

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK GROUP



PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR
MOZAMBIQUE: MAPUTO WATER SUPPLY REHABILITATION PROJECT
ZAMBIA: CENTRAL PROVINCE WATER SUPPLY AND SANITATION PROJECT

Approach Paper

Operations Evaluation Department (OPEV)
Project and Programme Evaluation Division (OPEV.1)

OCTOBER 2011

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. EVALUATION RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES	1
3. THE PROJECTS.....	2
a) The Maputo Water Supply Rehabilitation project	2
b) Zambia Central Province Water Supply and Sanitation Project.....	3
4. EVALUATION ISSUES AND QUESTIONS	4
5. EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODS FOR INFORMATION GATHERING.....	7
6. COMMUNICATION AND DISSEMINATION.....	8
7. EVALUATION MANAGEMENT.....	8
8. EVALUATION OUTPUTS, TIMELINE AND WORKLOAD.....	8
ANNEX 1: MOZAMBIQUE MAPUTO WATER SUPPLY REHABILITATION PROJECT – LOGIC MODEL	9
ANNEX 2: ZAMBIA CENTRAL PROVINCE WATER SUPPLY AND SANITATION PROJECT – LOGIC MODEL.....	10
ANNEX 3: EVALUATION DESIGN MATRIX FOR THE MOZAMBIQUE WATER SUPPLY REHABILITATION PROJECT.....	11
ANNEX 4: EVALUATION DESIGN MATRIX FOR THE ZAMBIA CENTRAL PROVINCE WATER SUPPLY AND SANITATION PROJECT	19
ANNEX 5: TOR FOR NATIONAL CONSULTANT (MOZAMBIQUE)	29
ANNEX 6: TOR FOR NATIONAL CONSULTANT (ZAMBIA)	33
ANNEX 7: TOR FOR INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT	37
SELECT REFERENCES	41

PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR WATER SUPPLY AND SANITATION PROJECTS IN MOZAMBIQUE AND ZAMBIA

APPROACH PAPER

1. INTRODUCTION

Operations Evaluation Department (OPEV) of the African Development Bank is undertaking post-evaluations of two projects in the water supply and sanitation sector, viz., a) the Mozambique Maputo Water Supply Rehabilitation Project (approved in 1999 and completed in 2008); and b) the Zambia Central Province Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project (approved in 2000 and completed in 2007). This approach paper outlines the evaluation rationale and objectives; a brief description of the projects within the context of the country, sector and Bank's assistance; key issues and evaluation questions; evaluation design and methods of information gathering; communication and dissemination strategy, management and deliverables.

2. EVALUATION RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES

2.1 The project performance evaluation reports (PPER) for the two projects stated above are part of the 2011 CODE-approved OPEV work programme, which has prioritised water supply and sanitation sector for 2011 project evaluations. About three years are now elapsed after completion of the two projects and it is expected that the project evaluations will be able to report on outcomes. The PCR Review Notes (PCRRNs) for the two projects also indicate important issues that warrant post-evaluation. The PCRRN for Maputo Water Supply Rehabilitation Project has highlighted quality-at-entry issues needing further assessment. The document reviews and an exploratory mission to Mozambique indicated important lessons to be learnt from this project experience especially related to the public-private partnership in operation, the financing model for urban water supply and the institutional arrangements for ensuring sustainability. The Zambia Central Province Water Supply and Sanitation Project PCRRN has recommended the project as a candidate for PPER indicating the critical sustainability issues to be covered, including: a) assessment of the demand-led approach to water supply and sanitation intervention; b) the post-project status of community-based management of water supply and sanitation activities; and c) cost recovery system in place for operation and maintenance and arrangements for supply of spare parts for the bore-wells. The data presented in the PCR were found to be inadequate to support the assessment of some of the outcomes.

2.2 The PPERs are expected to serve dual purposes of accounting for the investments made by the projects and to bring out key lessons that would help improve future operations of the Bank in the sector. The analytical findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the two PPERs will contribute to the water sector evaluation currently underway in OPEV.

2.3 The evaluation aims to: a) assess the results of the two projects and their sustainability; b) assess the performance of the Bank and the Borrower in delivering the projects; c) identify the

key determinants of performance and the problems faced at different stages of the project cycle; and d) draw main lessons and provide practical recommendations for the benefit of future operations of the Bank.

3. THE PROJECTS

a) The Maputo Water Supply Rehabilitation project

3.1 The Maputo Water Supply Rehabilitation project was designed in a context where large majority of the country's population of about 17.7 million had no access to safe drinking water or improved sanitation services. The situation was worse in rural areas where it was estimated that 68% of the population had not benefited from adequate and safe water supply and 77% had no access to improved sanitation. The rapid population growth in urban areas during the 1980s created major pressures on the water supply infrastructure which required urgent rehabilitation and capacity expansion.

3.2 In 1995 the Government of Mozambique adopted the National Water Policy which was followed by the National Water Development Programme in 1997 covering institution building, privatisation of urban water supplies, rural water supply and sanitation, water resource management and human resource development. Maputo was one of the five towns covered under the phase-1 of the programme. In September 1997, the government requested the Bank to finance components of Maputo Water Supply. The Maputo Water Rehabilitation project was approved by the Bank in June 1999 with a loan amount of UA 17.50 million and a Technical Assistance Fund grant of UA 2.16 million. The total approved assistance amounted to UA 19.66 million (US\$ 30.87 million at the current exchange rate).

3.3 The Government's national sector goal was to ensure provision of adequate quantity and quality of water and sanitation services to the whole population of Mozambique. The target for Maputo in the medium term was to achieve a coverage rate of 80% of the population by year 2002. The specific objective of the project was to rehabilitate and augment the water supply system in Maputo and to enable drinking water to be delivered to the un-serviced areas of Hulene, Laulane and Mahotas peri-urban areas of Maputo and improve sanitation and hygiene behaviour in these quarters. These interventions were expected to reduce morbidity and mortality due to water- and sanitation-related diseases, reduce drudgery of women in collecting water and eventually contributing to improved quality of life and productivity of the people in the project area. See Annex 1 for the logic model of the project.

3.4 The project was expected to increase water supply to the town to the tune of 144,000 m³/day by 2002 to improve water supply in Hulene, Laulane and Mahotas and to improve sanitation and number of sanitary facilities for 50% of the population in these areas. The project components during actual implementation included: a) Rehabilitation of the Old Umbeluzi Treatment Plant; b) Rehabilitation of Chamanculo-Maxaquene Trunk Main; c) Additional Storage at Maxaquene; d) Construction of Chamanculo-Laulane Trunk Main; e) Construction of the Laulane Distribution Centre; f) Distribution and Reticulation Network Extension; g) Study on

Community Profile in the four quarters of Laulane, Mahotas and Hulene A and B for sanitation component including construction of communal latrines; and h) Construction of a drainage channel from Laulane to Costa do Sol.

3.5 The project was implemented by two agencies in the Government of Mozambique. The Water Supply components were implemented by Fundo de Investimento e Património do Abastecimento de Água (FIPAG) which is a parastatal organisation, and the Health Education, and Sanitation / Solid Waste Disposal component was implemented by National Directorate of Water (DNA), which is a department under the Ministry of Public Works and Housing (MOPH). The project was completed in December 2008 and a Project Completion Report (PCR) was prepared by the Bank in December 2009.

b) Zambia Central Province Water Supply and Sanitation Project

3.6 African Development Bank supported the Zambia Central Province Water Supply and Sanitation Project in a context where large segments of the country's population of about 13 million had no access to safe drinking water and improved sanitation services. In rural areas the situation was worse with an estimated 67% of the population having no access to adequate water supply and 70% with no access to improved sanitation. It was also estimated that about 80% of the preventable diseases in Zambia were related to unsafe drinking water supply and poor environmental sanitation particularly in rural areas where over 50% of the people lived. This was manifested in increased outbreaks of diarrhoea and cholera in the 1990s. Zambia is known for its high incidence of HIV/AIDS and high rate of environmental degeneration due to deforestation for making charcoal.

3.7 Government of Zambia began reforms in the water sector in the early 1990s and adopted its first National Water Policy in 1994 which stipulated that water supply and sanitation should be community-based, with the communities taking up full responsibility for service provision in this sector ensuring sustainability, and the government playing the role of a facilitator. This was not least because the government simply did not have adequate funds to finance provision of these services. It followed the strategy of providing an enabling environment and empowering the rural communities to identify and meet their needs for water supply and sanitation through Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Education (WASHE) concept, and approached the Bank to provide assistance under this framework for the rural areas of the Central Province. The Central Province Water Supply and Sanitation Project was approved by the Bank in 2000 with a total loan amount of UA 12.41 million (US\$ 20.12 million at the current exchange rate).

3.8 The Government of Zambia's national goal for the sector was to improve the quality of life and productivity of all people, by ensuring provision of an adequate quantity and quality of water to all user groups and improved sanitation services for all, at acceptable cost and on a sustainable basis. The project aimed to provide the rural communities of five districts of the Central Province of Zambia (viz. Chibombo, Mkushi, Kapiri-Mposhi, Mumbwa and Serenje), access to adequate and sustainable water supply, improved sanitation and personal and

household hygiene, control and prevent malaria and control rate of deforestation in the project area. See Annex 2 for the logic model of the project.

3.9 The main project components were: a) Water supply development; b) Sanitation support; c) Health education and support; d) Catchment area protection; e) Community mobilisation and training; and f) Institutional support.

3.10 The project was implemented by the Ministry of Local Government and Housing, Government of the Republic of Zambia. The project was completed in June 2007 and a Project Completion Report was prepared by the Bank in December 2008.

4. EVALUATION ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

4.1 The preliminary document review and the exploratory missions fielded to Mozambique and Zambia for this evaluation has brought out certain issues that the evaluation should place particular focus on. The key stakeholders were consulted during the exploratory mission included the government departments, project executing agencies, service providers and civil society organisations.

4.2 For the evaluation of Mozambique Water Supply Rehabilitation Project, the government, the private sector service provider and the regulatory authority expressed their interest in knowing about the extent to which the project achieved its expected outcomes and the challenges for sustainability. This is in view of the fact that there have not been any studies conducted by them after the completion of the project in the project area with this focus. The evaluation will thus place particular focus on the following issues:

- a) *Management and financing model:* One of the key factors that influence the project sustainability is the success of the management and financing model for water supply and sanitation. The evaluation will critically look at the management and financing model (based on public-private partnership), which is reported to be capable of full cost recovery of drinking water provision while addressing the affordability and willingness to pay of the water users. Considering the fact that more than 50% of the population in Mozambique lives in poverty and hence likely having low ability to pay, the evaluation will look into the issues in making water affordable to all segments of population in the project area. The lessons learned from this model would have great value for replication.
- b) *Non-revenue water:* The second key factor that would affect sustainability is the high level of non-revenue water primarily caused by illegal connections from the main water distribution lines. Non-revenue water in Maputo is reported to be to the tune of 50% which is a huge revenue loss for the government and causing damage to the infrastructure. This high level of unaccounted for water is likely to have affected the existing tariff structure forcing the service provider to charge more than what is affordable for the lower income groups of people. The government has taken a gradual and persuasive approach towards this issue, and hope to bring the illegal users within the

ambit of the formal system. The evaluation will examine how the non-revenue water has affected the affordability of the prevailing tariff structure.

- c) *Informal water suppliers:* Maputo has a substantial informal network of water suppliers who provide household connections from bore-well water (popularly known as ‘spaghetti connections’) the quality of which is not necessarily ensured. The informal water suppliers remain as a challenge for the expansion of formal water supply system. The evaluation will look into this issue and see how it would affect the realisation of project outcomes.
- d) *Hygiene behaviour:* The project had a strong component of health and hygiene education which was expected to bring about change in people’s behaviour with respect to personal as well as environmental hygiene. The evaluation will examine the extent to which the project succeeded in bringing about the required behavioural changes.
- e) *Effectiveness of partnership:* The Bank’s assistance through the project is one of the many interventions happened simultaneously and many initiatives implemented subsequently to reach drinking water to the people. The initiatives by development partners had taken care of the institutional restructuring/strengthening in the water supply and sanitation sector while the Bank financed the rehabilitation and augmentation of the water supply system. Both during implementation and after the completion of the project, there have been several initiatives by NGOs and bilateral agencies to reach drinking water to the final users through tertiary connections. The evaluation will look into the effectiveness of this partnership in delivery of the outputs and while assessing the short-term and medium term outcomes.

4.3 The key issues for the Zambia Central Province Water Supply and Sanitation Project also centred on sustainability challenges and project results.

- a) *Sustainability challenge:* The water supply facilities created in many places are not maintained well by the users. The pump menders who were equipped with toolkits are not always available to repair the water points when they go dysfunctional. The community or user groups are not motivated enough to carry out maintenance activities, instead they would prefer to go back to the old unsafe water sources. Some stakeholders are of the view that due to high poverty levels in Zambia, it would be unrealistic to expect the users to bear the cost of repairs and maintenance. The government now has initiated a new programme (SOMAP) with bilateral assistance to address the sustainability issues. The government’s budgetary allocation of 6% for the water supply and sanitation sector however is perceived to be inadequate to take care of the sustainability challenges. This situation indicates important lessons for the Bank as well as the government on the importance of participatory processes essential for mobilising the community and thereby ensuring sustainability of the facilities provided.

Construction quality: Sustainability of facilities delivered depends a great deal on the quality of construction and technical soundness. The evaluation will look into the quality aspects which were said to be inadequate in some instances as pointed out by the stakeholders.

- b) *Project outputs:* There is an inadequacy of data about the project outputs delivered and their locations. The M&E system has been weak in this project and there has not been any tracking of the functionality of the facilities. In the post-project scenario, the government, constrained by insufficient human and financial resources, has not been able to invest resources for this purpose. The evaluation will look into these aspects through a sample survey of facilities.
- c) *Coordination of diverse initiatives:* There is inadequate coordination of various water supply and sanitation sector interventions in the country by different development partners and the government. Development partners including NGOs (whose approaches range from almost free service provision to cost recovery from users) follow different models for improving access to water supply and sanitation and this is said to pose obstacles for the government which wants to follow the demand driven approach in which the beneficiaries are expected to make substantial contribution. This strategy was followed in the project partly and met with limited success.
- d) *Behavioural change:* The evaluation will look into the project's performance with respect to personal as well as environmental hygiene. Evaluation should also see if the insecticide treated bed nets provided under the project to fight malaria, were effective and used properly.

4.4 Incorporating the specific concerns of the stakeholders, the PPERs will focus on the project's relevance and quality-at-entry, efficacy, efficiency, institutional development impacts, sustainability as well as the performance of the Bank and the Borrower in delivering the project. The evaluation will place particular emphasis on outcomes and impacts of the project with a gender perspective. The evaluation questions are framed around these evaluation criteria and are as follows:

- a) Was the project consistent with the water supply and sanitation sector policies, strategies and priorities of the government and the Bank, and relevant to the needs of the target population?
- b) To what extent was the project design rigorous, adequate and relevant to achieve the project objectives?
- c) To what extent did the project achieve the development objectives of enhancing access to adequate quality and quantity of water supply and sanitation to the target population towards achieving health and gender outcomes and environmental protection?

- d) To what extent are the realised as well as expected project benefits commensurate with the resources already invested and to be invested in future to ensure continued flow of benefits?
- e) To what extent has the project contributed to improvements in the norms and practices that enable the country to make more efficient, equitable and sustainable use of its human, financial and national resources?
- f) What is the likelihood that the project facilities delivered will be maintained over the life of the project and yield expected benefits to the target population with resilience to the risks to development outcomes?
- g) How effectively did the Borrower perform through identification, preparation and implementation of the project by complying with the covenants and ensuring transparency and accountability?
- h) How effectively did the Bank perform by ensuring the project quality at entry, adequate supervision and quality at exit?
- i) What factors have contributed to or constrained efficient achievements of relevant project outputs and outcomes on a sustainable basis?
- j) What strategies worked and what did not work for successful implementation and towards achieving development outcomes? What lessons can be learnt from the project experience to contribute to future operations in water supply and sanitation sector?

4.5 Specific evaluation questions and corresponding indicators, data sources and data collection methods are elaborated in the evaluation matrices in Annexes 3 and 4 (Annex 3 Evaluation Design Matrix for Mozambique Water Supply Rehabilitation Project; and Annex 4 Evaluation Matrix for the Zambia Central Province Water Supply and Sanitation Project).

5. EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODS FOR INFORMATION GATHERING

The evaluation will use a quasi-experimental design and analyse the results produced by the projects through ‘before and after’ and ‘with and without’ analyses. Multiple methods will be used to collect data and information to produce credible evidence for the evaluation. Sources of data would be primary as well as secondary. Primary data sources are the sample households who have benefited from the project services as well as a comparator group that did not benefit from the project. Direct observation, focus group discussions and interviews with key informants are expected to yield relevant information for the evaluation. Consultations with the Bank operations department, government officials, service providers, Civil Society Organisation and other development partners engaged in the sector will be conducted. Secondary sources of data and information include the government statistics, project records, studies conducted by development partners, and data published by the service providers or available in their M&E system. Data and information from multiple sources will be triangulated to arrive at credible evaluation evidence. Baseline data are available for certain parameters but there will be a need to re-create the baseline for several outcome indicators. Data and information collected from the

user- and non-user groups will enable the analysis of a counterfactual. The methods of data and information gathering are specified in the evaluation design matrices in Annex 3 and 4.

6. COMMUNICATION AND DISSEMINATION

The main audience for this evaluation are the Bank's Board members, Management and operations staff, the country government including the executing agencies and the development partners. The PPERs will be submitted to the Bank's Board Committee on Operations and Development Effectiveness (CODE) after consultations with the Management, the respective governments and the evaluation reference groups at the country level. A dissemination seminar will be conducted involving the Bank's management, government representatives, project executive agencies, service providers and CSOs through videoconference. A two-page evaluation brief will be prepared for each of the PPERs for quick reference by the decision makers at the Bank as well as the country levels. Opportunities to spread the message of the evaluation at available forums at the country level as well as at the Bank headquarters level will be utilised. After finalisation, the PPERs will be uploaded on the Bank's Intranet and Extranet.

7. EVALUATION MANAGEMENT

7.1 The evaluation is coordinated by an evaluation task manager of OPEV.1. An international consultant with proven experience in evaluation of water supply and sanitation sector projects will be recruited to prepare the two PPERs. A national consultant each will be engaged to carry out the evaluation of socioeconomic and environmental impacts of the two projects. The TORs for the national consultants are attached in Annexes 5 and 6. The TOR for the international consultant is in Annex 7.

7.2 In order to ensure quality, the evaluation approach paper and draft reports will be reviewed by a three-member OPEV peer review committee, the concerned operations department of the Bank and the Evaluation Reference Group at the country level. The draft evaluation report will be reviewed by an external peer reviewer.

8. EVALUATION OUTPUTS, TIMELINE AND WORKLOAD

8.1 The key deliverables for each PPER are: a) Evaluation Approach Paper; b) Inception Reports for the Evaluation of Socioeconomic and Environmental Impacts; c) Final PPERs; and d) a two-page Evaluation Brief.

8.2 The final draft of the evaluation reports will be completed by end-January 2012 and submission to the Board will be by end-February 2012.

8.3 An estimated 44 person-days of work are required for each national consultant to carry out the evaluation of socioeconomic and environmental impacts, and 83 days of work for the international consultant to prepare the two PPERs.

ANNEX 1: MOZAMBIQUE MAPUTO WATER SUPPLY REHABILITATION PROJECT – LOGIC MODEL

Key activities	Outputs	Short term outcomes	Medium term outcomes	Impacts
Rehabilitation of existing water supply system.	A new filter unit installed at water treatment works. Chamanculo pumping station modified. Chamanculo-Maxaquene pipeline rehabilitated.			
Construction of new water supply system.	Matola-Cimentos trunk main of 5.6 km constructed.* Chemanculo-Maxaquene distribution systems of 280 km of pipelines. New trunk main from Chamanculo-Laulane, 6.5 km of 600 mm constructed. New distribution network of 74 km for Hulene, Laulane and Mahotas constructed. New storage reservoir at Maxaquene constructed.	Increased availability and access to drinking water of adequate quality and quantity in Maputo City and the peri-urban areas of Hulene, Laulane and Mahotas.		
Carry out Beneficiary Assessment Survey.	Country Health Profile report prepared.		Reduction in morbidity and mortality due to water- and sanitation related diseases. Reduced drudgery of women and productive use of saved time.	Improved quality of life and productivity of people in the project area.
Conduct campaign on health education, sanitation and solid waste disposal.	Health education, sanitation and solid waste disposal campaign conducted in Hulene, Laulane, and Mahotas. Improved low cost sanitary units constructed with beneficiary participation at household level and in schools.	Project beneficiaries are aware of and adopt healthy sanitation and hygiene practices. Increased access to adequate sanitation, hygiene and solid waste disposal facilities in Hulene, Laulane, Mahotas peri-urban areas.		
Construction of a storm water drainage line.	Drainage line of 2.3 constructed in the T-Basin area of Maputo City.	Improved drainage in the water-logged area and environmental quality.		
Conduct training workshop on EIA.	Senior staff of DNA, AdM and City Council trained on Environmental Impact Assessment.	Improved management of environmental impacts.		
Equip PIU with WSS engineer & health education, sanitation and solid waste disposal expert.				

* This component was implemented with the support of AFD, prior to the beginning of the project.

ANNEX 2: ZAMBIA CENTRAL PROVINCE WATER SUPPLY AND SANITATION PROJECT – LOGIC MODEL

Key activities	Outputs	Short term outcomes	Medium term outcomes	Impacts
Community mobilisation, training and formation of community groups.	Sustainable demand driven water supply facilities developed in the project area.	Improved access to and use of adequate quality and quantity of water by all user groups.	Reduction in morbidity and mortality due to water- and sanitation-related diseases and HIV/AIDS. Reduced drudgery of women and productive use of saved time. Improved environmental quality and regeneration. Households able to meet wood fuel needs from the woodlots raised.	Improved quality of life and productivity of people in the project area. Improved environmental sustainability.
Construction and rehabilitation of water supply points at community level and for schools and health centres.				
Construction of latrines for households, schools and health centres.	Improved demand driven sanitation facilities constructed for households and institutions in the project area.	Improved access to and use of adequate sanitation by all user groups.		
Conduct health and hygiene education campaign.	Increased knowledge of personal and environmental hygiene and prevention of malaria and HIV/AIDS in the project area.	Improved personal hygiene for the beneficiaries.		
Execute malaria control measures.	Insecticide Treated Bed-nets (ITN) provided to households. Health centres equipped with trained personnel.	Transmission of malaria prevented and controlled in the project area.		
Community sensitisation on environmental degradation, training in participatory forestry and provision of seedlings to raise woodlots.	Increased knowledge about conservation of the environment. Households and communities supplied with seedlings to raise woodlots near water points.	Households and communities establish and maintain woodlots. Rate of deforestation controlled in the project area.		

ANNEX 3: EVALUATION DESIGN MATRIX FOR THE MOZAMBIQUE WATER SUPPLY REHABILITATION PROJECT

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Indicators and Measures	Data Source	Data Collection Method
Relevance and Quality at Entry	Relevance			
	Was the project consistent with the water supply and sanitation sector policies and strategies of the government of Mozambique?	The project focus matched with the stated priorities of Mozambican water and sanitation sector policy and strategy.	Water and sanitation sector policy and strategy 1995.	Document review.
	Was the project consistent with the water supply and sanitation sector policies and strategies of the Bank?	The project focus matched with the Country Strategy Paper for Mozambique.	Bank CSP for Mozambique 1996-1999.	Document review.
	Did the project address the critical needs of the people for water supply sanitation services in the project area?	Percentage of people with access to safe water supply. Percentage of people with access to sanitation facilities. Incidence of water and sanitation related morbidity and mortality. Water supply and sanitation figured in the diagnostic studies as priority. Response from the beneficiaries in the project area.	Project feasibility studies. Bank CSP 1996-1999 analysis of the sector. Direct responses from the beneficiaries.	Document review. Primary survey.
	Quality at Entry			
	Were the objectives of the project realistic and achievable within the time and resources earmarked?	Project objectives were set based on adequate diagnostic / feasibility studies.	Project appraisal report. Project feasibility studies.	Document review.
	Was the project intervention logic coherent and consistent?	Consistency and coherence of the project Logframe and supporting analysis.	Project appraisal report.	Document review.
	Was the quality of stakeholder participation adequate and to what extent were they involved in project	Project appraisal report presented the participatory processes followed during project design, particularly	Project appraisal report.	Document review.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Indicators and Measures	Data Source	Data Collection Method
	design?	women's participation.		
	Were the economic and financial analyses in the project design coherent and realistic?	Economic and financial analyses were based on realistic data and sound assumptions.	Project appraisal report.	Document review.
	Did the project draw lessons from the previous interventions in water supply and sanitation sector?	Statement in the project appraisal report about the use of lessons learnt.	Project appraisal report. Country portfolio reviews.	Document review.
	Were the project conditionalities realistic and facilitative of project implementation?	Number and difficulty level of conditionalities for approval, signature and first disbursement. Time taken by the government to fulfil conditionalities and time overrun if any.	Project appraisal report. Project supervision reports. Aide memoirs.	Document review. Interviews with the executing agencies.
	To what extent were gender issues mainstreamed in the project design?	Project appraisal report presented adequate gender analysis. Project Logframe contained gender indicators for the hierarchy of objectives.	Project appraisal report.	Document review.
	Were the arrangements for procurement and financial management adequate?	Project appraisal report clearly stated the procurement and financial management arrangements. Project had envisaged capacity building of the implementing agency in procurement and financial management, as necessary.	Project appraisal report.	Document review. Interviews with the executing agencies.
	To what extent environmental safeguards were ensured by the project design?	Project was directed by an Environmental and Social Management Plan. Adequacy of environmental mitigation measures.	Project Appraisal Report. Environment and Social Management Plan.	Document review.
	Did the project take into account the key risks and, were the risk mitigation measures adequate?	Risk analysis based on relevant diagnostic data and information.	Project appraisal report.	Document review.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Indicators and Measures	Data Source	Data Collection Method
	To what extent was the monitoring and evaluation system design adequate and results-based?	M&E system was results-focussed and integrated to the project design. M&E system was supported with adequate resources.	Executing agency. Project appraisal report.	Document review.
	To what extent has the monitoring and evaluation system delivered quality data and information to guide the project implementation?	Quality of data and information from the M&E system. Use of M&E information for project implementation.	Project progress reports.	Document review. Interviews with executing agency staff and task manager.
	To what extent has the monitoring and evaluation system ensured accountability and transparency?	Regular production of data and reporting on project's progress.	Supervision reports. Aide memoirs. Project mid-term review report.	Document review. Interviews with executing agency staff and task manager.
Efficacy	Impacts			
	Has the project contributed or is likely to contribute to improvement in the quality of life of the people in the project area?	Sustained improvement in health outcome indicators. Sustained improvement in productivity of the people.	Household responses. Community responses.	Household interviews. Key informant interviews. FDGs.
	Medium-term outcomes			
	Has the project contributed to the realisation of health outcomes of reduction in morbidity and mortality due to water- and sanitation related diseases?	Morbidity rate at baseline and over time. Mortality rate (specifically due to water- and sanitation-related illnesses). Average expenses on disease treatment.	Hospital records (local and referral). Government health statistics. Household responses. Studies by development partners.	Document reviews. Household interviews. FDGs.
	To what extent has the project reduced the drudgery of women, enhanced self-respect and enabled them to use the saved time for productive purposes?	Time spent on collecting water before and after the project. Uses to which the saved time spent after the project. Perceived enhancement of self-	Household responses. Studies by development partners.	Primary survey at household level. FDGs.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Indicators and Measures	Data Source	Data Collection Method
		respect among women.		
	Has the project resulted in any educational outcomes such as improvement in school enrolment of children?	Enrolment rate in school before and after the project for girls and boys. School drop-out rates for girls and boys.	School records. Government education statistics. Household responses.	Document review. Household interviews. FDGs.
	Short-term outcomes			
	To what extent has the project increased availability of and access to drinking water of adequate quality and quantity in the project area?	Number of people accessing drinking water points established by the project. Per capita water availability and consumption. Distance to water source before and after the project. Water quality measures. Quality of water storage at home.	Project records. Household responses.	Document review. Household interviews.
	To what extent has the project increased access to adequate sanitation, hygiene and solid waste disposal facilities in the project area?	Number of households that acquired latrines. Number schools and hospitals provided with latrines. Maintenance and hygienic use of the latrines. Sanitation coverage rate in the project area.	Project records. Government statistics on sanitation. Household responses. Site visits.	Household interviews. Direct observation of facilities.
	To what extent are the project beneficiaries aware of and adopt healthy sanitation and personal hygiene practices?	Percentage of sample households adopting hygienic practices such as hand-washing. Percentage of schoolchildren adopting hygienic practices.	Household responses. Site visits. Response from school teachers.	Interviews of households, schoolchildren, and teachers. Direct observation of facilities.
	Did the project contribute to improvement in the environmental quality of the project area?	Prevalence of open defecation. Drainage in low lying areas. Water logging during rainy season.	Household responses. Community responses. Key informant responses.	Household interviews. FDGs.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Indicators and Measures	Data Source	Data Collection Method
	To what extent has the environmental management capacity of the water and sanitation sector institutions enhanced by the project?	Community level institutions to address water and sanitation issues. Public-private partnerships in water supply and sanitation. Water supply and sanitation sector institutions able to address critical issues.	Household responses. Community responses. Official responses.	Household surveys. FDGs. Key informant interviews. Interview of officials.
	Outputs			
	To what extent has the project achieved the outputs as specified at appraisal or as modified in course of implementation with Bank's agreement?	Quality and quantity of the outputs delivered by the project. Water quality indicators.	Project documents. Site visits. Data from the M&E system. Executing agency. Service providers. Regulatory Authority.	Document review. Site visits. Key informant interviews. Reports on water quality.
Efficiency	Were the project activities implemented within the planned time and financial resources?	Time overrun. Cost overrun.	Project documents. Data from the M&E system. Executing agency.	Document review. Executing agency interview.
	Did the project receive the counterpart funding in time as per the implementation schedule?	Adherence to the financing schedule by the Borrower.	Project documents. Data from the M&E system. Executing agency.	Document review. Executing agency interview.
	Did the project receive timely disbursement of funds from the Bank as per the implementation schedule?	Adherence to the financing schedule by the Bank.	Project documents. Data from the M&E system. Executing agency.	Document review. Executing agency interview.
	To what extent was the project viable in terms of financial and economic internal rates of return?	Recalculated financial rate of return. Recalculated economic rate of return.	Project documents. Primary and secondary data on assumption variables.	Document review. Government statistics. Development partner reports. Household survey.
Institutional	To what extent has the project	Facilitative legislative measures	Government policy	Document review.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Indicators and Measures	Data Source	Data Collection Method
Development Impacts	contributed to improvements in norms and practices that enable the country to make more efficient, equitable, and sustainable use of its human, financial and national resources?	taken by the government.	documents. FIPAG, ADM, CRAA, DNA.	Interviews of service providers.
	To what extent has the project facilitated public-private partnerships and sector management and governance capacity?	Public private partnership. Capacity building of the service providers and regulatory authorities.	FIPAG, ADM, CRAA, DNA.	Interviews of service providers.
Sustainability	Were the project outputs delivered technically sound and capable of yielding sustainable benefits?	Technical quality of water supply systems built. Technical quality of sanitation systems rehabilitated. Technical quality of sanitation facilities constructed. Track record of system functioning.	FIPAG, ADM, CRAA, DNA. Reports from development partners.	Document review. Key informant interviews.
	Has the government shown and likely to show adequate commitment for the functioning of water supply and sanitation system delivered by the project?	Dedicated technical and managerial expertise available with service providers to maintain and operate the water supply system. Adequacy of budgetary provisions for maintenance.	FIPAG, ADM, CRAA, DNA. Key informants. Government budget document. Sector policy/ strategy papers.	Interviews with service providers. Key informant interviews.
	What is the level of community ownership, as reflected in their participation in planning, construction and management of water supply and sanitation facilities?	Quality of community participation. State of maintenance of the sanitation facilities.	Community responses. Project executing agency. Project documents.	FGDs. Key informant interviews. Document review.
	Are the institutional arrangements for building, operating and maintaining the water supply and sanitation infrastructure and regulating the functioning of the system adequate and have a long term vision and strategy?	Financial viability of the model of service provision in water supply and sanitation sector. Public private partnership in operation.	FIPAG, ADM, CRAA, DNA. CSOs.	Document review. Interviews with service provider officials. Key informant interviews.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Indicators and Measures	Data Source	Data Collection Method
	Is the service provider well-equipped with institutional, managerial and technical capacity?	Staffing pattern of ADM. Skills-mix available for operation and maintenance.	FIPAG, ADM, CRAA, DNA.	Document review. Interviews with service provider officials. Key informant interviews.
	Are systems of cost recovery responsive to the affordability and willingness to pay of the users in place and how effective have they been?	Water tariff and its components. Affordability and willingness to pay for water. Affordability and willingness to pay for sanitation facility. Collection rate of water charges. Appropriateness of mode of collection. Revisions made to tariff structure and frequency of revision. Cost-sharing by beneficiaries for sanitation facilities constructed.	ADM, FIPAG & CRAA, tariff structure. DNA policy on cost recovery on sanitation facilities. Household responses. Community responses. CSOs.	Document review. Household interviews. Focus group discussions. Executing agency interviews. CSO interviews.
	To what extent are the project facilities created environmentally sustainable?	Level of environmental pollution from water treatment plants. Arrangements for treatment of effluents. Level of maintenance of sanitation facilities.	ADM, FIPAG, CRAA, DNA. CSOs. Community responses.	Site visit. Document review. FGDs. Key informant interviews.
	To what extent are the functioning of water supply and sanitation system resilient to any likely external or internal shocks?	Government commitment. Viability of the financing model.	Government budget document. ADM, FIPAG, CRAA, DNA.	Document review. Interviews with service providers.
	Are water tariffs affordable to all income groups?	Affordability of water tariff.	FIPAG, ADM, Economic Report	Document Review, Interviews with key informants.
	What is the extent of non-revenue water and what measures are taken to reduce it?	Extent of non-revenue water. Trend in non-revenue water. Extent of formalisation of illegal	ADM, FIPAG, CRAA.	Document Review, Interviews with key informants.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Indicators and Measures	Data Source	Data Collection Method
		connections.		
	Are the beneficiaries willing to pay more in future for the services (supposing that the tariff is already high due to the high un-accounted for water)?	Willingness to pay.	FIPAG, ADM, Household responses	Interviews with key informant.
	Is ADM financially viable?	Financial viability of ADM.	FIPAG, ADM	Document review. Interviews with key informants.
	Are the sanitation facilities used appropriately and hygienically and what are the shortcomings, if any?	Level of cleanliness. Arrangements made to maintain cleanliness and hygiene. Proper use of facilities by girls, boys, teachers.	Site visits.	Observations, Interviews with key informants
Borrower Performance	How effectively did the government/ executing agency perform at different stages of the project cycle from identification and preparation through implementation?	Borrower contribution to project preparation. Project implementation as per the implementation plan. Well-staffed project executing agency. Government commitment to and ownership of the project.	Project progress reports. Supervision aide memoires.	Document review. Discussion with executing agencies. Discussion with Bank task manager.
	To what extent had the government complied with fiduciary requirements and various covenants agreed upon?	Compliance with procurement principles. Transparency in financial management. Compliance with covenants.	Project progress reports. Supervision aide memoires.	Document review. Discussion with executing agencies. Discussion with Bank task manager.
	Were the M&E system and reporting adequate and regular?	Regular and realistic project progress reporting. Quality of monitoring data/ information.	Project progress reports. Supervision aide memoires.	Document review. Discussion with executing agencies. Discussion with Bank task manager.
	To what extent did the Bank contribute to ensure quality-at-entry of the project?	Multi-disciplinary skills-mix of the project preparation and appraisal	Project preparation and appraisal	Document review. Discussion with

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Indicators and Measures	Data Source	Data Collection Method
		team. Quality of donor coordination.	documents. BTORs and Aide Memoires.	Bank task manager. Discussion with executing agencies.
Bank Performance	To what extent did the executing agency find that the Bank was responsive to solving the implementation problems?	Timeliness and adequacy of Bank response to implementation issues.	Project progress reports. Supervision aide memoires. Project executing agencies.	Document review. Discussion with Bank task manager. Discussion with executing agencies.
	To what extent was the Bank's timely fiduciary (procurement and financial management) inputs assist project implementation?	Delay in issuance of no-objection clearance and causes. Delay in disbursement and causes.	Project documents. Executing agencies. Project task manager.	Document review. Interviews with project executing agencies and the task manager.
	To what extent has the Bank met the required supervision targets with adequate skills-mix?	Supervision frequency. Skill-mix of supervision team. Realism of supervision ratings.	Supervision reports.	Document review.
	To what extent has the Bank contributed to address sustainability issues?	Bank's continued interest in assistance to the sector. Follow up project or non-project assistance.	Country portfolio reviews. Country Strategy Papers.	Document review. Interviews with project executing agencies and the task manager.

ANNEX 4: EVALUATION DESIGN MATRIX FOR THE ZAMBIA CENTRAL PROVINCE WATER SUPPLY AND SANITATION PROJECT

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Indicators and Measures	Data Source	Data Collection Method
Relevance and Quality at Entry	Relevance:			
	Was the project consistent with the water supply and sanitation sector policies and strategies of the government of Zambia?	The project focus matched with the stated priorities of Zambian water and sanitation sector policy and strategy.	Water and sanitation sector policy and strategy.	Document review

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Indicators and Measures	Data Source	Data Collection Method
	Was the project consistent with the water supply and sanitation sector policies and strategies of the Bank?	The project focus matched with the Country Strategy Paper for Zambia.	Bank CSP for Zambia 1999-2001.	Document review
	Did the project address the critical needs of the people with respect to water supply sanitation in the project area?	Percentage of people with access to safe water supply. Percentage of people with access to sanitation facilities. Incidence of water and sanitation related morbidity and mortality. Water supply and sanitation figures in the diagnostic studies as priority. Response from the beneficiaries in the project area.	Project feasibility studies. Bank CSP 1999-2001 analysis of the sector. Direct response from the beneficiaries.	Document review. Primary survey.
	Quality at Entry:			
	Were the objectives of the project realistic and achievable within the time and resources earmarked?	Project objectives were set based on adequate diagnostic / feasibility studies.	Project appraisal report. Project feasibility studies.	Document review.
	Was the project intervention logic coherent and consistent?	Consistency and coherence of the project Logframe and supporting analysis.	Project appraisal report.	Document review.
	Was the quality of stakeholder participation adequate and to what extent were they involved in project design?	Project appraisal report presented the participatory processes followed during project design (particularly women's participation).	Project appraisal report.	Document review.
	Were the economic and financial analyses in the project design coherent and realistic?	Economic and financial analyses were based on realistic data and sound assumptions.	Project appraisal report.	Document review.
	Did the project draw lessons from the previous interventions in water supply and sanitation sector?	Statement in the project appraisal report about the use of lessons learnt.	Project appraisal report. Country portfolio reviews.	Document review.
	Were the project conditionalities realistic and facilitative of project	Number and difficulty level of conditionalities for approval,	Project appraisal report. Project supervision	Document review. Interviews with

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Indicators and Measures	Data Source	Data Collection Method
	implementation?	signature and first disbursement. Time taken by the government to fulfil conditionalities and time overrun if any.	reports.	the executing agencies.
	To what extent were gender issues mainstreamed in the project design?	Project appraisal report presented adequate gender analysis. Project Logframe contained gender indicators.	Project appraisal report.	Document review.
	Were the arrangements for procurement and financial management adequate?	Project appraisal report clearly stated the procurement and financial management arrangements. Project has envisaged capacity building of the implementing agency in procurement and financial management, as necessary.	Project appraisal report.	Document review.
	To what extent environmental safeguards were ensured by the project design?	Project was directed by an Environmental and Social Management Plan. Adequacy of environmental mitigation measures.	Environmental and Social Management Plan. Project Appraisal Report.	Document review.
	Did the project take into account the key risks and, were the risk mitigation measures adequate?	Risk analysis based on relevant diagnostic information.	Project appraisal report.	Document review.
	To what extent was the M&E system design adequate and results-based?	M&E system was results-focussed and integrated to the project design. M&E system was supported with adequate resources.	Executing agency. Project appraisal report.	Document review.
	To what extent has the M&E system delivered quality data and information to guide project implementation?	Quality of data and information from the M&E system. Use of M&E information for project implementation.	Project progress reports.	Document review. Interviews with executing agency staff and task

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Indicators and Measures	Data Source	Data Collection Method
				manager.
	To what extent has the M&E system ensured accountability and transparency?	Regular production of data and reporting on project's progress.	Supervision reports. Aide memoirs. Project mid-term review report.	Document review. Interviews with executing agency staff and task manager.
Efficacy	Impacts			
	Has the project contributed or likely to contribute to improvement in the quality of life of the people in the project area?	Sustained improvement in health outcome indicators. Sustained improvement in productivity of the people.	Household responses. Community responses.	Household interviews. Key informant interviews. FDGs.
	Has the project contributed or likely to contribute to the improvement in environmental sustainability in the project area?	Area of woodlots established by households. Reduction in deforestation due to charcoal making. Reduction in deforestation due to cutting for wood fuel.	Household responses. Community responses.	Household interviews. Key informant interviews. FDGs.
	Medium-term outcomes			
	Has the project contributed to realisation of health outcomes of reduction in morbidity and mortality due to water- and sanitation-related diseases, and HIV/AIDS?	Morbidity rate at baseline and over time. Mortality rate (specifically due to water- and sanitation-related illnesses). Incidence of HIV/AIDS. Average expenses on disease treatment.	Hospital records. Government health statistics. Household responses. Studies by development partners.	Document reviews. Household interviews. FDGs.
	To what extent has the project reduced the drudgery of women, enhanced self-respect and enabled them to use the saved time for productive purposes?	Time spent on collecting water before and after the project. Uses to which the saved time spent after the project. Perceived enhancement of self-respect among women.	Household responses. Studies by development partners.	Primary survey at household level. FDGs.
	Has the project resulted in any	Enrolment rate in school before	School records.	Document review.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Indicators and Measures	Data Source	Data Collection Method
	educational outcomes such as improvement in school enrolment of children?	and after the project for girls and boys. School drop-out rates for girls and boys.	Government education statistics. Household responses.	Household interviews. FDGs.
	Short-term outcomes			
	To what extent have the households in the project area able to meet their wood-fuel needs from the woodlots raised?	Number of trees planted by households. Maturity period of trees.	Household responses. Key informants.	Household survey. Key informant interviews.
	To what extent has the project increased availability of and access to drinking water of adequate quality and quantity in the project area?	Number of people accessing drinking water points established by the project. Per capita water availability and consumption. Distance to water source before and after the project. Water quality measures. Quality of water storage at home.	Project records. Household responses.	Document review. Household interviews.
	To what extent has the project increased access to adequate sanitation, hygiene and solid waste disposal facilities in the project area?	Number of households that acquired latrines. Number schools and hospitals provided with latrines. Maintenance and hygienic use of the latrines. Sanitation coverage rate in the project area.	Project records. Government statistics on sanitation. Household responses. Site visits.	Household interviews. Direct observation of facilities.
	To what extent are the project beneficiaries aware of and adopt healthy sanitation and personal hygiene practices?	Percentage of sample households adopting hygienic practices such as hand-washing. Percentage of schoolchildren adopting hygienic practices.	Household responses. Site visits. Response from school teachers.	Interviews of households, schoolchildren, and teachers. Direct observation of facilities.
	Did the project contribute to improvement in the environmental quality of the project area in terms of	Prevalence of open defecation. Reduction in deforestation for charcoal making.	Household responses. Community responses. Key informant	Household interviews. FDGs.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Indicators and Measures	Data Source	Data Collection Method
	decrease in the rate of deforestation?	Reduction in deforestation for wood fuel.	responses.	
	To what extent has the environmental management capacity of the water and sanitation sector institutions enhanced by the project?	Community level institutions to address water and sanitation issues. Public-private partnerships in water supply and sanitation. Water supply and sanitation sector institutions able to address critical issues.	Household responses. Community responses. Official responses.	Household surveys. FDGs. Key informant interviews. Interview of officials.
	Outputs			
	To what extent has the project achieved the outputs as specified at appraisal or as modified in course of implementation with Bank's agreement?	Quality and quantity of the outputs delivered by the project. Water quality indicators.	Project documents. Site visits. Data from the M&E system. Executing agency.	Document review. Site visits. Key informant interviews. Reports on water quality.
Efficiency	Were the project activities implemented within the planned time and financial targets?	Time overrun. Cost overrun.	Project documents. Data from the M&E system. Executing agency.	Document review. Executing agency interview.
	Did the project receive the counterpart funding in time as per the implementation schedule?	Adherence to the financing schedule.	Project documents. Data from the M&E system. Executing agency.	Document review. Executing agency interview.
	Did the project receive timely disbursement of funds from the Bank as per the implementation schedule?	Adherence to the financing schedule by the Bank.	Project documents. Data from the M&E system. Executing agency.	Document review. Executing agency interview.
	To what extent was the project viable in terms of financial and economic internal rates of return?	Recalculated financial rate of return. Recalculated economic rate of return.	Project documents. Primary and secondary data on assumption variables.	Document review. Government statistics. Development partner reports.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Indicators and Measures	Data Source	Data Collection Method
				Household survey.
Institutional Development Impacts	To what extent has the project contributed to improvements in norms and practices that enable the country to make more efficient, equitable, and sustainable use of its human, financial and national resources?	Facilitative legislative measures taken by the government.	Government policy documents. MLGH, D-WASHEs.	Document review. Interviews of officials.
	To what extent has the project facilitated public-private partnerships and sector management and governance capacity?	Public private partnership. Capacity building of the ministry.	MLGH, D-WASHEs.	Interviews with officials.
Sustainability	Were the project outputs delivered technically sound and capable of yielding sustainable benefits?	Technical quality of water supply systems built. Technical quality of water supply systems rehabilitated. Technical quality of sanitation facilities constructed. Track record of system functioning.	MLGH, D-WASHEs. Reports from development partners.	Document review. Key informant interviews. Interviews with officials.
	Has the government shown and likely to show adequate commitment for the functioning of water supply and sanitation system delivered by the project?	Dedicated technical and managerial expertise available with service providers to maintain and operate the water supply system. Adequacy of budgetary provisions for maintenance.	MLGH, D-WASHEs. Key informants. Government budget document. Sector policy/ strategy papers.	Interviews with service providers. Key informants.
	What is the level of community ownership, as reflected in their participation in planning, construction and management of water supply and sanitation facilities?	Quality of community participation. Quality of women's participation.	Community responses. Project executing agency. Project documents.	FGDs. Key informants. Document review.
	Are the institutional arrangements for building, operating and maintaining the water supply and sanitation infrastructure and regulating the functioning of the	Functionality and financial viability of the model of service provision in water supply and sanitation sector.	MLGH, D-WASHEs. CSOs.	Document review. Interviews with service provider officials.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Indicators and Measures	Data Source	Data Collection Method
	system adequate and have a long term vision and strategy?	Public private partnership in operation.		Key informant interviews.
	Are systems of cost recovery responsive to the affordability and willingness to pay of the users in place and how effective have they been?	Community / individual contribution for facility maintenance. Affordability. Willingness to pay.	MLGH, D-WASHEs. CSOs. Household responses. Community responses.	Document review. Household interviews. Focus group discussions. CSO interviews.
	To what extent are the project facilities created environmentally sustainable?	Water point design takes care of disposal of waste water. Water point premises are maintained hygienically.	MLGH, D-WASHEs. CSOs. Community responses.	Site visit. Document review. FGDs. Key informant interviews.
	To what extent is the functioning of water supply and sanitation systems resilient to any likely external or internal shocks?	Government commitment. Viability of the financing model.	Government budget document. MLGH, D-WASHEs. CSOs.	Document review. Interviews with service providers.
	To what extent has the demand led approach to rural water supply and sanitation worked?	Beneficiaries' contribution to the construction, operation and maintenance of the facilities.	MLGH, D-WASHEs, Development Partners (DPs), CSOs	Site visits, Interviews with different stakeholders.
	Are the facilities maintained to make it operational for the life of the project?	Availability of spare parts and local skills for O&M. Timely response from the community for O&M.	MLGH, DPs, CSOs, Site visits,	Site visit, Interviews with Beneficiaries,
	To what extent the water supply and sanitation schemes implemented under D-WASHE and V-WASHE supervision and what are the visible differences?	Percentage of schemes constructed by D-WASHE, V-WASHE and by other arrangements. Difference in quality.	MLGH, D-WASHEs, DPs, CSOs	Site visits. Interviews with stakeholders.
	Are the D-WASHE and V-WASHE committees take follow up actions for maintenance of completed schemes?	D-WASHE and V-WASHE take up maintenance.	MLGH, D-WASHE, V-WASHE.	Document review, Interviews with concerned parties
	Are the selected water sources reliable	Year-round availability of water.	MLGH, V-WASHE.	Site visits,

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Indicators and Measures	Data Source	Data Collection Method
	and of good quality?	Water quality meets accepted standards.	Water quality reports.	Interviews with beneficiaries. Interviews with water quality experts.
	To what extent was the training of artisans, operators and WASHE Committee members effective?	Number of persons trained. Number of women trained. The trained persons are available for repairs and maintenance.	MLGH, WASHE Committees	Interviews with WASHE committees. Key informant interviews.
	What is the level of appropriate and hygienic utilisation of the household latrines and what are the shortcomings, if any?	Extent of use. Level of cleanliness. Toilets maintained well.	Site Visits. Beneficiaries.	Site visits. Household interviews.
Borrower Performance	How effectively has the government/ executing agency performed at different stages of the project cycle from identification and preparation through implementation?	Borrower contribution to project preparation. Project implementation as per the implementation plan. Well-staffed project executing agency. Government commitment to and ownership of the project.	Project progress reports. Supervision aide memoires.	Document review. Discussion with executing agency. Discussion with Bank task manager.
	To what extent had the government complied with fiduciary requirements and various covenants agreed upon?	Compliance with procurement principles. Transparency in financial management. Compliance with covenants.	Project progress reports. Supervision aide memoires.	Document review. Discussion with executing agency. Discussion with Bank task manager.
	Was the M&E system adequate and reporting regular?	Regular and realistic project progress reporting. Quality of monitoring data/ information.	Project progress reports. Supervision aide memoires.	Document review. Discussion with executing agency. Discussion with Bank task manager.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions	Indicators and Measures	Data Source	Data Collection Method
Bank Performance	To what extent did the Bank contribute to ensure quality-at-entry of the project?	Multi-disciplinary skills-mix of the project preparation and appraisal team. Quality of donor coordination.	Project preparation and appraisal documents. BTORs and Aide Memoires.	Document review. Discussion with Bank task manager. Discussion with executing agency.
	To what extent did the executing agency find that the Bank was responsive to solving the implementation problems?	Timeliness and adequacy of Bank response to implementation issues.	Project progress reports. Supervision aide memoires. Project executing agency.	Document review. Discussion with Bank task manager. Discussion with executing agency.
	To what extent was the Bank's timely fiduciary (procurement and financial management) inputs assist project implementation?	Delay in issuance of no-objection clearance for procurement and causes. Delay in disbursement and causes.	Project documents. Executing agency. Project task manager.	Document review. Interviews with project executing agency and the task manager.
	To what extent has the Bank met required supervision targets with adequate skills-mix?	Supervision frequency. Skill-mix of supervision team. Realism of supervision ratings.	Supervision reports.	Document review.
	To what extent has the Bank paid attention to sustainability issues?	Bank's continued interest in assistance to the sector. Follow up project or non-project assistance.	Country portfolio reviews. Country Strategy Papers.	Document review. Interviews with project executing agency and the task manager.

ANNEX 5: TOR FOR NATIONAL CONSULTANT (MOZAMBIQUE)
PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT FOR THE MOZAMBIQUE:
MAPUTO WATER SUPPLY REHABILITATION PROJECT

Introduction

The Operations Evaluation Department (OPEV) of the African Development Bank requires the service of a consultant socio-economist to be recruited locally to contribute to the preparation of the Project Performance Evaluation Report (PPER) for the Maputo Water Supply Rehabilitation project in Mozambique.

Brief Description of the Project

The Maputo Water Supply Rehabilitation project was designed in a context where large majority of the country's population had no access to safe drinking water or improved sanitation services. The situation was worse in rural areas where it was estimated that 68% of the population had not benefited from adequate water supply and 77% had no access to improved sanitation. The rapid population growth in urban areas during the 1980s created major pressures on the water supply infrastructure which required urgent rehabilitation and capacity expansion.

In 1995 the Government of Mozambique adopted the National Water Policy which provided a framework for the development of the sector based on non-intervention of the state, participation of the beneficiaries, adoption of models of autonomous management in which management was delegated to private operators, integrated water resource management, and economic pricing of water. This was followed by the National Water Development Programme in 1997 covering institution building, privatisation of urban water supplies, rural water supply and sanitation, water resource management and human resource development. Maputo was one of the five towns covered under the phase-1 of the programme. In September 1997, the government requested the Bank to finance components of Maputo Water Supply. The Maputo Water Rehabilitation project was approved by the Bank in June 1999 with a loan amount of UA 17.50 million and a Technical Assistance Fund grant of UA 2.16 million. The total approved assistance amounted to UA 19.66 million (US\$ 30.87 million at the current exchange rate).

The Government's national sector goal was to ensure provision of adequate quantity and quality of water and adequate sanitation services to the whole population of Mozambique. The target for Maputo in the medium term was to achieve coverage of 80% of the population by year 2002. The specific objective of the project was to rehabilitate and augment the water supply system in Maputo and to enable water to be delivered to the un-serviced areas of Hulene, Laulane and Mahotas peri-urban areas of Maputo and improve sanitation and hygiene behaviour in these quarters.

The project was expected to increase water supply to the town to the tune of 144,000 m³/day by 2002 to improve water supply in Hulene, Laulane and Mahotas and to improve sanitation and

number of sanitary facilities for 50% of the population in these areas. The project components during actual implementation included the following: a) Rehabilitation of the Old Umbeluzi Treatment Plant; b) Rehabilitation of Chamanculo-Maxaquene Trunk Main; c) Additional Storage at Maxaquene; d) Construction of Chamanculo-Laulane Trunk Main; e) Construction of the Laulane Distribution Centre; f) Distribution and Reticulation Network Extension; g) Study on community profile in the four quarters of Laulane, Mahotas and Hulene A and B for sanitation component including construction of communal latrines; and h) Construction of a drainage channel from Laulane to Costa do Sol.

The project was implemented by two agencies in the Government of Mozambique. The Water Supply components were implemented by Fundo de Investimento e Patrimonio do Abastecimento de Agua (FIPAG) which is a parastatal organisation, and the Health Education, and Sanitation / Solid Waste Disposal component was implemented by National Directorate of Water (DNA) which is a department under the Ministry of Public Works and Housing (MOPH). The project was completed in December 2008 and a Project Completion Report was prepared by the Bank in December 2009.

Evaluation Objectives and Purpose of Local Consultancy

The PPER aims to a) assess the results of the Maputo Water Supply Rehabilitation project and their sustainability; b) assess the performance of the Bank and the Borrower in delivering the project; c) identify the key determinants of performance and the problems faced at different stages of the project cycle; and d) draw the main lessons and provide practical recommendations for the benefit of future operations of the Bank.

The evaluation criteria of relevance and quality-at-entry, efficacy, efficiency, institutional development impact, sustainability and the performance of the Bank and the Borrower will be applied for the preparation of the PPER.

The local consultancy is required to contribute to the evaluation by assessing the socio-economic and environmental impacts of the project. The areas of focus will include:

- a) Participation of the community and the beneficiaries in planning, construction and management of the water supply and sanitation facilities and the level of ownership;
- b) Extent and quality of women's participation in planning and management of the facilities;
- c) Behavioural change among the users on health and hygienic practices as a result of the project interventions;
- d) Effects of the project on the health indicators including incidence of water and sanitation related and other infectious diseases and mortality;
- e) Effects of the project on women and children including reduction in women's drudgery, use of the time spent otherwise on collecting water, self-respect and improvement in educational achievements;

- f) Effect of the project on quality of environment due to proper management of the facilities, and hygienic practices, and adverse impact, if any, on environment due to inadequate maintenance of the facilities; and
- g) Direct or indirect impacts of the project on livelihoods, food security and asset status of the beneficiary population.

Description of Duties and Deliverables

The consultant will assess the socioeconomic and environmental impacts of the project on the population by collecting and analysing the relevant data from secondary sources and by conducting a mini-survey among the beneficiaries as well as the comparison groups. Under the supervision of the evaluation task manager, the consultant will carry out the following tasks:

- a) Prepare the strategy and tools for data collection, e.g. interview guide, questionnaires etc.
- b) Develop a methodology for collecting and analysing data on the socioeconomic and environmental impacts of the project as well as identifying sources of such data.
- c) Collect data from the secondary sources including the local governance structures for water supply and sanitation and environmental safeguards.
- d) Organise and supervise a mini-survey of beneficiaries and comparison groups to collect data on socioeconomic impacts. The consultant will design data collection tools, decide a suitable representative sample for beneficiaries as well as comparison groups, carry out the survey and analyse the data collected.
- e) Participate as a member of the evaluation team in field mission and feedback sessions with the stakeholders.
- f) Prepare a draft and final report on the socioeconomic and environmental impacts of the project.
- g) The following are the deliverables:
- h) An inception report clearly stating the strategy for data collection and the tools for collecting data and information on the effects and impacts of the project.
- i) Draft and final report on the results, socioeconomic and environmental impacts of the project, along with the data sets collected from the field.

Duration of the Assignment

The estimated level of effort for this assignment is 44 working days (60 calendar days) spread over a period of four (4) months as detailed in the following table.

Tasks	Number of Days
a) Review project documents and develop the methodological approach and data collection tools and strategy	7
b) Collection of data – primary and secondary	14
c) Prepare of the draft report on the socio-economic and environmental impact of the project	7
d) Participate in the evaluation mission	10
e) Finalize the report on the socio-economic and environmental	4

Tasks	Number of Days
impact of the project	
f) Contribute to the finalization of the PPER	2
TOTAL	44

The expected date of commencement of the assignment is 15 August 2011.

Work Schedule

The indicative work schedule for the assignment is as follows:

Tasks	Dates
a) Commencement of work	18 Aug 2011
b) Submit draft Inception Report containing literature review, methodological approach and data collection tools and strategy	29 Aug 2011
c) Submit final Inception Report incorporating comments from OPEV	5 Sept 2011
d) Begin the mini-survey	6 Sept 2011
e) Join the Evaluation Field Mission	19 – 30 Sept 2011
f) Submit of Draft Report on Socioeconomic and Environmental Impacts	14 Oct 2011
g) Submit Final Draft Report incorporating comments from OPEV	26 Oct 2011
h) Provide inputs and comments for Draft Mozambique PPER	11 Nov 2011

Consultant Profile

- a) The consultant should hold a master's degree in social sciences or development related disciplines and have specific experience in data collection and analysis of socioeconomic and environmental impacts of water supply and sanitation projects.
- b) The consultant should have knowledge of and sensitivity to gender and environmental issues.
- c) The consultant is expected to have proven skills and experience in the following areas:
 - Methodology and practice of project evaluation;
 - Policies and operations of multilateral development Banks;
 - Development aid in Africa;
 - Excellent verbal and written communication skills in English;
 - Good knowledge of the local language in Mozambique particularly in Maputo; and
 - Computer skills: for documentation, data analysis and presentations.

ANNEX 6: TOR FOR NATIONAL CONSULTANT (ZAMBIA)
PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT FOR THE ZAMBIA: CENTRAL PROVINCE RURAL WATER SUPPLY AND SANITATION PROJECT

Introduction

The Operations Evaluation Department (OPEV) of the African Development Bank requires the service of a consultant socio-economist to be recruited nationally to contribute to the preparation of the Project Performance Evaluation Report (PPER) for the Central Province Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project in Zambia.

Brief Description of the Project

The project was designed in a context where large segments of the country's population had no access to safe drinking water and improved sanitation services. The situation was worse in rural areas where it was estimated that 67% of the population had not benefited from adequate water supply and 70% had no access to improved sanitation. It was also estimated that about 80% of the preventable diseases in Zambia were related to inadequate water supply and poor environmental sanitation particularly in the rural areas. This was manifested in increased outbreaks of diarrhoea and cholera in the 1990s.

Government of Zambia began reforms in the water sector in the early 1990s and adopted its first National Water Policy in 1994 which stipulated that water supply and sanitation should be community-based, with the communities taking up full responsibility for service provision in this sector ensuring sustainability, and the government playing the role of a facilitator. This was not least because the government simply did not have adequate funds to finance provision of these services. It followed the strategy of providing an enabling environment and empowering the rural communities to identify and meet their needs for water supply and sanitation through Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Education (WASHE) concept and approached the Bank to provide assistance under this framework for the rural areas of the Central Province. The Central Province Water Supply and Sanitation Project was approved by the Bank in 2000 with a total amount of UA 12.41 million (US\$ 20.12 million at the current exchange rate).

The Government of Zambia's national goal for the sector was to improve the quality of life and productivity of all people, by ensuring provision of an adequate quantity and quality of water to all user groups and improved sanitation services for all, at acceptable cost and on a sustainable basis. The project aimed to provide the rural communities of five districts of the Central Province of Zambia (viz. Chibombo, Mkushi, Kapiri-Mposhi, Mumbwa and Serenje), access to adequate and sustainable water supply, improved sanitation and personal and household hygiene, control and prevent malaria and control rate of deforestation in the project area.

The main project components were: a) Water supply development; b) Sanitation support; c) Health education and support; d) Catchment area protection; e) Community mobilisation and training; and f) Institutional support.

The project was implemented by the Ministry of Local Government and Housing, Government of the Republic of Zambia. The project was completed in June 2007 and a Project Completion Report was prepared by the Bank in December 2008.

Evaluation Objectives and Purpose of National Consultancy

The PPER aims to a) assess the results of the Zambia Central Province Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project and their sustainability; b) assess the performance of the Bank and the Borrower in delivering the project; c) identify the key determinants of performance and the problems faced at different stages of the project cycle; and d) draw the main lessons and provide practical recommendations for the benefit of future operations of the Bank.

The evaluation criteria of relevance and quality-at-entry, efficacy, efficiency, institutional development impact, sustainability and the performance of the Bank and the Borrower will be used for the preparation of the PPER.

The national consultancy is required to contribute to the evaluation by assessing the socio-economic and environmental impacts of the project. The areas of focus will include:

- a) Participation of the community and the beneficiaries in planning, construction and management of the water supply and sanitation facilities and the level of ownership;
- b) Extent and quality of women's participation in planning and management of the facilities;
- c) Behavioural change among the users on health and hygienic practices as a result of the project interventions;
- d) Effects of the project on the health indicators including incidence of water and sanitation related and other infectious diseases and mortality;
- e) Effects of the project on women and children including reduction in women's drudgery, use of the time spent otherwise on collecting water, self-respect and improvement in educational achievements;
- f) Effect of the project on quality of environment due to proper management of the facilities, hygienic practices, and tree planting, and adverse impact, if any, on environment due to inadequate maintenance of the facilities; and
- g) Direct or indirect impacts of the project on livelihoods, food security and asset status of the beneficiary population.

Description of Duties and Deliverables

The consultant will assess the socioeconomic and environmental impacts of the project on the population by collecting and analysing the relevant data from secondary sources and by conducting a mini-survey among the beneficiaries and comparison groups. Under the supervision of the evaluation task manager, the consultant will carry out the following tasks:

- a) Prepare the strategy and tools for data collection, e.g. interview guide, questionnaires etc.
- b) Develop a methodology for collecting and analysing data on the socioeconomic and environmental impacts of the project as well as identifying sources of such data.
- c) Collect data from the secondary sources including the local governance structures for water supply and sanitation.
- d) Organise and supervise a mini-survey of beneficiaries and comparison groups to collect data on socioeconomic impacts. The consultant will design data collection tools, decide a suitable representative sample in the Central Province, and a comparison group, carry out the survey and analyse the data collected.
- e) Participate as a member of the evaluation team in field mission and feedback sessions with the stakeholders.
- f) Prepare a draft and final report on the socioeconomic and environmental impacts of the project.
- g) The following are the deliverables:
- h) An inception report clearly stating the tools for collecting data and information on the effects and impacts of the project.
- i) Draft and final report on the results, socioeconomic and environmental impacts of the project, along with the data sets collected from the field.

Duration of the Assignment

The estimated level of effort for this assignment is 44 working days (60 calendar days) spread over a period of four (4) months as detailed in the following table.

Tasks	Number of Days
a) Review project documents and develop the methodological approach and data collection tools	7
b) Collection of data – primary and secondary	14
c) Prepare of the draft report on the socio-economic and environmental impact of the project	7
d) Participate in the evaluation mission	10
e) Finalize the report on the socio-economic and environmental impact of the project	4
f) Contribute to the finalization of the PPER	2
TOTAL	44

Expected date of commencement of the assignment is 26 August 2011.

Work Schedule

The indicative work schedule for the assignment is as follows:

Tasks	Dates
a) Commencement of work	26 Aug 2011
b) Submit draft Inception Report containing literature review, methodological approach and data collection tools and strategy	05 Sept 2011
c) Join the exploratory mission	5-9 Sept 2011
d) Submit final Inception Report incorporating comments from OPEV	12 Sept 2011
e) Begin the mini-survey	13 Sept 2011
f) Join Field Mission	22 Sept – 3 Oct 2011
g) Join the Evaluation Field Mission	03–14 Oct 2011
h) Submit of Draft Report on Socioeconomic and Environ. Impacts	21 Oct 2011
i) Submit Final Draft Report incorporating comments from OPEV	02 Nov 2011
j) Provide inputs and comments for Draft Zambia PPER	14 Nov 2011
k) Participate in Dissemination Seminar (tentative date)	19 Jan 2012

Consultant Profile

- a) The consultant should hold a master’s degree in social sciences or development related disciplines and have specific experience in data collection and analysis of socioeconomic and environmental impacts of water supply and sanitation projects.
- b) The consultant should have knowledge of and sensitivity to gender and environmental issues.
- c) The consultant is expected to have proven skills and experience in the following areas:
 - Methodology and practice of project evaluation;
 - Policies and operations of multilateral development Banks;
 - Development aid in Africa;
 - Excellent verbal and written communication skills in English;
 - Good knowledge of the local language in Zambia particularly in the Central Province; and
 - Computer skills: for documentation, data analysis and presentations.

ANNEX 7: TOR FOR INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT
PROJECT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORTS FOR TWO WATER SUPPLY
AND SANITATION PROJECTS (MOZAMBIQUE AND ZAMBIA)

1. INTRODUCTION

The Operations Evaluation Department (OPEV) of the African Development Bank requires the services of an individual consultant familiar with the evaluation system of Multilateral Development Banks to prepare, two Project Performance Evaluation Reports (PPERs) in the water supply and sanitation sector. The two projects are: a) the Mozambique: Maputo Water Supply Rehabilitation Project; and b) the Zambia: Central Province Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project. This TOR presents: (i) the context and purpose of the assessment, (ii) description of the assignment and deliverables, (iii) Evaluation approach and methodology; iv) Consultant profile; and (iv) Timeline.

2. CONTEXT AND PURPOSE OF THE ASSIGNMENT

2.1 The evaluation function at the African Development Bank Group includes both self-evaluation and independent evaluation systems. Self-evaluation is undertaken by the Bank's operations complexes and includes reviews at project, sector and country levels. The Operations Evaluation Department (OPEV) of the Bank undertakes independent evaluations of the Bank's operations, policies and procedures. This ensures accountability and encourages learning, which ultimately promotes development effectiveness of the Bank's operations.

2.2 At completion of the financed project or programme, the Operations Departments of the Bank prepare Project Completion Report (PCR) which assesses the achievements of the project in terms of its outputs and outcomes as well as the Bank and borrower implementation performances. PCRs provide the foundation for independent evaluation studies undertaken, intended to strengthen the Bank's development effectiveness by drawing relevant lessons from operations. Completed PCRs are subject to an independent review and validation by OPEV.

2.3 OPEV undertakes for a purposive sample of reviewed completed projects an independent evaluation of the overall project or programme outcomes and results achieved on the basis of a set of evaluation criteria viz., relevance of the development operation, efficacy (achievement of development objectives), efficiency, institutional development impact and sustainability.¹ The PPER provides an objective and analytical statement on the project performance focusing on issues that merit closer attention. Its preparation begins usually after a decision is taken on the selection of the project for performance evaluation, country or sector reviews, thematic or special evaluation studies.

¹ The evaluation criteria are harmonised with the OECD-DAC criteria and the MDB Evaluation Cooperation Group good practice standards for public sector operations evaluation.

2.4 The purpose of the assignment is to provide an independent evaluation of the two selected projects in the water supply and sanitation sector, viz. a) the Mozambique: Maputo Water Supply Rehabilitation Project (approval: 1999; completion: 2008); and the Zambia: Central Province Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project (approval: 2000; completion: 2007), based on OPEV Revised Evaluation Guidelines for project evaluation.² A brief description of the two projects is placed in Appendix 1 of the TOR.

2.5 The consultant will prepare two PPERs which will include the evaluation findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations. The two PPERs will contribute to a synthesis report on evaluation findings from the cohort of WSS sector PPERs prepared in 2011 and to the water sector review currently underway in OPEV.

3. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 **Evaluation Objectives.** The PPER aims to: a) assess the results of the Zambia – Central Province Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project and the Mozambique – Maputo Water Supply Rehabilitation Project and their sustainability; b) assess the performance of the Bank and the Borrower in delivering the project; c) identify the key determinants of performance and the problems faced at different stages of the project cycle; and d) draw the main lessons and provide practical recommendations for the benefit of future operations of the Bank.

3.2 **Evaluation Criteria and Focus.** The evaluation criteria of relevance and quality-at-entry, efficacy, efficiency, institutional development impact, sustainability and the performance of the Bank and the Borrower will be used for the preparation of the PPER. The evaluation will focus on outcomes and impacts of the project. The analysis and findings from the socioeconomic and environmental impact study being carried out as part of this evaluation by national consultants will be substantial input for the evaluation. The evaluation team will consider the problems of attribution/contribution and guide the analysis accordingly.

3.3 **Data Collection Methods.** The evaluation will be based on evidence collected from different sources including the project related documents and various stakeholders of the project such as the beneficiaries, implementing agency, service providers and the Bank management. Literature review, key informant interviews, direct observation and mini-surveys could be used to collect data and information. Information collected should be triangulated to ensure the rigour of analysis, inferences and conclusions.

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSIGNMENT AND DELIVERABLES

a) Description of the main tasks

4.1 **Finalisation of the Approach Paper.** The approach paper will be based on the available documentation on the projects to be evaluated. It will specify the evaluation rationale, purpose and objectives; the key evaluation questions and areas of focus; detailed methodological

² African Development Bank- ADB/BD/IF/2001/94-ADF/BD/IF/2001/85 of May 2001

approach specifying the evaluation criteria, design, sampling, data collection and analysis; deliverables; resource requirements and timeline; communication and dissemination strategy and management of the evaluation including quality assurance. A draft approach paper is being prepared for review and finalisation by the consultant at the outset of the evaluation. As part of this, the consultant will review and finalise the methodological approach with particular focus on: (i) finalising the evaluation methodology; (ii) reviewing the sample for mini surveys for the assessment of socioeconomic and environmental impacts (to be undertaken by the national consultant); (iii) fine-tuning the tools for gathering information; and (iv) finalising the results framework and evaluation matrix.

4.2 Preparation of PPER. Project performance is assessed based on the evaluation criteria as described in Appendix 2 of the TOR. The consultant will review and comment on all data/information collected and reports prepared by the national consultants on the socioeconomic and environmental impacts of the project and use the findings and conclusions for the preparation of the PPERs. The PPER must be evidence-based and self-contained to the extent possible. However, repetition of the contents of the PCR must be avoided by making selective references to the PCR for details concerning technical, operational and implementation aspects with which the PPER concurs. A PPER should focus mainly on: (i) important issues affecting implementation performance of the project; (ii) relevance of the project to both country and the Bank's country priorities and strategies; (iii) achievement of development objectives and outcomes based on appropriate indicators, efficiently, with lasting sustainable institutional development and other impacts (see Appendix 3 of the TOR for an indicative outline). Performance of the Bank and the Borrower including the executing agency for delivering the project should be assessed. Lessons drawn from the operation's experience and recommendation of remedial measures to be undertaken by operations complexes will be highlighted. The length of the PPER excluding the annexes should not exceed of 20 pages. Draft PPERs will record the results of the evaluation and the assessments made. PPERs will be reviewed by the OPEV Management, which will establish a Review Panel (internal and/or external) for this purpose using the DAC evaluation quality Standards.³

4.3 Preparation for and facilitation of a feedback/dissemination seminar. Evaluation results will be disseminated through feedback workshops in Mozambique and Zambia (or through video conference) to be organised in collaboration with the Field Offices of the Bank in those countries. The consultant will prepare the necessary documentation for each PPER – a 2-page “brief” for policymakers, a 4-page summary for technicians and a PowerPoint presentation – and will take into account in the final report any comments and observations made in the feedback seminar.

b) Deliverables

The deliverables of this evaluation are:

³ DAC Evaluation Quality Standards: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/51/7/38686953.pdf>

- a) A finalised evaluation approach paper of satisfactory quality as judged by the peer reviewers.
- b) Draft and final PPERs for the two projects of satisfactory quality as judged by peer reviewers.
- c) PowerPoint presentations and short notes on both evaluations, containing the main conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations of the two evaluations for the feedback/dissemination seminar as specified in 4.3 above.

5. CONSULTANT PROFILE

5.1 The consultant will be an international expert, with a minimum of master's degree level qualifications in hydraulics, civil engineering or other related disciplines and specific experience in the field of water supply and sanitation (rural and urban), including IWRM. Proven skills and experience in the following areas are essential:

- Methodology and practice of project evaluation.
- Policies and operations of Multilateral Development Banks.
- Development Aid in Africa.
- Excellent verbal and written skills in English.
- Skills in computer use for word processing, data analysis and presentations.

5.2 During the field mission, the international consultant will be assisted by a national consultant who is hired primarily to carry out the socioeconomic and environmental impact assessment of the project as part of this evaluation.

6. WORKLOAD AND TIMELINE

6.1 The estimated workload of the consultant for this assignment is 83 working-days.

6.2 Tentative timeline for the consultancy assignment is as below:

Tasks	Dates
a) Assignment Begins	15 Sept 2011
b) Review Literature and Draft Approach Paper	05 Oct 2011
c) OPEV Comment on Draft Approach Paper	10 Oct 2011
d) Submit Final Approach Paper	12 Oct 2011
e) Field Mission (Mozambique & Zambia)	15 Oct – 2 Nov 2011
f) Submit Draft Report – Mozambique Report	25 Nov 2011
g) OPEV Peer Review Comments on Mozambique Report	30 Nov 2011
h) Submit Revised Draft Mozambique Report	05 Dec 2011
i) Review by Govt and Operational Depts. Mozambique Report	20 Dec 2011
j) Submit Final Draft Mozambique Report	30 Dec 2011
k) Submit Draft Mozambique Report	16 Dec 2011
l) OPEV Peer Review Comments on Mozambique Report	21 Dec 2011
m) Submit Revised Draft Report Mozambique	24 Dec 2011
n) Review by Govt and Operational Depts. Mozambique Report	15 Jan 2012
o) Final Draft Submission	21 Jan 2012
p) Dissemination Seminar	31 Jan 2012

SELECT REFERENCES

Project Appraisal Reports

Mozambique: Maputo Water Supply Rehabilitation Project, January 1997, ADF/BD/WP/99/07.
Zambia: Central Province Water Supply and Sanitation Project, Appraisal Report, November 2000, ADF/BD/WP/2000/187.

Project Completion Reports

Mozambique: Maputo Water Supply Rehabilitation Project, December 2009, ADF/BD/IF/2009/289.
Zambia: Central Province Water Supply and Sanitation Project, Project Completion Report, April 2009, ADF/BD/IF/2009/100.

PCR Review Notes

Mozambique: Maputo Water Supply Rehabilitation Project, PCR Evaluation Note, January 2010.
Zambia: Central Province Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project, PCR Evaluation Note, July 2009.

Country Strategy Papers

Mozambique: 1999 –2001 Country Strategy Paper, November, 1999, ADF/BD/WP/99/138.
Mozambique: 2002 – 2004 Country Strategy Paper, June 2005, ADF/BD/WP/2003/127/ADD.1.
Mozambique: 2006-2009 Country Strategy Paper, April 2006, ADF/BD/WP/2006/41.
Zambia: 1999-2001 Country Strategy Paper, November 1999, ADF/BD/WP/99/127.
Zambia: 1999-2001 Country Strategy Paper, Update, November 2000, ADF/BD/WP/99/127/ADD.2.
Zambia: 2002-2004 Country Strategy Paper, June 2003, ADF/BD/WP/2003/70.

Country Portfolio Reviews

Mozambique: Portfolio Review Report, June 2006, ADF/BD/WP/2006/48.
Mozambique: Country Portfolio Performance Report, October 2008, ADF/BD/WP/2008/109.
Zambia: Country Portfolio Review, December 2005, ADF/BD/WP/2005/153.
Zambia: Country Portfolio Performance Report, October 2008, ADF/BD/WP/2008/107.