin level and the responsibility for all water points be transferred to the community under Decree 315. This meant that beneficiaries were responsible for maintaining the local infrastructure. The DNH was responsible for this process. Decentralization was also taking place in the health and education sectors.

#### Historical Overview of the Water Sector in Mali

Mali was among a group of countries that in 1998, during a West African IWRM conference in Ougadougou, committed to putting in place a process for IWRM, supported by a national action plan for water. In March of 2002, hosted by the Malian Minister of Mines, Energy and Water in Bamako, a founding meeting of the West African Water Partnership (or GWP-WA) was held. GWP-WA's principle mission was to create alliances among its members and reinforce their institutional capacity to strengthen their research networks, expertise and information on IWRM.

One year later, in April of 2003, GWP-WA supported the creation of the Mali Water Partnership (MaWP), whose intention was to raise awareness about IWRM issues in the country. CREPA (Centre Régional pour l'Eau Potable et l'Assainissement à faible coût), an institution that groups 17 West African countries, with its headquarters in Ouagadougou, also assisted by being the host institution for the CWP Mali.

The creation of the MaWP was considered an important step in formally bringing together government and NGOs interested in IWRM in Mali. The structure of MaWP has evolved as follows:

- The **General Assembly** - composed of its membership that meets once a year.
- The **Pilot Committee** - this body oversees the implementation of the decisions of the General Assembly, - composed of 17 administrators (8 from civil society and private sector, 4 from government, and 5 from the Permanent Secretariat), they meet twice a year.

- The **Permanent Secretariat** - made up of 5 members, elected by the General Assembly; this is the implementing body of the CWP; they are invested with the powers necessary to fulfill the mission and objectives of the Partnership.
- The **Scientific and Technical Committee** - a permanent structure with 9 members, designated by the Permanent Secretariat, known for their expertise and competence in different disciplines linked to IWRM; their role is to ensure the quality of the CWP programs.

In September of 2002, Malian officials attended the World Summit on Sustainable Development where the call was made for all members of the United Nations to reduce the number of people without access to drinking water and sanitation by a half for 2015 and by 2005 to have begun elaborating action plans for integrated water resource management and the efficient use of water. In 2003 an IWRM Unit was put in place at the DNH for the PNIR (Programme National d'Infrastructure Rurale) financed by World Bank. On December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2003 a memorandum of understanding was signed between GWP and the Minister responsible for the DNH and the MaWP identifying the latter two as the focal points for a project that would lead to the creation of a national IWRM plan. The agreement for the management of funds for the PAWD project was signed between GWP and CREPA in July 2004.

### **PAWD Achievements Against Planned Outcomes**

Over the four years, PAWD has contributed substantially to the first two and last two of six project outcomes and has contributed modestly to the middle two outcomes (improvements in service delivery and financing arrangements for IWRM).

In terms of the first outcome, the environment in the country was favourable to the initiative of an IWRM plan, however, several key informants doubted whether without PAWD financing it would have been possible to complete the IWRM within the same timeframe and with the same level of ownership. Therefore, PAWD is considered to have a high attribution for these two first outcomes. Interviews with key informants from government and non-government organizations and discussions held during the evaluation workshop yielded the following insights:

- The preparation and finalization of the IWRM plan has been centralized within the IWRM Unit. As mentioned above, the unit was created in 2004 with a national director, head of unit, secretary, a driver, 2 hydrologists, an economist, a communications specialist and environmentalist. In June 2004, a meeting co-financed by PAWD and the World Bank was held to validate a road map for the preparation of the IWRM plan. The project team developed a detailed work plan and the Pilot committee met with them twice a year to oversee progress.
- In 2005 regional consultation workshops were held, in collaboration MaWP, with stakeholders from the communities, NGOs, professional associations, water users and media. The consultations looked at water use, conservation issues and priority problems in water management. The consultations also served as an opportunity to raise awareness around IWRM issues. Further research on six water management themes (funded by the World Bank) were carried out to deepen the understanding of these issues and to contribute to formulating a national water policy.
- In February 2006, the second annual "Salon International de l'Eau" (SIDEAU) held in Bamako, was used as a venue to discuss the results of the consultations and studies and to explore the key priorities for water management. A key turning point in the IWRM planning process was considered to be in November of 2006 when a strategic planning workshop was held over five days at Selengue with key government technical services from the various ministries concerned (including the PRSP Unit), territorial community representatives, NGOs, MaWP and the GWP-WA. During this workshop, analysis of the major problems and strategies took place and the priorities actions for the IWRM plan were identified.

- Following this workshop, the IWRM plan was drafted by the project team with the assistance of consultants as resource persons. In May of 2007, a validation workshop was held where GWP Technical Committee gave feedback, which was incorporated into the final document.
- Some of the comments of the GWP TEC were focused on the need for articulating better alignment between the plan and its contribution to the water code and national water policy. As well, it was indicated there needed to be clearer explanation of the various partners for technical and financial cooperation in the sector and their options negotiated with the government for the period 2007-2015.
- The document was finalized and printed in December of 2007 and submitted to the Government and was recently approved in early April 2008.
- The Mali IWRM plan covers the essential elements of an IWRM plan and elaborates 52 actions for achieving 9 essential results. The total budget of the IWRM plan is 24 518 076.
- The linking of the IWRM plan to the new PRSP was considered, during the stakeholder evaluation workshop, as one of the important changes since 2003 in the way water has been managed in Mali. Some participants discussed that the new PRSP (2007-2011) has more emphasis on sustainable resources and has new indicators for the MDGs that take into account the development of the water sector.

Regarding the second outcome, the process for developing the IWRM plan was considered very inclusive of participation by many different water sector stakeholders at various stages and levels of plan preparation. The multi-stakeholder platform approach was considered innovative for both the sector and for Mali. One comment was that the plan has a much broader national ownership than previous plans developed under World Bank projects in the sector because the latter had plans that were prepared by external consultants before being disseminated. By contrast, this plan was prepared through a bottom up consultative process involving the regions and the use of national consultants (with support from GWP and external consultants where needed) with a consultative process that shaped the plan.

- During the stakeholder evaluation workshop, having a better understanding of the water resource situation because of the IWRM process was considered one of the biggest changes in the way water has been managed since 2003. That said, some stakeholders at this workshop from the NGO community commented that even with this process, IWRM has not penetrated the grass roots and remains a somewhat 'intellectual' theory that needs to be translated into local language and local action in the next phase.
- From the stakeholder evaluation workshop, 75% of the participants felt that there was a satisfactory level engagement in the IWRM planning process by the various stakeholders but only 51% felt that there was a satisfactory level of ownership of the IWRM plan. The GWP TC group in their comments on the IWRM plan, identify that a principal challenge will be the accountability of the other ministerial actors, (other than Minister of Mines, Energy and Water) such as environment, agriculture, territorial administration and health to the plan as this does not come out clearly in the document.

Regarding the third outcome - improved water resources management and service delivery - 60% of the stakeholder evaluation workshop participants reported that the situation is not where it should be.

- As outlined in the IWRM plan, many attribute this to the non-application of the water code due to the lack of decision-making power and financial resources in place to effectively improve water management through decentralization.
- The most important changes cited in the way water is being managed since 2003, during the stakeholder evaluation workshop, rested at the planning level and not the delivery.
- It appears too early to see any results on this outcome for the PAWD project.

Regarding the fourth outcome - stronger collaboration with potential financing institutions – this has been paid more attention to within the last year as opposed to the previous years.

- Two projects with IWRM aspects are already underway and will continue. The Germans, through GTZ, are financing an 'IWRM Information System'. The Dutch are financing a second phase of GIRENS (IWRM in the Upper Niger Basin) which will work with local committees on IWRM while at the same time monitoring water levels and flows and reinforcing technical capacity for water quality monitoring. This is an important project for advancing IWRM application at the basin level. MaWP will play a rôle in IWRM training and awareness and creation of water user networks. With European Union Water Facility funding (3 494 605 Euros) UNESCO funding, MaWP partners Mali Association of Municipalities and the University of Bamako will implement a project to work with communities on the Niger River in the Bamako, Segou, Mopti and Djenne regions on strengthening water governance by putting in place local river users associations and using cultural approaches. The Danish government has also committed to funding 4 community based IWRM projects.
- The next step proposed, now that the IWRM plan is finalized, is to hold a donor roundtable to look at how to finance the various aspects of the plan. This is in keeping with feedback from the African Development Bank representative, interviewed in Bamako, who referred to the fact that since there was now an official government plan, they could now explore financing. Furthermore, they indicated that the AfDB Water Facility could be an option, particularly for the monitoring and evaluation aspects in the IWRM plan.
- That said, Mali's dependence on outside support is considerable. In terms of financing of the water sector, 85% is financed externally through aid or loans. The government expenditure of 15% is mainly for salaries and overhead. This is seen as a major constraint for the sector.

Regarding the fifth outcome – strengthened regional and country level partnerships – the country partnership has experienced considerable growth.

- MaWP began with approximately 50 members and currently has approximately 100. There is one executive secretary (paid staff) to look after administrative duties.
- During the PAWD project, 8 regional water partnerships (RWPs) were also created within the country. These RWPs played an important role in mobilizing participation in the regional consultations and were invited to participate in 3 capacity building workshops.
- Currently with the Chair of the MaWP also being the Director of the IWRM Unit at the Direction Nationale de l'Hydraulique (DNH), there has been an internalization of the PAWD project within government, sometimes giving the impression, as expressed by several key informants, that the IWRM Unit and the MaWP are one in the same.

Regarding the sixth outcome – integration of IWRM into PRSPs – the currency of the water sector generally and IWRM specifically to national planning has been increasing over the life of PAWD.

- With the perspective of achieving the MDGs in 2015, the Government adopted the National Plan for Access to Potable Water (PNAEP) in 2004. Following sector consultations, the Ministry of Mines, Energy and Water and the Ministry of Environment and Sanitation decided in 2005 to concretize this approach by initiating a program that would integrate potable water and sanitation. In response to a fragmented project approach to water management and need for greater coherence between the Ministries concerned with achieving the MDGs, they created an ad-hoc in tri-ministerial group. In 2006, this group came up with a program called PROSEA (Programme Sectoriel Eau et Assainissement) with 3 axis: i) access to potable water; ii) access to sanitation; iii) integrated management of water. A budgeting by objective exercise took place in 2007 to put medium term framework for spending in this sector. Some of the advantages of the PROSEA process were to clarify the responsibilities around potable water and sanitation and to include an IWRM approach.
- According to key informants, the adoption of the IWRM approach within PROSEA was somewhat influenced by the PAWD project and IWRM planning being far enough along in its process for it to be understood within the ministries concerned.
- Another important policy initiative in 2006 was the creation of a national water policy. During the evaluation workshop, participants credited the PAWD project for its catalytic role in advancing the creation of the policy.

- In terms of on-going reform and administrative changes, the National Water Council has recently been created as set out in the 'Code de l'Eau' to support the decentralization of water resource management with the creation of a regional and local water councils foreseen as well as creation of basin and sub-basin committees. This will be supported by a national water fund which although it has approximately 500 million CFA allocated to it for this year, is yet to be operationalized.

### **Assessment of GWP – WA's (and the larger network's) Role**

The support given by GWP and GWP-WA was considered important to the success of the PAWD project. Key informants highlighted the support and confidence that the GWP Chair, gave to the team when they themselves felt daunted by the task ahead. There was also an appreciation by the team that they were contributing to the 'pioneering' of the IWRM planning process when they took their questions to the 2005 GWP conference in Johannesburg and realized that these could not all be answered by the technical experts present.

The annual meetings held in Nairobi, Zambia, and Dakar were also considered important capacity building and shared learning opportunities as they implicated the other partner countries. The technical documents on preparing an IWRM plan were constant reference points. They cited the helpful contribution to the process that GWP-WA at the pivotal Selengue meeting in November of 2006 for the selection of priorities and the useful written recommendations made by the technical team at the May 2007 validation workshop.

In terms of weaknesses of the GWP support, key informants cited the lack of flexibility when it came to budget lines, delays in the transfer of funds (specifically activities for January 2008 were not carried out because funds didn't arrive until March 2008) and the inconvenience of frequently changing reporting requirements (however, this was accepted as part of the 'learning by doing' for GWP on the project). They also mentioned that although it was not authorized in the budget, an IWRM pilot project at the basin level would have been a big contribution to the project and accelerated the learning around IWRM application.

### **Observations on IWRM Capacity Building in Mali**

Capacity building during the PAWD project happened in terms of the project team receiving training and giving training to MaWP partners, water sector actors and students. The GWP led training received by project team members focused on the following topics: results based management, gender and IWRM and conflict resolution in water management. The RBM training was considered very helpful for the project team, however one concern was that the training held in Dakar didn't use the PAWD RBM framework and the final IWRM plan still needed to strengthen its use of RBM (feedback from GWP TEC).

Timing of training for the team also could have been improved as the Gender and IWRM came rather late in the project. In terms of reach, the training held by MaWP and its partners reached not only government partners but university and primary school and community organizations as well. However, only 20% of the respondents in the self-evaluation considered that the partners were able to better fill their role related to IWRM following the capacity building activities. This seems to be attributed to the fact that the training stayed at the awareness raising level and has yet to go to the application level.

### **Observations of Gender Mainstreaming in Mali**

Similarly, the gender and IWRM aspects of the project, for the most part stayed at the awareness raising level. However, key informants indicated that this was new to many at the beginning of the project, as cited in the

national IWRM « taking into account of gender is generally insufficient at the local, regional and national level by the key institutions and intervenors. » During the project MaWP was able to pilot Gender and IWRM awareness training at the regional level, following the training they received by Gender Water Alliance. However, it was felt that the training was too short (3 days) to go beyond awareness. It was also felt that MaWP needed to strengthen its capacity in evaluation to be able to improve its training and monitor follow-up and application.

The MaWP treasurer is the president of the 'Coordination des Association Femminine ONGs' for Mali. She explained how joining MaWP has increased her knowledge and capacity around IWRM which was minimal before joining. She also described how the IWRM and Gender training built on the traditional IWRM activities women were already doing (ie. Changing fishing net sizes with the seasons, following certain shared rules about water disposal etc.) and discussed how women's role is very important for other water management decisions and tasks. She also sees the representation of women within MaWP as very low and something to work on in the next few years, especially as CAFO has 2,000 members and could be more present in MaWP. Another role for MaWP will be to actively encourage women's participation in water basin committees and give them IWRM training.

### **Observations on MaWP's Strategic Positioning to Sustain its Multi-Stakeholder Platform Role**

By most accounts, the PAWD project is leaving MaWP a stronger organization with a role to play in the implementation of the IWRM plan. It has in place:

- an official status and operational governance structure
- over 100 members from civil society, private sector, municipalities, research institutions, government technical services
- many members having received training in gender and IWRM, conflict resolution, communication, water pollution and prevention and ready to participate actively in IWRM activities and processes
- a membership fee structure (25,000 CFA initiation fee and 15,000 CFA annual fee) in place though not all members find it possible to participate yet
- regional MaWP 'attenas' in all 8 regions of the country as well as the district of Bamako

MaWP sees its niche as continuing to support capacity building and awareness for IWRM with its members. It identifies as the organization with decentralized networks that civil society, local NGOs, communities and other partners can look to for support on IWRM, as compared to other networks like WAWI (West African Water Initiative) that works with international water NGOs on bore-hole access at the national and regional level.

There was a feeling from several of the NGO members of MaWP that they need to go further down the to the grass roots to do their training and use local languages because during the PAWD process, this was more or less limited to those that are intellectuals and educated and not the grass roots population, keeping in mind that only half of women in Mali are literate.

As indicated above, with MaWP is a partner in three IWRM projects that have confirmed funding by external donors, the one staff member will continue in his position as well as the hosting relationship with CREPA, giving MaWP a life well beyond PAWD.

In terms of climate change, the IWRM information system being put in place in the IWRM Unit, financed through GTZ, will play an important part in having the tools (ie. piezometers) and systems to monitor levels of the water table and climate change. In the IWRM plan, monitoring the effect of climate change on water resources is included as one of the 52 actions. Key informants felt that climate change is a reality for Mali and will cause increased pressure on water resources and therefore a greater need for IWRM approaches both nationally and regionally.

### **Key Lessons Learned**

Key informants offered the following insight that could be taken as lessons learned:

- While the PAWD process was demanding because of development of the IWRM plan, it would have been advantageous to have a pilot project at the basin level putting IWRM practices into place to provide more learning in anticipation of the rolling out of the IWRM plan particularly in light of the decentralization process on-going in Mali
- The need to foresee a step in the PAWD process for dissemination of the the IWRM plan and organizing a donor's roundtable for financing the activities in the plan
- The evaluation missions by GWP/GWP-WA that took place every six months were key to keeping the process moving forward and making corrections along the way
- Tthe multi-stakeholder platform was an innovative approach in Mali for bringing together government and non-government stakeholders to plan together in a sector

Helen Patterson

PAWD Evaluator



# Malawi

## Report of Findings

### PAWD Final Evaluation

#### Introduction

Below is a set of country findings of the PAWD evaluators following their visit to Malawi between March 12<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>, 2008.

#### Baseline Conditions

Prior to 2003, IWRM was mostly an academic concept. It gained expression in policy and planning documents emanating from the first phase of the World Bank financed National Water Development Program (NWDP), most notably the 2005 National Water Policy which advocated integrated water resource management as the basis of sustainable water development.

The PAWD project has been the mainstay of the Malawi Water Partnership (MWP) since its formation in 2003. Up to being selected for inclusion in PAWD, MWP operated on a modest start up budget provided by GWP-SA. Impetus for a partnership in Malawi a combination of...

- Global interest in IWRM – Malawi is a signator to the Dublin Principals
- Malawi's participation in the SADC Regional Strategic Action Plan on Integrated Water Resources Development and Management (2005-10)
- Recognition, through the first phase of NWDP, that the water sector was in poor shape – infrastructure/services degraded and a dirth of systematic water resource management.

There was recognition from within government that prior to the introduction of the IWRM planning by MWP, there was little coordination between ministries associated with water users – that is, each ministry had their own strategies and plans as well as different approaches. Some were seen to be in conflict with each other (e.g. agriculture was seen as a major water user, opening up forests, winter cropping not seen as consistent with good water resource management). Noted one informant to the evaluation, "To bring these issues together we needed some sort of plan – this (PAWD) is exactly what was needed – share all perspectives and appreciate the need to work together."

From the beginning, MWP has been hosted by the Malawi Polytechnic. The platform's original pre-PAWD management structure reflected its multi-stakeholder character, with representation on the MWP Steering Committee from the Polytechnic, MoIWD, NGOs, Academia and a water related parastatal (ESCOM).

The project was launched with considerable backing from government, which included...

- Strong championship of the Principal Secretary of the Ministry of Irrigation and Water Development (MoIWD)
- The Vice President officiating the PAWD launch
- 29/32 principal secretaries attending an IWRM orientation workshop - by all accounts their early orientation at this launch served the project well; PS's from the water related ministries were ready to

nominate their directors or Senior Officers to the PAWD Core Team when it was established in mid - 2004.

The PAWD Core Team was broadly constituted – MoIWD and four other water related ministries, water related training institutions, NGOs, private sector and parastatal enterprises. Initially, there was confusion around role delineation between the MWP Steering Committee and the PAWD Core Team. In the end, the former was folded into the latter. An MOU signed between MWP and MoIWD defined the relationship, focusing on the formulation of the IWRM plan.

## **PAWD Achievement Against Planned Outcomes**

Over four years, PAWD has substantially delivered on the first two and last two of six project outcomes (plan formulation and integration of IWRM into national planning); it cannot claim more than an indirect contribution toward the third and fourth outcomes (financing for IWRM and improvements in service delivery).

Conversations with key informants from government and non-government organizations yielded the following insights on project results:

- PAWD is ending with an IWRM plan at or very near completion and ready for submission to Cabinet. As such, PAWD is said to have accelerated a process that would have occurred, but over a longer time frame. And PAWD is credited for making the planning process broadly consultative. The situation analysis, water, forestry and land resources/agriculture studies were contracted out.
- The draft covers all aspects expected of an IWRM plan including a detailed situation analysis, vision, goals and objectives, and implementation modalities. It specifies project concept papers complete with rationales, expected outputs, timeframes and cost estimates over a maximum of five years. The GWP TEC group has given the document a positive review. Implementation will be helped by the passage of the Water Bill, currently before Cabinet. This sets out the institutional arrangements for IWRM (MoIWD (policy), National Water Resources Authority (regulation) and catchment and sub-catchment management authorities (planning and management of resources). The current phase of the National Water Development Program (NWDP Phase II 2007 - 11) will be a vehicle for implementation of the IWRM plan, according to several key informants with knowledge of this initiative (NWDP is funded by EU, OPEC Fund, AfDB, JICA, UNDP and the Icelandic Government).
- The IWRM plan is anchored in the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS) – the Country's principle medium term planning instrument, and is seen as the implementation strategy under the MGDS. Building to this, a consultant was hired to carry out a review of Malawi's PRSP and prepare a position paper for consideration by MoIWD. MoIWD and the lead Ministry of Economic Planning and Development took up the position advanced through the MWP. This resulted in the inclusion of IWRM in the successor document to the PRSP, the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy.
- With the IWRM implementation plan draft to its name, MWP – the multi-stakeholder platform – has become well recognized, at least within the sectors directly tied to water resource management and service delivery. From all accounts it has filled a gap by creating an inter-sectoral mechanism for information exchange and discussion.
- Through the PAWD activities, MWP has been able to convey water as a finite resource, which has been a major shift in thinking, perhaps not for those who already work in the sector, but for others who work indirectly with the sector and the general population. It comes as a surprise to many that the Malawi is actually a water scarce country.
- Since 2003, water development has gained much more prominence – it is now considered second priority – resource allocations have increased by about 40% since 2006. As one person noted, "Government has overspent by 100% this past year in the sector in order to ensure that the building of multi-purpose dams is complete". That said, stakeholders participating in this evaluation are cautious about attributing this result to PAWD in anything more than an indirect manner.
- In the same vein, stakeholders describe shifts in awareness about IWRM amongst decision-makers down to the catchment level – this as a result of national and regional consultations and a concerted

media campaign (TOT of media a prominent capacity building activity). But they are cautious about attributing any actual changes in service delivery to PAWD. In the view of the Chair of MWP a key challenge now that the plan is written, is to communicate it to sub-regional stakeholders – those at the base (chiefs and local politicians) using tailored messaging.

## **Analysis of Constraints on Progress**

The progress in PAWD has been most dramatic over the past two years. It took upwards of a year to build the PAWD team and to develop a work program. This was the first key task of the project manager when hired in October 2004. The Chair described this a ‘formative time’ when stakeholders were getting used to sitting together. The subject matter – how to prepare an IWRM plan in a participatory way – represented unchartered water. The launch of the situation analysis (procurement of contracting services) was reportedly also delayed through the slow release of funds through the Polytechnic.

There was an appreciation for the innovative nature of the multi-stakeholder platform from those from within government. At first, MWP was not that well understood as an entity. Appreciation for MWP being ‘chaired’ outside government grew as it became apparent that other non-government stakeholders saw MWP as a neutral voice. This encouraged their participation in the IWRM consultation and planning meetings. Previously, national plans (e.g. National Water Development Plan Phase 1) were prepared by consultants and then presented. The multi-stakeholder platform approach to planning meant that there was input all along the way. This is now widely seen as innovative and signifies that there is more understanding and ownership across the board for the IWRM plan.

In this formative stage, MoIWD had proposed that MWP facilitate a pilot catchment area planning process. After considering this, the Core team decided against this pilot, for the following reasons:

- The size of the catchment and the complexity of the issues involved.
- Concern that, at this stage in the project, the MWP did not yet have enough resident expertise to embark on an application of the IWRM process.
- Perceived obligation to stick to the main task of preparing the plan.
- Budget and time constraints.

In discussions with the Chair, it is clear that MWP is ambivalent about not having been able to take on a pilot. At least some members would have liked to see the partnership facilitate some local catchment planning. Their argument is three-fold: a) it would have given the members of the partnership another way to engage in IWRM activities (instead of simply being engaged in the IWRM planning process), b) it would have allowed the partnership to test out some IWRM concepts and thereby provide some grounded experience in the IWRM planning process, and c) it would have given the partnership a ‘live model’ to showcase as part of the effort to spread general awareness of IWRM in the country. Indeed, in the wake of a 2007 IWRM awareness workshop in Mangochi District, the partnership did facilitate a small catchment planning process.

An important catalytic moment in the project occurred in 2006, following MWP’s circulation of zero draft of the IWRM plan. The Project Core Team realized that their process was running in parallel and potentially overlapping the design of some preparatory work for a Phase II of NWDP. The Core team organized a meeting in Liwonde, chaired by the Principal Secretary of MoIWD and attended by directors of relevant government ministries (including MoIWD), MWP Executive and the Core Team. Participants resolved to work together – in

particular to hold a joint consultation (co-financed by MoIWD and MWP) at the regional level with: civil society, traditional leaders, MPs, and leaders for water users associations. It appears that having the support of senior government officials in MoIWD was instrumental in bringing about a resolution.

### **Assessment of GWP SA's (and the larger network's) Role**

By and large, the PAWD Manager and members of the Core Team are appreciative of the support that has been provided by GWP – SA and others in the GWP network. As one person put it, “When it seemed we were out of tune with the Ministry, GWP – SA intervened in a constructive way – there was good rapport with each member of the Core Team.” The regional program has been helpful in supporting the host institution come to grips with a more rigorous administrative and financial control system than they were accustomed to providing – support which has resulted in the Polytechnic deciding to dedicate a single staff person to the accounting function. Some concern was expressed about the presence of GWP technical experts who came to review the draft plan in 2007. While enlightened by the team's assertion that Malawi is and needs to be recognized as a water scarce country, members of the partnership were: a) not sure how well prepared the team members were to provide detailed feedback on the document, b) not impressed by the argumentative style of the consultants.

### **Observations on IWRM Capacity Building (including Gender Aspects) in Malawi**

GWP – SA coordinated PAWD capacity building in the region. Upwards of 150 Malawi stakeholders participated in PAWD training over the four years. Most have reportedly been happy with their training (the evaluators did not examine end of activity evaluations). However, there are some cautionary notes:

- The capacity building schedule, generated through a regional needs assessment exercise has been out of sync with programming in Malawi – a case in point being the Gender & HIV/AIDS training done after rather than before MWP develops a gender and HIV/AIDS strategy with MWP members.
- Capacity building has tended to be limited to practitioner training. Neither GWP – SA or MWP have been able to put in place TOT processes through PAWD.
- For the gender and IWRM training, there was a feeling among some of the participants interviewed that the 3 day training gave them a high level of awareness and sensitivity to gender and water issues but fell short of preparing them to carry out gender analysis themselves. One particular concern was that the timing of the training itself was out of sync with MWP's planned gender activities. Those that took the regionally organized gender training felt that gender skill building could be improved through a more extensive training program, coupled with follow up activities.

MWP organized its own training on IWRM within three target audiences: the media, water related training institutes and district level stakeholders (leaders of user groups, district staff of MoIWD, local government).

- Several colleges have taken up IWRM into their teaching programs.
- There are now several IWRM champions in the Malawi media. Perhaps the biggest media treatment of IWRM, to date, has come in the form of a TV series of 7, 15 minute programs for general consumption in Chichewa local language. Coverage includes: water demand management, sanitation, water for environment, waste management, catchment management. It was first aired on national television in mid 2006-2007 and is re-run periodically.
- In one district, stakeholders have moved beyond the training to address water related conflicts in a catchment plan.

## Observations on MWP's Strategic Positioning to Support IWRM Implementation

It appears that, as PAWD continued, MWP's activities and management became nearly synonymous with those of the project. With about a year to go in the project, the Core Team began work on an MWP strategic plan (2007-12). By all accounts there was a realization that the Partnership had to address several key questions: a) its constitution and legal status, b) its financial viability post-PAWD, c) and its future programming niche following the completion of the IWRM. MWP's constitution came into being in mid 2007. Deliberations on the three big strategic questions, noted above, continue at the time of the evaluation. All persons with whom the evaluators spoke, agree that the coming few months will be delicate for the partnership.

- MWP finds itself in a dilemma regarding its legal status. On one side, GWP has indicated a preference for country water partnerships to remain as loose networks affiliated to GWP, connected to local host institutions. However, without legal status, MWP is severely limited in its ability to generate resources – for this, it would remain dependent on its local host or on GWP. For its part, the Malawi Government, finds it difficult to relate to an unregistered entity. There is a strong desire to register in some legal form, but this too has its complications. It is clear to the Core Group, that to register as an NGO would make it difficult for the Government to be a partner.
- The partnership has not found other sources of funds to continue following the close of PAWD. In large part the question of future financing is tied up in the legal question.
- And on the question of future niche, there are several options being considered – MWP as a convenor, IWRM trainer/coach, catchment level IWRM facilitator, general promoter and monitor/advocate. Many of these are implied in the IWRM plan. The Partnership is wrestling over GWP's contention that country water partnerships are to be 'facilitators'. Where is the line that divides 'facilitation' from 'implementation'? Can aspects of IWRM plan implementation be 'facilitated'? In discussion with those with whom we discussed these questions, it appears that MWP recognizes that it can facilitate implementation in a variety of ways (see above) without itself conflicting roles with members (government departments, NGOs, etc.). It worries, though, that as a 'facilitator' it won't be in a strong position to attract donor resources.

Philip Cox

Helen Patterson

PAWD Evaluation



# Senegal

## Report of Findings

### PAWD Final Evaluation

#### Introduction

Below is a set of country findings of the PAWD evaluation following a visit to Senegal between March 20<sup>th</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup>, 2008.

#### Baseline Conditions

The CWP Senegal was created on Tuesday, November 12, 2002 as a non-profit organization with support from GWP-WA with the fundamental mission of promoting in Senegal the principals of IWRM. After 2 years of existence, CWP Senegal received its receipt of recognition as an association on May 23, 2005 under the n° 12038/M.INT/DAGAT/DEL/AS. According to key informants, and as discussed during the evaluation workshop, CWP Senegal played a supportive role as opposed to a leading role in the PAWD project in the sense that its main focus was the development of the IWRM plan (PAGIRE). The implementation of the IWRM plan was carried out by a Project Coordination Unit (4 members) and by a multidisciplinary project team made up of about twenty experts from key technical services and from the CWP Senegal. The function of project leader was carried out by the Director of the DGPRE (Direction of Management and Planning of Water Resources), and the technical advisor of the minister of hydraulics served as project coordinator. The process was overseen by a steering committee (66 members), and a follow-up committee (10 members) established by the ministerial order n° 03371/MAH of March 23, 2004.

#### Historical Overview of the Water Sector in Senegal

Senegal had been moving towards an IWRM approach a few years before the creation of CWP Senegal and the launching of the PAWD project. Some examples of this are:

- in 1998 a UNDP project on water resource management put forward the idea of a IWRM plan for water basins according to ecological and geographical aspects.
- In 2000, under the framework of the Water Sector Project (PSE – Support to services and management of water resources), a Strategy for Water Resource Management was developed based on information sharing, identification of water resources as a national priority, and the strengthening of water resources staff with the implication of local actors.
- In 2001, the document Vision for Water, Life and the Environment (EVE) summoned the Senegalese government to address water management issues and to define an IWRM strategy.
- In 2002, the CWP Senegal was formed with the mandate to promote awareness of IWRM approaches with a wide range of stakeholders.
- Meanwhile, during this period, it has been reported that water management activities in Senegal were focused on increasing access to water through bore-hole construction and that there was limited integrated planning between all the ministries concerned with water.
- In 2002, during Water Week in Stockholm, the DGPRE began negotiating the support of GWP for assistance in developing an IWRM plan as recommended by the World Summit on Sustainable Development (2002). In 2003, under the Canadian initiative, Senegal was chosen as a PAWD country

and the process began in 2004 and an accord was signed between the Ministry of Hydrology and Infrastructure and GWP-WA to begin the project.

### **PAWD Achievements Against Planned Outcomes**

The achievement towards the six PAWD outcomes, at the end of the project reveals mixed results. In terms of the first outcome, the PAWD project can be credited with providing the technical support and funding that enabled the participatory process for the creation of an IWRM plan. In terms of the second outcome, the result appears to be partial in the sense that the ownership is strong by those that were directly involved - this group appears to be contained to the multidisciplinary team and some of the core CWP members. For the third outcome, there appears to be no attribution to the PAWD project for improved water resource management and service delivery. The fourth outcome of stronger collaboration with potential financing institutions to support projects, appears to be partially achieved through the commitments of the African Development Bank Water Facility however, the majority opinion from the self-evaluation exercise was that this outcome was not satisfactorily achieved. The latter may be due in part to the lack of information and confirmation around what aspects from the IWRM plan have been officially funded. The fifth outcome related to the strengthening of the multi-stakeholder platform manifested late in PAWD. Since 2007, it has put in place a constitution and work program. Finally, on the sixth outcome related to influencing higher level national planning (e.g. the PRSP), PAWD has come up short on expectations, though this is now being addressed.

Conversations with key informants from government and non-government organizations yielded the following insights on project results:

- The IWRM plan was prepared using regional workshops, situational analysis and validation of the plan through a steering committee (multi-stakeholder platform) and covers all aspects expected of an IWRM; it specifies seven priority projects with timeframes and cost estimates over eight years.
- The plan is not yet adopted by the government of Senegal and during the stakeholder evaluation workshop a discussion was held during which it appeared that the majority of stakeholders, both government and non-government, believed that the adoption or approval of the plan by the government was important for the final step of validation of the plan across government and for ensuring that donor support could be garnered for a government sanctioned plan. A minority view was that the plan, by virtue of the involvement of the various ministries, was already considered as 'adopted or approved' at the inter-departmental level.
- The plan was evaluated by the GWP technical team at the September 2007 validation workshop, as having taken into account other national plans and programs and creating synergies that will be important in the implementation of the plan. In an effort to promote integration, the government put the PAWD under the same pilot committee that it had in place for the PEPAM (Programme Eau Potable et Assainissement pour le Millenaire), which marked an important step in unifying the sector and ensured that PEPAM includes an IWRM approach.
- Some of the challenges in water resource management in Senegal when PAWD began, and that are still a concern today, have been identified in the IWRM Plan as:
  - lack of understanding of water management methods, incomplete data base on water resource issues (ie. Quality and quantity, etc.) lack of knowledge sharing and communication between stakeholders involved in water resources and insufficient human resources to address these issues;
  - insufficient frameworks for shared planning and the institutions meant to be put in place for this, CSE (Conseil Supérieur de L'eau) and CTE (Comité Technique de L'Eau) are not operational;
  - weak application of policy and legal instruments concerning water management

- weak capacity to mobilize financial resources for access and management of water resources and weak budget allocations for follow-up and maintenance of water infrastructure;
  - increased risks regarding water management observed i.e. Frequent floods, increased water pollution, increased sickness related to water-borne diseases and an increase in proliferation of aquatic plants;
  - lack of operational strategies and communication and education about water with the most important actors and users;
  - in the Ndiaye region where there is competing use of water for growing vegetables and providing water for Dakar, a harmonized approach for managing water resources has been the strategy of the Ministry of Agriculture; it was felt that this type of IWRM approach needed to be formalized and tools created to replicate elsewhere.
- Water pricing came up during the stakeholder evaluation by 80% of the respondents as an issue that is not adequately addressed in the IWRM plan and yet is of concern to many CWP Senegal members. It is not clear how this would be addressed in the future in the IWRM plan, however the CWP Senegal Strategic Plan has identified a project entitled 'Feasibility of Right to Water' which includes identifying the constraints as to why there is not a formal 'Right to Water Policy' and what structures etc. could be put in place to adopt such a policy. CWP Senegal sees this as an innovative way to promote equitable access to water in Senegal and contribute to GWP's role in promoting equitable water access in Africa.
  - Even though IWRM planning process happened during a period of political change (the project coordinator and former advisor to the Minister for Agriculture and Rural Hydraulic was transferred to the Ministry of Urban Sanitation and Urban Hydraulic) where progress on the process and the plan were interrupted, the plan was completed according to the time frame. All those interviewed doubted that the IWRM plan would be completed today if it weren't for the PAWD funding and GWP support.
  - The PAWD project closes with some uncertainty as to the approval of the IWRM plan and the mechanism of how it will be implemented. The view as to what mechanism should oversee the plan appears to be somewhat divided. Some members of the Project Coordination Unit believe that it should be overseen by an IWRM unit in the Ministry of Hydrology and not by a permanent technical secretary attached to the Primature (a key informant explained that this approach of permanent secretariats attached to the Primature is being discouraged), as recommended by some members of the Project Coordination Unit and CWP Senegal, and GWP Reference Group in their feedback on the IWRM Plan in September 2007. At the end of the PAWD project in March 2008, the IWRM plan still remains to be approved by the Government of Senegal.

Regarding the second outcome addressing stakeholder participation, some key informants from outside the DGPRES were concerned that the level of participation, in the consultations about the plan, stayed at the level of the departments (administrative units) and didn't get down to the local level, possibly because of lack of resources. That being said, 43 regional and departmental workshops were held for the purpose of analyzing the current IWRM situation in the regions, carrying out a needs assessment and formulating proposals for the IWRM plan. In addition:

- The PAWD project is credited with having supported the first steps of having IWRM focal points in the in the regions for the Regional Hydrologic Division and the Regional Agriculture Division.
- The feedback from the self-evaluation reported that in terms of stakeholders participating in the key steps of the formulation of the plan, 93% of respondents felt satisfied or felt that it was achieved but could have been somewhat improved. However, in terms of shared ownership, there still seems to be some lack of collective vision of the stakeholders as to how the institutional roles of the government organizations linked to water are defined in the plan. More than 60% of those that participated in the self-evaluation felt that the latter is in the plan but not yet as they wish to see it.
- Moreover, there were several comments in the self-evaluation regarding the lack of communication and sharing of the final IWRM plan among the stakeholders (as also mentioned in the document 'Capitalisation du processus PAGIRE au Senegal" pg. 18, GWP-WA) and questions as to what priorities were finally included in the document.

- Based on comments in the self-evaluation and discussions at the evaluation workshop, the ownership of the IWRM plan is strongest by those who were closely associated with it on the multidisciplinary team and the project coordination team and moderately so by those that participated in the validation process.

Regarding the third outcome relating to improved water resources management and service delivery, it was clear that this outcome had not been achieved during the project from the feedback in self-evaluation and discussions during the evaluation workshop. More specifically,

- 81% of respondents reported that there either was no improvement or it was inadequate.
- On the one hand, most believed that it was too early to expect this outcome and that, practically speaking, the project was focused on the goals of raising IWRM awareness and of preparing and completing the IWRM plan which would impact water resource management and delivery only once it was being implemented.
- On the other hand, a greater awareness about the IWRM approach from certain sectors of government, was seen as a change within the last 4 years, and in particular that IWRM principles are now mentioned in the strategic plans of many ministries concerned with water resources.
- During the evaluation workshop, the adoption of the Agro-sylvo-pastoral bill in 2005, was identified as an important change in the way water is managed in Senegal because it will guide government in policy in agriculture and livestock for the next 20 years. This bill defines IWRM as the main principal for controlling water use in the development of agriculture and its sub-sectors.

There has been one significant basin-level application of the IWRM approach with promising results, so far:

- The OMVS (Organization pour la mise en valeur du Fleuve Senegal) started in 2004 working with the World Bank, with co-financing by the Dutch on the Senegal River Basin Water Resources and Environment Management Project that had two IWRM components for setting up and strengthening basin management committees and water users associations for the control of invasive plants and control of soil degradation.
- With support from the PAWD project, some basin level IWRM initiatives took place, supported by the CWP Senegal, at Lac des Guiers where there are competing needs for water from the local population, agriculture and the transfer of water to Dakar. Meetings were held to present the existing texts on water use and discuss their application.
- A Unit to address shared water needs was opened at the Lake and there has been reported decrease in pollution and increase in water quality. Certain goals have been set regarding water use to reduce the demands on the water table. This is held up as an example of the PNE providing IWRM guidance, knowledge and support on IWRM under the leadership and coordination of the DGPRES. These types of basin level planning activities and water quality monitoring are foreseen in the IWRM plan under the project entitled « Putting in place an integrated system of information and knowledge about water. »

On the fourth outcome seeking stronger collaboration with potential financing institutions to support projects, PAWD appears to have made a contribution.

- The IWRM Plan identifies that 40% of funding for water projects will come from the state (from user fees and taxes) and 60% will come from external sources to fund the 11,818 million CFA for the IWRM plan. So far, 1.9 million euros from African Water Facility has been committed to the DGPRES for IWRM Plan projects. Furthermore, in the 2008 budget 100 million CFA has been committed to the DGPRES for studies regarding water quality and quantity, which also falls under the IWRM plan. CIDA, through the PSU, has also expressed interest in funding the IWRM plan. Only 35% of respondents to the self-evaluation tool were satisfied that financial instruments were in place to fund projects from the IWRM Plan.

Regarding the fifth outcome – on strengthening multi-stakeholder platforms – there are mixed reviews. During the evaluation workshop, several participants commented that since the beginning of the PAWD project, they did not have a complete vision or understanding of all the components of the project. For some respondents to

the self-evaluation, PAWD was seen as “ a project of the DGPRE”. The Pilot Committee (which was a multi-stakeholder platform of 66 members from government, technical services, private sector, elected representatives, civil society, water user groups etc.) met twice during the PAWD project for the approval of the roadmap (January 2004) and the validation (December 2007) of the IWRM plan.

- Several key informants expressed the opinion that the CWP Senegal was still searching for its role during the first few years of its creation and really became more active in the PAWD process when the Scientific and Technical Committee was put in place in March 2005. In 2007 CWP Senegal held its second General Assembly which was an important turning point for the organization in terms of discussing governance issues; also in that year, CWP Senegal adopted its 2008-2011 action plan. At that time its statutes were amended and aligned with the GWP conditions of accreditation. As noted in the evaluation workshop, the PAWD budget allocated for institutional capacity building for the CWP Senegal had been utilized only to a small extent despite activities being proposed by CWP Senegal members. The Project Coordination Unit was the key body that led the PAWD process through planning, follow-up and organization of all project activities.

And on the sixth outcome – on integrating IWRM into higher level development planning...

- Key informants involved in the preparation of the plan acknowledged that one of the one of the weak points of their process is that there is not a direct link with the PRSP, despite water being among the priorities of the strategy. Currently, a review period of the PRSP is underway and, to address this concern, the Minister of Hydraulic has sent a note to the Minister of Finance to ask for explicit inclusion of an IWRM approach in the PRSP.

### **Assessment of GWP – WA’s (and the larger network’s) Role**

The following comments about GWP support were collected by key informants and at the evaluation workshop:

- The operational workshops hosted by GWP every 6 months were considered a chance for valuable capacity building (in RBM, gender and IWRM, participatory processes, preparation of the IWRM plan etc.) knowledge sharing and learning opportunities with other countries following a similar process.
- The workshops for strengthening capacity building for creating the IWRM plan (RBM, participatory approach to planning process etc.) were important contributions of GWP.
- There was a feeling that the GWP approach with its partners in the period 2004-2006 was top-down and moved to a more bottom-up approach from 2006 forward.
- It was felt that there was an insufficient consultation on the part of GWP-WA regarding the allocations and ceilings for the budget lines, and not enough flexibility regarding transfer from budget lines.
- The use of English language by GWP for communicating and reporting at the beginning of the project was a barrier, however, a field visit by a CIDA officer helped to resolve this.
- Most members of IWRM team understood that the Canadian Initiative (PAWD) was to finance the IWRM plan.
- GWP could have been more active in the strengthening of the CWP-Senegal since the platform role was considered limited during the first few years of the project

### **Observations on IWRM Capacity Building in Senegal**

Capacity development and training happened at several levels during the PAWD process:

- Two capacity building workshops were held on the project i) gender and IWRM; ii) environment and IWRM; the approach used for the training was practitioner oriented as opposed to train the trainer.
- IWRM awareness and capacity building workshops were held in the regions and cited as an important contribution to raising level of IWRM knowledge; these workshops focused on the IWRM concepts and on the inter-dependence of water users; a strong point of these workshops was that the IWRM information was translated into local language, which had not been done previous to the PAWD project; a weakness cited in the training was the lack of concrete examples of applied IWRM.

- The project is credited with assisting in establishing a university level IWRM course that covers the IWRM approach and principals, tools, governance, water and poverty issues; this initiative grew out of the implication of the university professors who were CWP Senegal members part of and the Science and Technical Committee; this involvement allowed for increased involvement of the university with the regional departments and more field level experience through the regional workshops.

### **Observations on Gender Mainstreaming in Senegal**

In terms of analyzing and addressing gender issues during the PAWD process, this appears to be limited to the gender and IWRM training and the development of a project in the IWRM plan focused on “ Strengthening women's participation and others who are marginalized in the integrated management of water resources”.

Gender analysis did not appear to be applied in depth to the IWRM plan and stayed at the 'awareness' level – i.e. awareness that women play an important part in water resource management.

The 'gender project' in the IWRM plan outlines activities, but does not clarify what specific outcomes (changes) it is aiming to achieve and the indicator for the project ('percentage evolution of number of women implicated in water management') may prove to be challenging to measure . The CWP Senegal is identified as a key partner for implementing this project.

As a result of involvement in the PAWD process, a member of the Scientific and Technical Committee of CWP Senegal, who is also with the Ministry of Promotion of Women, has integrated IWRM into some of the workshops given by the Ministry. This serves as one example of integration of gender and IWRM training into government programming, outside the ministry directly focused on water resources.

### **Observations on CWP Senegal's Strategic Positioning to Sustain its Multi-Stakeholder Platform Role**

The future role of the CWP Senegal is articulated in their strategic plan for 2008-2011 which was prepared by the Scientific and Technical Committee with contributions from five working groups, that included outside resource persons in addition to CWP members. This plan identifies seven themes that were identified as insufficiently addressed in the IWRM plan. These themes are presented as projects that the CWP would like to implement in partnership with the relevant stakeholders and institutions.

The role that CWP Senegal sees itself playing in these 'projects' is one of capacity building, advocacy for the poorest, knowledge sharing in IWRM strategies and techniques. The plan has a budget of 3.25 million euros and identifies a staff of 3 for CWP Senegal for project management and administration and education and information.

CWP Senegal is identified in the IWRM plan as a pillar for the implementation of several projects in the plan that require IWRM awareness training, participatory processes and social mobilization.

At the time of the evaluation, there was no specific funding commitment to CWP Senegal and the contract of the Executive Secretary was finished at the end of March 2008. However, the PAWD project ends with the CWP Senegal having a clearer vision for what they would like to achieve articulated in their strategic plan, which recognizes that the priority needs regarding water resource management issues in Senegal cannot all be met by the existing capacity and institutions or by the IWRM plan, thus, they would like to make a significant contribution as well.

Climate Change was identified by a key informant as an issue that will have an important impact on IWRM in Senegal. Their concern was that the projections regarding water resource availability by the OMVS identify that the supply will not meet the current demand. The impact that has on the population is significant and in five years time, the IWRM plan and all plans regarding water resources in the region, particularly where water resources are trans-boundary, will need to be revised according to the impact of climate change. It was suggested that GWP and GWP-WA will have an important role to play in this.

## **Key Lessons Learned**

Key informants offered the following insights that could be taken as lessons learned:

- The PAWD approach allowed for a national dialogue on water that reached right out to the regional level. This was a significant contribution. This approach allowed for raising awareness about IWRM and made the situational analysis more accessible to participants in the process.
- At the end of the project, all actors involved in the process at all levels have a better understanding of IWRM as an approach. Some actors have significantly deepened their knowledge and understanding of IWRM issues as a result of the project.
- An important contribution was also made to the bridging the gap between the university and the departments involved in water resource management through this project. PAWD allowed for the the opportunity for the university departments to engage in applied IWRM research. The lesson here is that when you create the space for stakeholders to share and exchange knowledge gaps are identified/filled, complementarities are found.
- The PAWD process gave confidence to the ministry responsible for water resources and has left them empowered with a plan of action for IWRM.

Helen Patterson

PAWD Evaluator



# Zambia

## Report of Findings (not-validated)

### PAWD Final Evaluation

Below is a set of country findings of the PAWD evaluator following a visit to Zambia between March 6<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup>, 2008.

#### **Baseline Conditions**

PAWD has been by far the Zambia Water Partnership's (ZWP's) most significant project since its inception in 2000. Up to being selected for inclusion in PAWD, ZWP operated on a shoe string following a strategy of implementing IWRM related research and development contracts and securing some overhead resources to finance member activities. This source supplemented some start up funds provided by GWP and generated by ZWP itself through a K250,000 annual member subscription.

Prior to 2003, IWRM was mostly an academic concept. It had expression in policy and planning documents but mostly as an unexplored intent of government.

#### **PAWD Achievements Against Planned Outcomes**

Over four years, PAWD has substantially delivered on three of six project outcomes (plan formulation, broad based ownership of plan, and integration of IWRM into national planning); and is showing modest progress toward the other three (financing for IWRM, improvements in service delivery, and functional multi-stakeholder platforms). Conversations with key informants from government and non-government organizations yielded the following insights on project results:

- PAWD is widely credited for enabling the ZWP to draft an IWRM plan that now has considerable support – not just by the water related ministries (Health, Home Affairs and Local Government, and Agriculture), but by the Ministry of Finance and Planning. PAWD is said to have accelerated a process that would have occurred, but over a longer time frame.
- The draft covers all aspects expected of an IWRM; it specifies projects, timeframes and cost estimates over the first three years of implementation. The GWP TEC group has given it a generally positive review. Implementation will be helped by the passage of the Water Bill, currently before Cabinet, but even without the Bill, it appears that IWRM concepts are sufficiently integrated into MEWD's strategic plan to allow implementation to proceed. MEWD has already included projects named in the IWRM Implementation Plan into its spending plan for the current fiscal year.
- The IWRM is entirely consistent with the national government's five year development plan (FNDP – 2006-10); indeed the chapter on water was drafted by Professor Nyambe, Coordinator of the ZWP and a person intimately familiar with the IWRM planning process. Since the passage of the FNDP, the Partnership is adjusting the IWRM plan to be an *implementation* plan under the FNDP – this on the advice of the Directors of Planning from various ministries at a conference convened by the MOFP on behalf of the partnership in 2006.
- Sector Advisory Groups (SAGs) have been established to advise the MOFP on the formulation and implementation of the FNDP. The Water SAG has provided positive feedback on the IWRM implementation plan.

- With the IWRM implementation plan now complete, ZWP – the multi-stakeholder platform – has become well recognized, at least within the sectors directly tied to water resource management and service delivery. From all accounts it has filled a gap by creating an inter-sectoral mechanism for information exchange and discussion. This was its original ‘niche’ when formed in 2000.
- As the principle instrument by which the Government articulates its spending priorities, the FNDP has already been instrumental in generating more externally and internally generated resources for water development.
- As a result of the combination of media coverage of IWRM (most notably a 13 part series on IWRM that has been aired on national TV and adapted for radio) and national and regional consultations, key informants are describing innovations at the water user level. For example: Zambia Sugar, a member of the ZWP, is implementing new irrigation techniques with savings on water use. Placement of hydrometric gauges along the Chalimbana River are providing water flow data to inform contentious discussions between upstream and downstream users. Related, project stakeholders have learned from their provincial consultations that IWRM practices resemble traditional stewardship practices – and, as such, the concepts once de-mystified should resonate readily at the catchment level. That said, all agree that, it is too soon to see generalized change in water management and service delivery. Several informants have noted that this outcome seems unreasonable for a project of the limited scale of PAWD.

## Analysis of Constraints on Progress

The progress in PAWD has been most dramatic over the past two years. The partnership has struggled to overcome considerable organizational challenges. Indeed, participants at the evaluation described the history of PAWD in Zambia having four epochs: “process”, “turbulence”, “formation” and “progress”. Aspects of the organization challenges follow:

- Water Resource Management is under the mandate of the Ministry of Energy and Water Development (MEWD). MEWD had been undertaking the Water Resources Action Plan (WRAP) since 2002. At the outset, some within MEWD felt that PAWD should simply be integrated under this initiative.
- GWP explained that this was not possible since PAWD was to be implemented by GWP, its Country Water Partnership and the CWP’s host institution – the University of Zambia Schools of Mines and Energy (CIDA stipulation). This institutional arrangement, which included MEWD as a member, had been in place since 2000 – indeed, the Minister of Energy and Water Development presided over the launch meeting of the Zambia Water Partnership.
- The resulting institutional set up saw:

**The PAWD project being managed through the hitherto fledgling ZWP Secretariat comprised of several faculty from UNZA with oversight provided by a three person Executive** - Initially, this Executive included the Permanent Secretariat of MEWD, but this person left very soon after the project began. The Executive remained inactive.

**A four person Task Team mandated by ZWP to begin work in the absence of a Project Manager** - Relations with MEWD at this time were problematic. As described by one person connected to MEWD’s Water Resources Action Program (WRAP), “ZWP/UNZA showed up with a project that looked like it was covering the same territory as WRAP – strange because water resource management is squarely the mandate of government (MEWD)”.

**A Project Manager and Administrative Assistant** – hired in mid to late 2004.

**Reliance on UNZA’s administrative apparatus for the financial management system** – receipt of funds, disbursements, accounting and financial reporting.

- Several informants lament that a detailed management structure and program concept was not developed and sealed with an MOU at the outset. One person noted that, “MEWD should have formally mandated UNZA to implement PAWD under the ZWP within the framework of its own Water Resources Action Program”. As it was, the accountability relationships between UNZA and MEWD were not clear.
- GWP-SA made an early intervention – from which a new governance body was created - the Project Core Team led by the Director of the Department of Water Affairs (also responsible for WRAP).
- MEWD’s comfort level with the project increased, but there was still the question of role delineation. The Project Core Team pressed for the WRAP and PAWD teams to delineate their roles. It was agreed that the two teams would work together to formulate a zero draft combining the research and writing of both to date. It was further agreed that the WRAP team would concentrate on developing the water bill and policy revisions, while PAWD concentrated on an IWRM consultation process. One key informant offered that initially, at least, the Project Core team took a ‘procedure’ bound approach to its oversight role – i.e. not so much focused strategically on outcomes but more on the minutia of document preparation.
- The first Project Manager is said to have been inexperienced in this kind of a role and, despite strong effort, was unsuccessful in navigating the project through the uncertainty described above. This person’s contract was not renewed and a new, more experienced, individual filled the role (this person has been in place between early 2006 and the end of the Project).
- As a fledgling, non-legalized entity in Zambia, ZWP was dependent on the financial and administrative apparatus of its host the University of Zambia. This was problematic, from the point of view of PAWD management, as the University’s systems were unable to provide the quick response support that project needed, particularly with regard to disbursement and financial reporting. This was an irritant, not only to PAWD management, but also to personnel in MEWD that found it hard to get strong commitments from PAWD.

Much of the PAWD supported research and drafting work was done by expat. consultants hired through the Task Team. Recalling this phase, Task Team members uniformly comment on the high quality of the work, and one suggested that in retrospect it might have been easier to parcel the tasks in larger chunks to reduce the synthesis task at the end. Sadly, this work was hampered by the death of individuals who were instrumental to the drafting process - the former Chair of the ZWP and one of the consultants.

Most individuals met during the evaluation, noted frustration with the lack of progress made on a pilot catchment IWRM process. The Chalimbana Pilot Project represented a manageably sized IWRM challenge for the ZWP to test out IWRM concepts. The project suffered delays resulting from:

- Divergent opinions within the catchment over whether the project should go forward
- Lack of clarity over whether this was a UNZA or a MEWD led initiative (early work was done prior to the sorting out of the management structure of PAWD).
- Procurement related delays
- Decision by the newly elected government to re-consider the Water Bill. This legislation had been slated for approval by the Cabinet of the outgoing government (the Act would have set out the institutional arrangements for water management at the catchment level).
- In the end, the project was able to hold some initial consultations in the upper, middle and lower catchment areas and to install hydrometric gauges to track water flows along the heavily dammed stretch of river (35km). The project was not able to facilitate the formation of a water development councils and provide requisite training/orientation for stakeholders.

### **Assessment of GWP – SA’s (and the larger network’s) Role**

GWP is credited by many for making several timely interventions:

- Helping to delineate roles for WRAP and for PAWD and for facilitating the creation of the PAWD Core Team.
- Assisting ZWP with a constitutional review and an election process for the ZWP Executive.
- Providing commentary on the IWRM plan draft

### **Observations of IWRM Capacity Building in Zambia**

Capacity building support provided through GWP-SA is described as useful by those interviewed, though two cautionary observations can be drawn from the conversations:

- The TOT modality does not appear to have been used – at least to the extent that participants are learning both content and pedagogy so that they can pass the training on.
- Capacity building strategies beyond training – follow up support and mentoring, for example – have not featured during PAWD.
- By all accounts, the demand for IWRM training has and will continue to increase both at the catchment level and within MEWD. This will require a more localized approach to capacity building.

### **Observations on Gender Mainstreaming in Zambia**

Gender and HIV/AIDS, as cross-cutting themes, have been addressed through a training activity in Harare. Two individuals interviewed indicated satisfaction with the training course, as far as it went, but noted that it did not provide sufficient orientation to help them apply a gender analysis to their IWRM plan preparation. The plan, itself, speaks in general terms of the importance of women's participation in water related planning and management. Gender considerations tend to focus on women's participation in IWRM planning deliberations through consultations and at partnership meetings. Several persons interviewed suggested that gender aspects have not been thought through conceptually at the country level.

### **Observations on ZWP's Strategic Positioning to Sustain its Multi-stakeholder Platform Role**

By most accounts, the PAWD project is leaving ZWP a stronger organization than it was when the project began. Several commented that the partnership is making progress toward GWP's accreditation standard, and now would have the capacity to manage projects of the scale of PAWD on its own. ZWP...

- has a constitution and an elected, broad based governance body
- enjoys a higher public profile
- has proven itself competent through the generation of a broadly owned IWRM plan
- has, by the end of the project, established a durable working rapport with the MEWD – it appears well established that the IWRM plan is owned by the Government and that the role of the partnership is to facilitate its implementation where it can.

At the same time the partnership finds itself in a delicate position over the coming few months – and at a time when the IWRM is moving into a new and potentially very demanding implementation phase:

- ZWP remains a non-legalized network affiliate of GWP, and as such cannot fundraise independently of its host institution in Zambia. Decisions are currently being taken on the question of whether ZWP should register as an NGO or association, but there are pros and cons (note: one potential disadvantage noted in Malawi is that government might have a difficult time being part of an NGO entity).

- It has some financial resources of its own with which to maintain some secretariat functions for a short time, but this would not be at the same level as that enjoyed under PAWD – ZWP may lose some of the human resource capital that it has generated over the past four years.

The partnership can see many opportunities for itself in the implementation of the IWRM - potential roles include: IWRM capacity building, monitoring and evaluation, modeling and documenting catchment level IWRM planning practices, fund generation for IWRM projects – but it remains to agree on its strategic priorities.

Two persons suggested that, initially, ZWP will return to its earlier practice of taking on contracts as a means of: a) inserting itself into IWRM work, b) generating funds for membership activities.

Meanwhile, UNZA is developing a new training institution through international university partnerships called the IWRM Centre, to be focused on academic programs in IWRM and some professional upgrading. This development is described as complementary to ZWP – it is not intended to create competition. That said, conversations on the topic suggest that respective roles would have to be thought out to ensure they are mutually reinforcing.

Climate Change is an emerging theme in IWRM deliberations. The Ministry of Environment, Tourism and Natural Resources Development has been promoting awareness of Climate Change consequences in Zambia; the President spoke about it during the week that the evaluator was in the Country. One person noted that, IWRM paves the way for helping communities to adjust to climate change, though noted that to address climate change action would be needed at multiple levels simultaneously.

## **Key Lessons Learned**

Key informants offered the following insights that could be taken as lessons learned:

- It is important to maintain 'champions' in strategically important places and to keep them engaged in the IWRM planning process.
- While it is tempting to want to accelerate the drafting process, to do so leaves people/institutions out of the picture and erodes the all important ownership factor.
- IWRM is occurring against a larger backdrop of 'decentralization'. Devolution of authority to lower levels of governance may bring with it some discomfort at the central level within government; departments lose mandates and sometimes budgets, and they have to search for new roles.

Philip Cox

PAWD Evaluator



## Appendix VI – List of Key Documents

- African Ministers' Council on Water. (2004). *Fifth session Entebbe, Uganda Nov 2004: Entebbe outcomes, decisions and commitments.*
- African Ministers' Council on Water. *Report of the activities of the technical advisory committee for the period 2004-2007: The 6<sup>TH</sup> ordinary session.*
- African Ministers' Council on Water. <http://www.amcow.org/index1.php>
- African Ministers' Council on Water. *Corporate profile.*
- African Ministers' Council on Water. *Handbook for decision makers.*
- Barlow, M., & Clarke, T. (2002). *Blue Gold: The battle against corporate theft of the world's water.* Toronto, Canada. Stoddart Publishing Co. Limited.
- Canada Fund for Africa. (March 2005). *RBM training completion report: GWP RBM training, Nairobi.*
- CEDEAO, & ECOWAS. (March 2008). *IWRM in West Africa 2007 situation: Integrated water resources management.*
- D. Mame Dagou DIOP r. (March 2007). *Analyse de la prise en compte de la gire et du genre dans les stratégies nationales de lutte contre la pauvreté.*
- Drouin, N. (Nov 19, 2004). *Memorandum: Authorization of gender and RBM consultancy contract for GWP initiative- Mary Liao.* Canadian International Development Agency.
- Drouin, N. (May 20, 2003). *Canada fund for Africa: Improving water management and access to water and sanitation.* Canadian International Development Agency.
- Global Water Partnership - Southern Africa PAWD. *Final/End of project report (2008).*
- Global Water Partnership. *Bilateral meeting with Ms. Margaret Catley-Carlson; Chair.*
- Global Water Partnership. (21 Feb 2007). *Comprehensive work plan 2007: Implementing the GWP 2004-2008 strategy and work programme.*
- Global Water Partnership. <http://www.gwpforum.org/servlet/PSP>
- Global Water Partnership. *Réunion de validation du plan d'Actions de la gestion des ressources en eau, rapport de l'ateleir du groupe 2.*
- Global Water Partnership. (Sept 2003). *An action partnerships program for sustainable african water development: Project document*
- Global Water Partnership. (Sept 11-12, 2007). *Processus d'Élaboration du plan national de gestion intéree des ressources en eau de la république du sénégale-PAGIRE, apports du groupe de référence du partenariat mondial de l'Eau.*
- Global Water Partnership. (Oct 2003). *Partnership for africa's water development (PAWD) project: Draft monitoring, evaluation and learning plan*
- Global Water Partnership. (March 2004). *Improving water resources management in Central, Eastern, Southern and West Africa: An inception report.*
- Global Water Partnership. (Feb. 2006). *Setting the stage for change: Second informal survey by the GWP network giving the status of the 2005 WSSD target on national integrated water resources management and water efficiency plan.* <http://www.gwpforum.org/gwp/library/IWRMSurvey-final.pdf>
- Global Water Partnership. (Dec 2007). *Global water partnership strategy 2004-2008*
- Global Water Partnership. (Dec 2007). *Global water partnership strategy 2004-2008*

- Global Water Partnership. (2005). *Trip report: Nairobi, Kenya RBM training for global water partnership march 16-17, 2005*
- Global Water Partnership. *Informal stakeholder baseline survey: Current status of national efforts to move towards sustainable water management using an IWRM approach, April 2004.* <http://www.gwpforum.org/gwp/library/IWRMSurvey.pdf>
- Global Water Partnership - PAWD. (Jan 2007). *Facilitation process to set-up the Chalimbana river catchment: IWRM pilot project*
- Global Water Partnership - PAWD. (Jan 2007). *Facilitation process to set-up the Chalimbana river catchment: IWRM pilot project*
- Global Water Partnership - PAWD. (Jan 2006). *Zambia water partnership: 2005 annual report.*
- Global Water Partnership - PAWD. (2007). *Zambia water partnership: Work Plan Jan 2007-Dec 2007.*
- Global Water Partnership - PAWD. (2006). *Zambia water partnership: Jan 2006-Dec 2006 annual progress report.*
- Global Water Partnership - Southern Africa. (Jan 2007). *Partnership for Africa's water development (PAWD) project: 2006 annual progress report (incl. Malawi and Zambia).*
- Global Water Partnership- PAWD. (Jul 2007). *Improving water resources management in central, eastern, southern and West Africa: Draft 2007 semi-annual progress report.*
- Global Water Partnership Technical Committee. *How IWRM will contribute to achieving the MDGs: Policy brief 4.*
- Global Water Partnership Technical Committee. *Climate change adaptation and integrated water resource management: An initial overview: Policy Brief 5.*
- Global Water Partnership West Africa. *Présentation du partenariat national de l'Eau du Senegal, L'eau au Senegal: Un défi majeur pour le millénaire.*
- Global Water Partnership West Africa. (Feb 2008). *Capitalisation du processus PAGIRE au sénégal.*
- Global Water Partnership. *2006/2007 Project/Program performance report: Partnership for Africa's water development.*
- Global Water Partnership. *Plan d'action 2008-2011 du partenariat national de l'Eau du sénégal.*
- Global Water Partnership-Eastern Africa. (Jan 2007). *Partnership for Africa's water development (PAWD) project: 2006 annual progress report (incl. Kenya).*
- Global Water Partnership-PAWD. (April 2007). *Improving water resources management in central, eastern, southern and West Africa: Revised draft 2006 annual financial report.*
- Global Water Partnership-West Africa. (Jan 2007). *Partnership for Africa's water development (PAWD) project: 2006 annual progress report (incl. Mali and Senegal).*
- Global Water Partnership. (2006). *The boldness of small steps, ten years of the global water partnership.*
- Global Water Partnership-PAWD. (Jan 2008). *Zambia water partnership: Final/End of project Report.*
- Liao, E. M. (March 2005). *Gender Equality Mainstreaming and Results Based Management.* Global Water Partnership and Canadian International Development Agency.
- Ministry of Irrigation and Water Development, Republic of Malawi. *Draft Malawi integrated water resource management and water efficiency (IWRM/WE) plan: 2008-2012*(March 2008).
- Ministry of Water and Irrigation, Republic of Kenya. (March 2008). *Draft integrated water resources management and water efficiency plan for Kenya.*

- Ministry of Energy and Water Development. (March 2007). *Report on western province provincial consultation workshop for the development of the IWRM/WE implementation plan.*
- Ministry of Finance and National Planning/Ministry of Energy and Water Development. (Feb 2007). *Report on the national workshop for directors of water related government ministries and heads of planning.*
- Ministry of Finance and National Planning/Ministry of Energy and Water Development. (Feb 2007). *Report on the national workshop for directors of water related government ministries and heads of planning.*
- Ministerial declaration: International conference on freshwater in Bonn. [http://www.water2001.de/outcome/MinistersDeclaration/Ministerial\\_Declaration.pdf](http://www.water2001.de/outcome/MinistersDeclaration/Ministerial_Declaration.pdf)
- Organisation pour la Mise en Valeur du Fleuve Sénégal, Republic of Senegal. (2006). *Senegal river water resources and environment management project, synthesis report of the regional forum on the contribution of GEF projects to the management of transboundary basins: Case of the Senegal river basin June 22-23, 2006.*
- OMVS-Organisation pour la Mise en Valeur du Fleuve Sénégal. *Sénégal river basin water resources and environment management project.*
- Organization of work during CSD-12: Introductory note from the chair. (14th April 2004). [http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csd/csd12/annotated\\_org\\_work.pdf](http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csd/csd12/annotated_org_work.pdf)
- Partnership for Africa's Water Development. (March 2008). *Processus d'élaboration du plan d'Action de gestion intégrée des ressources en eau du Mali.*
- Partnership for Africa's Water Development. (2004). *Statuts du partenariat national de l'Eau au Mali.*
- Partnership for Africa's Water Development. (2004). *Règlement intérieur du partenariat national de l'Eau du Mali.*
- Partnership for Africa's Water Development. *List of PAWD partners by country and organization.*
- Rees, A. J. (June 2006). *Urban water and sanitation services: An IWRM approach.* Global Water Partnership Technical Committee.
- Republic of Zambia. (Feb 2008). *Zambia integrated water resources management and water efficiency implementation plan: Volume 2 summary*
- Republic of Zambia. (Oct 2007). *Zambia integrated water resources management and water efficiency implementation plan: Volume 1 main report (2007-2030)*
- République de Sénégal. *Ministère de l'Hydraulique et du réseau hydrographique national, plan d'Actions pour la gestion intégrée des ressources en eau, gagner le pari d'une gouvernance efficiente de l'eau.*
- République de Sénégal. *Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Hydraulique, DGPRE.*
- République de Sénégal. *Ministère de l'Hydraulique et du réseau hydrographique national, élaboration du plan d'Actions pour la gestion intégrée des ressources en eau.*
- République du Mali. (Dec 2007). *Ministère de l'Énergie, des mines et de l'Eau, plan d'Action national de gestion intégrée des ressources en eau-2<sup>ème</sup> partie, objectifs, résultats, actions et modalités de mise en œuvre.*
- République du Mali. *Ministère de l'Énergie, des mines et de l'Eau, note de synthèse du document de plan d'action national de gestion intégrée des ressources en eau.*
- République du Mali. (Dec 2007). *Ministère de l'Énergie, des mines et de l'Eau, plan d'Action national de gestion intégrée des ressources en eau-1<sup>ère</sup> partie, état des lieux des ressources en eau et de leur cadre de gestion*

- République du Sénégal. (29 Sept 2007). *Ministère de l'Hydraulique et du réseau hydrologique national, note sur le secteur de l'hydraulique.*
- République du Sénégal. (Dec 2007). *Ministère de l'Hydraulique & DGPRE – direction de la gestion et de la planification des ressources en eau.*
- UN Water/Africa & African Minister's Council on Water. (2003). *The challenges of achieving the water, sanitation and human settlements target in Africa: "making it happen".*
- The new partnership for Africa's development -NEPAD.*  
(Oct2001).<http://www.dfa.gov.za/au.nepad/nepad.pdf>
- UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Division for Sustainable Development. *Johannesburg plan of implementation: Article 26 develop integrated water resources management and water efficiency plans by 2005, with support to developing countries, through actions at all levels:*  
[http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/documents/WSSD\\_POI\\_PD/English/POIChapter4.htm](http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/documents/WSSD_POI_PD/English/POIChapter4.htm)
- UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Division for Sustainable Development. *Commission on sustainable development (CSD).*<http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csd/aboutCsd.htm>
- UN Water. *International decade for action: Water for life, 2005-2012.*<http://www.un.org/waterforlifedecade/background.html>
- UNCED. *Agenda 21-chapter 18:Protection of the quality and supply of freshwater resources: Application of integrated approaches to the development, management and use of water resources.*<http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/documents/agenda21/english/agenda21chapter18.htm>
- UNDP, Global Water Partnership., & ICLEI. (May 2002). *Dialogue on effective water governance*
- UNESCO's World Water Assessment Programme. *Milestones 1972 - 2006: From Stockholm to Mexico.* <http://www.unesco.org/water/wwap/milestones/index.shtml>
- UNESCO's World Water Assessment Programme. *Water for people, water for life: The United Nations world water development report.*<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001295/129556e.pdf>
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. *Official list of MDG indicators.*  
<http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Host.aspx?Content=Indicators/OfficialList.htm>
- United Nations Economic Commission for Africa. *The Africa water vision for 2025: Equitable and sustainable use of water for socio-economic development.*<http://www.uneca.org/awich/african%20water%20vision%202025.pdf>
- Water Resources Management Authority, Republic of Kenya. (June 2007). *Lake Victoria north catchment area: Draft catchment management strategy.*
- Water Resources Management Authority, Republic of Kenya. (June 2007). *Tana water catchment area: Draft catchment management strategy.*
- Wilson-Grau, R., & Hall, A. (Dec 2007). *Guide for the introduction of outcome mapping in GWP.*
- World Bank. *World commission on water for the 21<sup>st</sup> century establishes body to assess water resources & devise solutions.*<http://go.worldbank.org/KT3FXGI7C0>
- World Health Organization. *2006 meeting the MDG drinking water and sanitation target: A mid-term assessment of progress.*[http://www.who.int/water\\_sanitation\\_health/monitoring/jmp04.pdf](http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/monitoring/jmp04.pdf)
- World Water Council. *Vision statement and key messages.*<http://www.worldwatercouncil.org/fileadmin/wwc/Library/WWVision/Chapter1.pdf>
- World Water Council. *World water actions report 2003.*<http://www.worldwatercouncil.org/index.php?id=191>
- World water Council. <http://www.worldwatercouncil.org/>