

**ETHIOPIA: GENALE-DAWA RIVER BASIN INTEGRATED RESOURCES
DEVELOPMENT MASTER PLAN STUDY**

TECHNICAL COMPLETION REPORT

1. BASIC DATA

Country:	Ethiopia
Project title:	Genale Dawa River Basin Integrated Resources Development master Plan Study
Grant number	: 2100155001698, project ID.P-ET-AA0-013
Borrower	: Government of Ethiopia
Executing agency	: Ministry of Water Resources
Date of appraisal	: 02 August 2001
Date of loan signature	: 16 November 2001
Grant entry into force	: 27 June 2002
Commencement date	: 23 October 2003
Completion date (implementation)	: 22 march 2007
Date of final disbursement	: 28 August 2009 (one final payment remains)
Total study costs (appraisal)	: UA 3,928,000 (ETB 42.54 million) from ADF and UA 273,000 (ETB 2.96 million) from GoE
Total Grant costs (actual)	: ADB: ADF: UA 3,928,000.00 Government/Borrower: ETB 26, 667,374.16
Grant amount	: UA 3,928,000 (of which UA 850,000 was reallocated to the Food Crisis Response Initiative)
Disbursement Rate	: UA 3,902,549.57 (99.35%)
Progress reports	: 21 Quarterly Progress Reports, 1 Terminal Report and 1 Audit Report have been prepared and submitted to the Bank.
Supervision/Follow up	: There was no stand alone Bank's Supervision Mission launched for the study. However, formal follow-ups were made at-least once in a year while conducting Supervision Missions of other agricultural projects. The findings of the assessment and agreed actions have been reflected in the Aide Memoires that were signed with government. ETFO had played active role in routine follow-up of the study. The Task Management of the study, which was handled at OSAN.1, was delegated to ETFO since Mid 2009.

2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND DESCRIPTION

2.1 Project Objectives

The overall sector goal of the study is to contribute to the reduction of poverty and the improvement of the welfare of the rural populations. The specific objectives of the study are to:

- (i) prepare a master plan which would contribute to the sustainable development and poverty reduction in the Genale Dawa River Basin and which makes optimum use of all natural, physical, human and animal resources with minimum possible adverse environmental impact; and,
- (ii) Preparation of three feasible projects for future financing.

2.2 Implementation Phases

The study was undertaken by the Ministry of Water Resources (MOWR) and was conducted over a 36 months period.

The overall master plan study comprised three phases:

- i) Phase I This phase of sixteen months duration was devoted to the execution of sectoral studies and analysis. The outputs of this phase included reports on sectoral studies and establishment of comprehensive database to serve as the foundation for phase II master plan preparation.
- ii) Phase II The second phase of the study was supposed to last ten months and was devoted to the preparation of the Master Plan. The outputs of this phase included the Basin Master Plan and potential Projects. The master plan included a Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) and a Regional Environmental Management Plan (REMP).
- iii) Phase III This phase was expected to last six months and was devoted to preparation of feasibility reports of three priority agricultural and water resources development projects selected by the client and stakeholders from the lists proposed in phase II.

Summary of the milestones of the study, as scheduled at appraisal stage and the actual implementation, is shown in the table below.

Summary Milestones of the study

ACTIVITY	SCHEDULE OF IMPLEMENTATION		REMARK
	APPRAISAL	ACTUAL	
A. Fulfilling Grant Conditions			
1. Board Approval	September 2001	27 September 2001	
2. Grant signature	October 2001	16 November 2001	
3. Establishing Study Coordination Unit and appointment of Study Coordinator	Data not available	January 2002	
4. Effectiveness	December 2001	27 June 2002	
B. Recruitment of Consultants			
5. Issue of invitation to tender	May 2002	19 July 2002	
6. Contract award	August 2002	30 April 2003	
7. Commencement date	October 2002	23 October 2003	
C. Implementation of the study			
8. Submission of inception report	January 2003	6 April 2004	
9. Submission of Draft Phase I report	November 2003	March 2005	
10. Stakeholders seminar	December 2003	April 2005	
11. Review and acceptance of Phase I report	January 2004	September 2005	
12. Phase II commences	March 2004	April 2005	
13. Submission of Draft Phase II report	October 2004	July 2006	
14. Stakeholders seminar	November 2004	August 2006	
15. Review and acceptance of Phase II report	December 2004	December 2006	
16. Phase III a. commences (GD-3 Multipurpose Hydropower project) b. LGIDP and NWSP Projects	February 2005	July 2005 March 2008	The study on the two additional projects delayed due to contractual dispute with the consultant
17. Submission of draft feasibility report 17.1. GD-3 M. Hydropower Project 17.2. LGIDP and NWSP (2 projects)	September 2005	February 2007 November 2008	
18. Stakeholders seminar 18.1 GD-3 M. Hydropower 18.2 LGIDP and NWSP	October 2005	April 2007 November 2008	
19. Submission of final report 19.1. GD-3 M. Hydropower project 19.2. LGIDP and NWSP	January 2006	December 2007 March 2009	
20. Submission of Terminal Report and External Audit report		September 2009	

LGIDP= Lower Genale Irrigation Development Project; NWSP= Negele Water Supply Project

2.3 Recruitment of Consultants

As per the grant agreement and stipulated in the Appraisal Report, the recruitment of consulting firm to undertake the study was done through Prequalification and Short listing of firms. Accordingly, the contract was awarded to Lahmeyer International GmbH of Germany in association with Yeshi-Ber Consult of Ethiopia on 30 April 2003.

The original contract amount was USD 3,984,154 with ADB's share of USD 3,984,154. But, due to the need for modification of the size and scope of the feasibility study of GD-3 Multi-purpose Hydropower Project in Phase III, the cost of the contract increased to USD 4,655,558.00 of which ADB's share was USD 4,505,734.00. In the same manner, the consultant claimed for additional resources for undertaking feasibility studies of the remaining two projects saying that both projects selected by the client are huge than anticipated. In attempt to justify the request, several letters and email communications were exchanged between the Bank and the Executing Agency. But, the request could not be accepted by the Bank due to lack of necessary provision in the contract to entertain such request. After a delay of one year, the dispute was resolved amicably as the client agreed to pay the additional resources from the government treasury.

As the result, the initial plan to complete the study under the original contract agreement of March 2007 was extended by 2 years until March 2009.

2.4 Implementation of the study

Phase I: Sectoral Studies and Analysis

After the full-fledged mobilization of the consultant in November 2003, the consultant submitted the Draft Inception report in March 2004 and was reviewed by the stakeholders in April 2004 and the Final Inception Report was submitted in June 2004.

Following the review of available documents, field data collected and analysis of the basin, the Draft Phase I on Sectoral studies and Indicative Master Plan Reports were submitted by the consultant in March 2005. The draft reports were reviewed during a stakeholder workshop held in April 2005. The Final Phase I report, after incorporating comments from the stakeholders, was submitted in September 2005. The planned schedule for implementation of Phase I activities as a whole was 17 months but the draft report was submitted on the 17th month whereas the final version of the reports were submitted on the 23rd months, i.e. after 8 months delay. However, implementation of Phase II activities was undertaken in parallel to avoid contractual delays.

The outputs of Phase I included several sectoral reports and establishment of comprehensive data base on the basin. All reports were shared with relevant stakeholders including the Bank.

Phase II: Master Planning and Pre-feasibility Study

Phase II Master plan preparation and pre-feasibility studies commenced in April 2005.

The deliverable/outputs at the end of Phase II include Master Plan for the basin and pre-feasibility studies for six water resource projects. The Main Report of the Master Plan includes Master Plan, Project Profiles, Water Planning Model, Strategic Environmental and Social Impact Assessment and Regional Environmental Management Plan. The six prefeasibility studies undertaken during Phase II are listed below:

- i. Lower Genale Irrigation Project (Somali Region)
- ii. Welmel Irrigation Development Project (Oromia Region)
- iii. Negele Water supply Scheme (Oromia Region)
- iv. Yabelo Water Supply Scheme (Oromia Region)
- v. GD-3 Multipurpose Hydropower Project (Oromia/Somali Regions), and
- vi. Bonora Integrated Watershed Management Project (SNNP Region).

Each Pre-feasibility report contains 3 volumes: Main report, Annexes, Drawings and Maps. The draft Master Plan and prefeasibility reports were submitted in July 2006 and reviewed during a stakeholder workshop in August 2006. The final version in hard and electronic copies (CD) were submitted in December 2006 and the same were shared with the Bank and other concerned stakeholders.

While in Phase II, government was interested in accelerating the feasibility study of GD-3 Multipurpose Hydropower Project which has already been studied at prefeasibility level by the MOWR in 1999. With the approval of the Bank, contract modification for USD 521,580 (from the unutilized grant balance) was signed between the client and the consultant to start the feasibility study of this project in parallel with the preparation of the master plan and prefeasibility studies of the other potential projects. Additional study was also required for geotechnical and geophysical investigation at the dam site which was critical to feed into the feasibility study of GD-3 Multipurpose Hydropower project. This additional work was done by a separate contract with another consulting firm (ARDICO-RODIO) at a cost of USD 1.023 million and this additional expense was fully covered from government resources.

Phase III: Feasibility studies

Among the list of projects identified in Phase II, the MOWR selected the following three agricultural and water resources projects to be studied to feasibility level:

- i. Genale Multipurpose Hydropower Project (GD-3),
- ii. Lower Genale Irrigation Development Project (15,000 ha) and
- iii. Negele Water supply Scheme

The draft feasibility report of GD-3 Multipurpose Hydropower Project, which commenced earlier in Phase II period, was submitted in February 2007 and reviewed at a stakeholder workshop held in August 2007. The final version of the feasibility report was submitted in hard and electronic copies and shared with the Bank in December 2007.

The two remaining projects, prioritized by the government for feasibility studies in Phase III were Lower Genale Irrigation Development Project and Negele Long Range Water Supply and

Sanitation Project. Implementation of the feasibility studies of these two priority projects encountered a contract-related problem. Lahmeyer International in Association with Yeschi-Ber Consult requested the MOWR for allocation of additional resources or downsizing of feasibility studies, claiming that these two projects were beyond the magnitude envisioned during the submission of their proposals. The MoWR negotiated with the Consultant and signed an MOU to provide for additional investigation costs assuming that it will be covered from grant resources (USD 149,854). As mentioned in the earlier section, the Bank could not accept the request as there was no article that supported the contract modification. The issue was resolved amicably after the MoWR decided to cover the additional costs from government treasury. The task on the above mentioned two feasibility studies was resumed by the consultant in March 2008.

The draft feasibility reports of the two projects were submitted in November 2008, reviewed during a stakeholder workshop held in November 2008. The final version of feasibility reports were submitted in hard and electronic copies in March 2009.

The outputs of the feasibility report of each project under phase III were contained in 5 volumes: Executive Summary, Main Report, Environmental Impact Assessment, Annexes and Drawings. The final reports were prepared after incorporating all the relevant comments delivered by concerned stakeholders to the respective draft reports.

The quality of the deliverables/outputs that were submitted by the consultant in all stages of the study was found to fully consistent with the TOR requirements. To that end, the reports were accepted by the Ministry of Water Resources and AfDB.

Other Implementations beyond the Grant financing study

The MOWR has continued the implementation of the Negele Area Long-range Water Supply scheme further towards the Design and Tender Document Preparation level by hiring a local consultant, Water Works Design and Supervision Enterprise (WWDSE) at a cost of ETB 3,591,340.00. The Bank was also informed that the Oromia Regional State has started the construction of the water supply scheme at the Negele town.

The MOWR has also allocated budget to the detailed design study of the Welmel (10,000 ha) Irrigation Development, which was studied at pre-feasibility level under the Genale Dawa Project Contract. The Consulting firm for this project is WWDSE and the cost of the study is ETB 15,000,000.00

In addition to the six prefeasibility projects listed in earlier section, GD-6 Hydropower project was also studied at feasibility level by Norplan Norconsult consultants from GOE allocated budget. The cost of the consultancy service and geotechnical investigation is USD 2,161,675.50.

Ethiopian Electric Power Corporation has also considered in its plan for further study and development of the GD-3 and GD-6 multipurpose hydropower project. These projects are ready for investment and some foreign investors from Turkey, Japan and China have expressed their interest.

2.5 Procurement Issues

Recruitment of consultant

To undertake the Genale-Dawa Master Plan Study, the consultant was recruited using shortlisting of firms through prequalification. Details on this aspect are already mentioned in earlier section.

Contract addendum

As mentioned earlier, the Bank provided its 'No Objection' and the addendum was signed between MOWR and the consultant, Lahmeyer International GmbH in Association with Yeshi-Ber Consult, for the allocation of additional resource due to variation in scope of work to undertake GD-3 Multi-purpose Hydropower project. But similar requests for the remaining two priority projects were rejected on the grounds that: The Bank had reviewed the issue extensively on two separate occasions and found no contractual justification for the addenda requests, and that the Consultant had a contractual obligation to complete the remaining Phase III Feasibility Studies within the allocated resources of the grant.

Additional feasibility study

In addition to the above-mentioned three priority projects, the MoWR informs the Bank of their intention to conduct a feasibility study of an additional irrigation project (Welmel 10,000ha), which was studied earlier at a pre-feasibility level under the Genale Dawa Master Plan Study and requests the Bank's 'no objection' to use remaining grant funds supplemented by the Government's own resources to procure the services of a consultant. Accordingly, the RFP (including shortlist of consulting firms) was approved by the Bank in May 2008. But this could not materialize as the remaining grant resources (UA 850,000) was reallocated, following the request from government, to the African Food Crisis Initiative. The MOWR, however, continued the feasibility study of this project by recruiting consulting firm using its own resource.

Recruitment of external audit firm

The need for submission of audit report by PIUs handling studies was raised during the Audit Mission in November 2008. The recruitment process adopted was short listing of national audit firms using Combined Technical Quality with Price Considerations method of selection. The total cost of the service has been ETB 32,000.00. The consultant, *kokeb Moges & Co*, successfully completed the assignment and the report was submitted to the Bank in September 2009.

Procurement of goods

Goods related to the study were procured in accordance with Bank's procurement rules and procedures. The procurement of goods, which included twelve computers with accessories, two Printers, one photocopier and surveying equipments, was done using National Shopping method.

Purchase of GIS Equipment

GIS equipment was also purchased and delivered through the same consulting firm at a value of USD 28,241.21 that was reimbursed from the grant resource. The mode of procurement of this equipment was originally International Shopping, but due to lack of bidders the direct mode of procurement was used through the consulting firm after no objection has been granted by the Bank.

Procurement of vehicles

There was no provision in the cost category to purchase vehicles using the grant resources. Rather, there was a lump sum budget for transportation costs. The contract agreement with Lahmeyer International also indicated lump sum transport costs. However, the purchase of 20 vehicles (cost of one of the vehicles covered by government budget) was delegated by the client to Lahmeyer. An e-mail communication from the Task Manager on 15 May 2003 indicates that the Study Coordination Unit was given green light to go-ahead with the proposed purchase using GOE rules and as far as the vehicles met the specifications indicated by government in the letter of Invitation. The vehicles were imported by the consultant with immediate ownership title transferred to MOWR and became operational with government plates. The cost of 19 vehicles valuing ETB 3,733,406.36 was covered by ADF grant whereas ETB 3,746,560.53 was covered by government contribution (purchase value of one vehicle plus custom's duty for all).

The Terminal Report of the study by the MOWR confirmed that all the vehicles and goods that were purchased and delivered to the consultant for undertaking its assignment have been formally handed over to the ministry at the end of the study.

2.6 Financial Management/Disbursement issues

Disbursement

- The study did not have special account and all payments to the consultants and suppliers were made using direct payment through the Bank. As at the end of the study, 64 applications received from the Executing Agency were processed by the Bank. Including part of the funds (UA 850, 000) that was reallocated to the Food Crisis Response Initiative, 99.35% of the grant funds has been disbursed as at 30 September 2009. This doesn't include the payment to the audit firm (ETB 32,000) that has been submitted but yet to be processed by the Bank.
- Following the request from the government to reallocate UA 850,000 from the unutilized grant balance of the study to the African Food Crisis Response (AFCR), the grant closing date of 31 December 2008 was further extended to 31 December 2009. As indicated in the Letter of Agreement signed between the Bank and GoE on 27th November 2008, a new component entitled '*AFCR for Goods and Services*' was introduced into the Category of Expenditures which allowed the disbursement to the new AFCR Bank account.
- The government contribution as envisioned during appraisal was UA 273,000 (ETB 2.96 million). According to the findings of the audit report, the actual amount of contribution by government was ETB 26, 667,374.16. This covered expenses incurred

for salary of SCU staff, investigation costs for feasibility studies, purchase of one additional vehicle, VAT and costumes' duty paid for the purchase of 20 vehicles and other goods.

Financial Management:

- The audit report which was reviewed by ORPF indicated that proper ledger to record government contributions to the study and fixed asset register for the fixed assets and equipments purchased with the Grant's fund were not maintained by the Study Coordination Unit.

Audit Report:

- As mentioned in earlier section, the need for submission of audit report by SCUs handling studies was raised during the Bank's Audit Mission in November 2008. To this end, an external auditor was engaged in accordance with the Bank's procurement procedure, to carry out audit of the study for the period covering 8 July 2003 to 7 July 2009. The reports were prepared and submitted to the Bank in September 2009.
- The major findings of the audit included: i) purchase of 20 vehicles without agreement with the Bank; and ii) Proper ledgers not maintained for government contributions. Regarding the first issue, evidence on communication made with the Bank has been explained in section 2.5 above.

2.7 Study coordination, M&E and Reporting

The Study was executed under the Ministry of Water Resources (MOWR), headed by the Basin Development Studies and Water Utilization Control Department. The Study Co-ordination Unit (SCU) established within the Department was managed by a Study Co-ordinator with counterpart staff. The Unit was instrumental in establishing continuous links between the Ministry, the Bank and the Consultant and regularly monitored the implementation of the study and facilitated the work of the Consultant.

A Steering Committee at federal level, chaired by the State Minister of MOWR, ensured high level of co-ordination of the study and provided strategic guidance. Other members of the Steering Committee comprised representatives of all relevant line Ministries and Agencies, such as the Environmental Protection Agency and Ethiopian Electric Power Corporation, the Regional Council and the Study Co-ordinator acting as Secretary.

At Regional level, a Technical Review Committee composed of different sector bureau heads, ensured that the regional perspectives are taken into account and actively participated in reviewing relevant reports of issued emanated from the study..

The day-to-day operations of the study were satisfactorily managed by the SCU in the MOWR and the Bank commended the staff of the Unit for their high level commitment and dedication during various agricultural supervision missions.

The Study was always up to date in submission of well qualified and detailed Quarterly Progress Reports. The consultant also submitted to the Coordination Unit its quarterly progress report on regular basis and the reports were shared with the Bank.

Some interested donors and those NGOs operating in the study area were consulted by the consultant during the study. Most of them also actively participated in stakeholder consultations and documents review workshops held at various stages of the study.

2.8 Sustainability

The Bank was delighted to note that GOE was proactively engaged in fast tracking to upgrade additional prefeasibility studies (Welmel Irrigation and GD-6 Hydropower) at feasibility level and some feasibility studies (GD-3 Multipurpose Hydropower and Negele Water Supply Scheme) to higher level of detailed design and tender document preparations.

Government is also highly committed and is in the process of implementing the two potential projects namely, the GD-3 Multipurpose Hydropower Project and Negele Water Supply scheme. The Bank was informed that there is international interest shown by EEPCO to undertake construction of the Hydropower project. The Bank was also informed that another company from Japan has expressed similar interest for Lower Genale Irrigation Development project. The Bank was encouraged to note that the Oromia Regional State benefited from the outcome of the study and just started construction of the Negele town water supply scheme.

2.9 Challenges/problems

There was no serious problem encountered during the study except the dispute over a contract addendum for two feasibility studies. Other minor problems included the followings

- Delays in fulfilling grant conditions. Fulfilling grant conditions took over seven months.
- Delays in recruitment of consultants. The process for recruitment of consulting firm took about 15.5 months.
- Periodic replacement of consulting personnel. Several consulting personnel were replaced during the course of implementation. Effort was made to replace with similar or better qualified staff. But the process also contributed to delays.
- Delays in Bank responses. In some instance, Bank response to various procurement related requests was not without delay.
- Delays in effecting payments by the Bank and deduction from payments without sufficient explanation. About 16 percent of the direct payment requests were processed after 50 days. The delays were partly caused by submission of incomplete documents by the SCU and partly due to delays within the Bank.

2.10 Lessons learned

The major lessons drawn from conducting this study are briefly listed below.

- The need for proper management of contract in recruitment of consultants especially in handling contract addendum. The delay caused due to dispute over magnitude and scope of work could have been avoided if such issue was properly handled during negotiation and signing of the contract agreement. Periodic familiarization of Bank rules and procedures to the Executing Agencies could also minimize the occurrence of such incidence.
- The study experienced frequent replacement of consultant personnel, partly due to delays in the start up stages caused by lengthy recruitment process as well as disputes

over the handling the two feasibility studies. Efforts were made by replacing qualified candidates but the problem could have been minimized if the borrower adheres to implementation schedules.

2.11 Conclusions and recommendations

With the exception of the long delays encountered as a result of contractual disputes regarding the feasibility of the two projects, the study has been rated as 'satisfactory'. The final Phase I, II and III reports were submitted by the Consultant in hard and electronic copies and were submitted to the Bank. Thus, the study output/deliverables as envisioned during the appraisal were fully achieved.

The ownership of the study by government was very strong as demonstrated by its commitment in allocating additional resources to the study and the immediate actions being taken to upgrade the studies and fast track the implementation of the projects.

The total capital investment required to implement the projects envisaged for 20-30 years planning period is about ETB 41,466 Billion. The major share of this investment is water resources development. The MOWR has indicated that immediate investment finance is required for the Lower Genale Irrigation Development and the GD-3 and GD-6 Multipurpose Hydropower Development Projects. The Bank may consider some of these projects under ADF XII if interest is still shown by government to include them as priority interventions during the upcoming CSP preparation for Ethiopia, scheduled for 2010.

ANNEXES

No	Comment	Response by the PCR mission
1	One important lesson coming from the PCR is that for studies of this magnitude and complexity duration of around 5 years is more appropriate.	Five years for a study seems too long. The problem could have been avoided if fulfilling conditions for grant effectiveness were accelerated and timely recruitment of consultants and proper contract administration were done by the SCU.
2	Having invested such a large amount of resources to develop these projects, the Bank should seriously consider being part of their financing.	Comment well noted. This will have to be discussed during the upcoming CSP preparation in 2010.
3	The reviewer is unable to confirm that a standard PCR format is used.	Internal consultation was made with ORQR, the new PCR guideline does not require to use the new excel format for studies. The report was prepared based on the previous format
4	Item 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6: Borrowers and Banks performance in the implementation of the study in terms of technical (project design, implementation, consultants performance, etc), financial management/disbursement, procurement, etc needs to be exhaustively evaluated.	Comments well noted and reflected in section 2.10
5	<p>Item 2.9 Lessons Learned: Lessons learnt with respect of each of the items discussed above (item 3) above have to be discussed. Page</p> <p>Page 10 last paragraph: It is stated that the delay caused due to dispute over magnitude and scope of work could have been avoided if such issue was properly handled during negotiation and signing of contract agreement. However, it is not clear how the magnitude and scope of the projects to be studied are understood during signing of the agreement? We understand the projects were identified during the course of the study. It would be appreciated if further clarification is given on this point.</p>	<p>Already reflected in the new section 2.10 on Lesson Learned.</p> <p>The issue of scope and magnitude of projects for feasibility study was mentioned in the consultant's proposal. The problem is that it was neither reflected in the minutes of negotiation nor the contract agreement. The Bank's rejection of the proposed addendum was due to the fact that the contract was a lumpsome contract and there was such provision mentioned to support the addendum.</p>

6	<p>Item 2.6 Study Coordination, M&E and Reporting: The status of the Monitoring and Evaluation on the project and its role in enhancing the performance of the project was not discussed</p>	<p>At appraisal, the SCU was expected to be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the study, facilitating the work of the consultant team and co-ordinating its activities and providing the link between the consultant, government and the Bank. This takes were adequately implemented by the SCU and this was reflected in the report.</p>
7	<p>Item 2.8 Sustainability: Sustainability of the implementation of projects and programs identified by the Master Plan can only be ensured if they are included in the Government Plan/PRSP recognized by MoFED.</p>	<p>Comment is handled in section 2.9 on Sustainability</p>
8	<p>Item 2.8 (2.9) Challenges: It would be more informative if the challenges listed under this section are elaborated exhaustively in terms of timing and their contribution in the delay of the project and proposed measures to avoid similar conditions in future projects. Draw backs in project supervision and its impact on the project progress.</p>	<p>Comments well taken and challenges briefly elaborated</p>
9	<p>Log-Frame: There are no comments made on the log-frame design.</p>	<p>There was no Log-Frame for this study prepared at appraisal</p>
10	<p>Coordination with other donors: It would be appreciated if the role/ participation of donors (working in the area) in sharing their experience during the course of the implementation of the study is mentioned.</p>	<p>Very few donors and all NGOs operating in the study area have been consulted during the study. They also participated in consultation and document review workshops at various stages of the study.</p>